

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty FACULTY OF HUMANITIES	Laitos – Department DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
Tekijä – Author Martin Pablo Bennung	
Työn nimi – Title The conjoint conceptualization and negotiation of national cultures - A qualitative study of discursive culture-concepts, their function and their relation to stereotypes	
Oppiaine – Subject Intercultural Communication	Työn laji – Level Master's thesis
Aika – Month and year May 2015	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 106
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>The study of stereotypes and stereotyping is as complex and multi-faceted as the social phenomenon itself. From being seen as an erroneous and over-generalizing image in the mind of individuals, to the current perspective that stereotypes have an individual and a social level, are shaped by long-term and short-term contextual factors, and are used for certain purposes, managed and negotiated, stereotypes have been acknowledged as a topic which cannot be studied within one academic discipline alone.</p> <p>This study looks into stereotype use and management during in-group discourse about other national cultures. The data consists of three focus groups consisting of Finnish students who talk about their attitudes towards other cultures. While the study is theoretically informed by the different fields interested in the phenomenon, it does not adapt or tend towards any single theoretical position.</p> <p>The analysis reveals that the group functions of stereotypes as laid out in Social Identity Theory can be observed in talk, but in a significantly more varied and complex way than expected. The nature of a short-term conversation as driven by stake, functions, context and individual factors, gradually turns out to be incompatible with any stereotype definition. The results argue for a separation between stereotypes as defined in social psychological literature, and the conjoint creation of a discursive culture-concept as a construct that only exists in the moment of the conversation. We finally address the complex relation between stereotypes and concepts.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Conceptualized, conceptualizer, culture concept, discursive comparison, Discursive Psychology, functions of stereotyping, Stereotype discourse, stereotype management	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository University of Jyväskylä	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

THE CONJOINT CONCEPTUALIZATION AND NEGOTIATION OF
NATIONAL CULTURES

A qualitative study of discursive culture-concepts, their function and their relation to
stereotypes

Martin Pablo Bennung

Department of Communication
University of Jyväskylä
Jyväskylä – Finland

21st of May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENT

1.	Introduction.....	4
2.	Theories on stereotyping.....	6
2.1	A review of the academic study of stereotypes and stereotyping	7
2.1.1	Social Cognition, social categorization and stereotypes as socially learned prototypes.....	12
2.1.2	Social Identity, Self-categorization and the effect of the stereotype-functions on their content	16
2.2	From mental states to discursive tools: Stereotypes as the discursive application and management of psychology	21
2.3	National and ethnic stereotypes as communicative representations of intercultural relations.....	26
3.	Research questions and issues of data gathering and analysis	30
3.1	Objectives of the study – Defining the research questions	30
3.2	Methods of data gathering and analysis.....	31
3.2.1	Discursive Psychology – Observing the manifestation of psychological affairs during conversations	31
3.2.2	Focus groups – Between critical topics and natural conversations	35
3.3	Design and participants of the focus groups	40
4.	The function-driven application and the management of stereotype-patterns during talk about different cultures	42
4.1	Discursive stereotype-patterns as context-bound markers of similarity and difference between or within groups.....	42
4.2	Stereotype-patterns as explanations for group behavior	54
4.3	The discursive expression of stereotype-awareness and mitigation	61
4.4	Generalization, accentuation, juxtaposition, individuation - Constructing cultural uniformity and diversity in discourse	66
5.	Conceptualizing heterogeneity in talk – A new perspective on the conjoint construction of cultures and the significance of stereotypes	80
5.1	The conceptualizer, the conceptualized and the concept – Making talk about cultures possible	81
5.2	Reference or description – Concepts are elaborated based on the function they are created and negotiated for.....	83
5.3	Discursive culture-concepts and their ascribed features adhere to a comparative function	85
5.4	Speakers are aware of stereotypes and their sources, and use this awareness for discursive purposes	87
6.	Constructing stereotype uniformity and diversity in academic discourse.....	92
7.	The study of stereotypes in talk – A critical evaluation of our research process... 94	
	References.....	97
	Appendix: Transcripts of the data.....	107

1. Introduction

In our society most people are familiar with the key features of a stereotype. They are overly simplified fixed images widely held among members of a group concerning characteristics of another group. The word "stereotype" is also connected to prejudice, meaning that in a certain situation we will judge members of another group by relying on our stereotypes rather than their individual characteristics ("stereotype, n. and adj", n.d.). The potentially negative impact of stereotyping is widely known, but despite this and despite the fact that we consider our society to be more open and globalized, we come across negative stereotypes on a daily basis. The public discourse concerning the financial crisis in Greece is one example that shows their impact. It is clear, that stereotypes in talk are not used to represent truth, so why are they used? What does their application achieve during conversations?

The academic study of stereotypes, and thus the definition of the phenomenon, has taken two different directions early on. These directions are acknowledged as the main areas of stereotype-research until today:

On the one hand, stereotypes as devices for saving cognitive capabilities are studied by Social Cognition. The low restricted mental capacity of the individual to process information leads to the need of using social categories to make sense of the world surrounding us. A stereotype is a belief associated to such a category. According to Social Cognition, a stereotype can form internally as a so-called illusory correlation, or it can be socially or culturally learned (Fiske & Macrae, 2012; Leyens, Yzerbyt, & Schadron, 1994).

On the other hand, stereotypes as tools to create and maintain a positive group identity are studied by the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory. These theories claim that individuals seek social-group membership to satisfy a basic social need. Once they belong to a certain group, they adapt its values, rituals, beliefs, etc. whenever this group-membership is relevant. Social Identity is the identity we generate from group membership. Within this strand, Tajfel (1982) has identified three social functions that stereotypes have: They are used

to explain events, f.ex. a behavior of a stranger, they serve to justify a certain behavior against another group, and they differentiate groups from each other and create a positive group identity by highlighting a negative trait of another group. (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994; Turner & Hogg, 1987).

So we can briefly say, that Social Cognition studies the unconscious cognitive process of stereotyping, while the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory study the stereotype content and application as a social and active process. While both approaches differ in several aspects, they do share the social category as key-template for coping with our social environment. They do also share the realist epistemology and treat stereotypes as enduring entities that can be empirically measured by the use of quantitative analysis (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998).

Especially in the case of the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory, this is a key-contradiction and a restriction to the study of stereotypes, because they are treated as complex and enduring systems of associated beliefs. They ignore or merely acknowledge their overt representation during a certain communicative act, where they are influenced by contextual, social and individual factors and are therefore highly variable. This shortcoming weighs so heavily, because everything social involves communication. Tajfel's group functions should not be restricted to stereotypes as enduring entities, they should be studied as the communicative application of a stereotype or an aspect of a stereotype at a certain point in time to fulfill such a function. For example, the explanation of an event by using a stereotype is something we might observe during a discursive situation rather than exclusively as an internalized sense-making process (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; McGarthy, Yzerbyt, Spears, 2002; Ladegaard 2011a). If we want to observe the act of applying a stereotype to fulfill a conversational function, and if we want to see what patterns are activated during this process, we need to turn to discursive data and the study of psychological phenomena using discourse-analytic methods. An approach committed to doing this is Discursive Psychology, which

Stubbe, Lane, Hilder, Vine, Vine, Marra, Holmes and Weatherall (2003) coin as being informed by social psychological theories and studying these phenomena by the analysis of discourse.

In this paper, we will look at theories addressing stereotypes in order to understand their limits and possibilities for a discursive study. We will then discuss the appropriate methodology of studying stereotypes in talk. We will analyze the data from three focus-group conversations among Finnish students at the University of Jyväskylä in Finland. We will observe and discuss stereotype-patterns reflecting the group functions defined by Social Identity Theory. We will look at methods, by which the participants cope with the potentially negative results of applying stereotypes. We will also look at the management of inconsistencies. Based on our analysis, we will discuss the general relation between stereotypes and their manifestation in talk. Finally, we will draw conclusions and point out implications for the academic study of stereotypes in talk.

2. Theories on stereotyping.

In the field of intercultural and cross-cultural communication, stereotypes are described as cognitions of an over-generalized, inaccurate and mostly negative nature. They have an origin, a function, a set of attributes, a descriptive and an evaluative dimension, and they are bound to all kinds of contextual factors. Culture is only one of the several levels on which stereotyping takes place. One assumption about why they exist is that stereotypes are devices that help to give order and structure to social reality. Additionally, the phenomenon is relevant for groups and their interrelation (Gudykunst, Abrams, Andersen, Barnett, Chen, Choi, Ting-Toomey, 2003).

The definition given above is so general and broad because it incorporates aspects originating from and studied by different academic approaches. If we want to study a specific

aspect of the phenomenon, we first want to get informed about these approaches. We will give an overview over the different theories on stereotyping, their origins and the aspects they focus on. Within this spectrum, the Social Cognitive approach and the Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory will be looked at in more detail. We will address the study of the use of stereotypes as a conversational tool within the discursive field. Finally, we will discuss the relation of these theories to each other and reintegrate these insights into the field of Intercultural Communication.

2.1 A review of the academic study of stereotypes and stereotyping

Since the American journalist Walter Lippman described the term stereotype in the societal and political context as “pictures in our heads” about social groups and since Katz and Braly developed a first method to measure national stereotypes in 1933, their study has been divided into social aspects and individual aspects. We will briefly look at theories within both approaches (Bar-Tal, Graumann, Kruglanski, & Stroebe, 1989).

I. Social aspects of stereotyping

The social approaches to stereotyping can be divided into conflict theories and social learning theories. Conflict theories argue that the basis of stereotyping is some kind of inter-group conflict that leads to negative stereotypes and prejudice. In 1965, Campbell laid the foundation for one of the theories emerging from this tradition, the Realistic Conflict Theory. According to this theory, a real conflict or threat or a falsely perceived threat can lead to in-group solidarity and the formation of negative stereotypes about the threatening out-group. An additional effect of this realistic conflict is ethnocentrism, the belief in the inherent superiority of one's own ethnic group (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Cargile, Bradac, & Cole, 2006; Leyens et al., 1994). This approach was later criticized because the relation between the real conflict and

ethnocentrism remained unclear. Neither was a real conflict seen as necessarily leading to ethnocentrism nor was such a conflict perceived as a necessary precondition for ethnocentrism (Bar-Tal et al., 1989).

The second conflict theory, Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), therefore rejected the idea of a real conflict as the basis for negative stereotypes. Rather it was the need of the individual to positively differentiate the groups he belongs to from relevant out-groups to achieve a positive social identity. The term 'conflict' should not be taken too literally, but these theories do account for the negative nature of the stereotype, as we will also see in the chapter about the Social Identity Theory.

The Social Learning theory by Eagly, on the other hand, argues that stereotypes are based on observations of actual inter-group differences or are learned through social sources like the mass media. Observation means that we perceive a certain behavior shown by another person and then make assumptions about traits that cause this behavior. For instance, if someone observes two Spanish persons engaging in a loud conversation and gesticulating wildly, the observer might perceive these persons as extroverted and passionate, thinking that these traits are necessary preconditions for the observed behavior. The ascription of traits is potentially random and it remains unclear, why a person attributes one trait or another to the observed behavior. A more important aspect is that the theory emphasizes the significance of socially learning stereotypes through influential sources such as the family, the media, or other entities. This learning through the social environment rather than through direct contact is a widely acknowledged feature of stereotypes (Bar-Tal, 1997; Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz & Ross, 2004).

II. Individual aspects of stereotyping

The second tradition focuses on individual aspects of stereotyping and can be further divided into psychodynamic and cognitive theories.

According to the psychodynamic theories, stereotypes and prejudice are a symptom of a deeper personality conflict. Therefore, Ashmore coined the term 'symptom theories' (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Bailenson, 2008; Leyens et al., 1994). The Scapegoat theory by Allport and Kramer argues that negative stereotypes due to the repression caused by an overly powerful entity, f.ex. a government. A less powerful entity is taken as a scapegoat for the aggression and attributed with negative traits that are allegedly responsible for the situation (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Leyens et al., 1994; Gollwitzer, 2004). The theory of the Authoritarian Personality is based on three assumptions: First, prejudice is a part of a bigger political, economic or social ideology. Second, the correlation between prejudice and other phenomena is based on more basic personal factors. Third, this personality basis is the result of parental control during the formative years.

It is important to understand, though, that these approaches concentrate on right-wing authoritarianism. Many explanations are outdated or incomplete and therefore not academically relevant. F. ex, according to the critics, these theories are unable to explain the content and the choice of target for stereotyping (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Lasorsa, 2008; Leyens et al., 1994).

The cognitive approach took a different direction. It is the limitations of the human capacity for the processing of incoming information that leads to perceptual and cognitive errors. Stereotypes are also seen as cognitive errors and are thus not motivational (Wetherell, 1996). A notable and interesting contribution to the cognitive study of stereotyping is the Accentuation theory which was coined by Richard Eiser and Wolfgang Stroebe (1972) and was developed by Tajfel and Wilkes. It defines a stereotype as an assumed correlation between a peripheral dimension or category like race or ethnicity and one or more focal

dimensions like intelligence, size, etc. Differences inside this category are assimilated and differences between categories are accentuated. These assumed correlations are acquired by the media, or inferences are made from observation. It was later assumed that this accentuating effect only occurs when subjects have no prior information about the out-group (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Eiser & Stroebe, 1972).

The accentuation effect may have originated from Social Cognition, but it not only involves individual ones. Henri Tajfel himself realized this and criticized the missing academic study of inter-group aspects of stereotypes. To put emphasis to this criticism, he developed a list of five functions of stereotypes, divided into two individual and three group-aspects:

The first function is the individual cognitive. Through stereotyping and categorization the individual systematizes and simplifies the environment.

The second function is the individual motivational. Stereotypes help to represent and preserve important social values.

The third is the explanatory group function, according to which stereotypes are used to explain social events that go beyond the individual.

The fourth function is the justifying group function. Stereotypes are used to justify the collective action or behavior against an out-group. If for example a German demands the exclusion of Greece from the Euro zone, he may justify this by using the stereotype of the “lazy Greek”.

The fifth function is the group differentiation function. Through stereotypes the positive differentiation of the in-group from relevant out-groups is achieved (Oakes et al., 1994).

This list outlines the boundary between the two main theories interested in stereotypes. A study of individual aspects will best be informed by Social Cognition, while the social and the group-aspects are addressed by the Social Identity Theory, as well as the Self-

categorization Theory originating from it. While this division can still be found in the current literature, it is not as rigid as it seems. Acknowledging the restricted nature of each theoretical approach, combined approaches have been suggested. National stereotypes for example often show a very wide consensus, which cannot be explained by focusing on individual cognitive aspects. Their effect may both be social in the sense of the favoritism of the in-group and the rejection of the out-group, as well as cognitive in the form of an internalized accentuation and other judgmental biases described by the cognitive theories (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998).

Tajfel's list indicates that the study of stereotypes in talk will most likely be informed by the theories focusing on social aspects, which would lead us to ignore Social Cognition. We will still discuss it for two reasons: First, Social Cognition helps us to understand the phenomenon of social categorization. Without a relevant category a stereotype cannot exist, and the foundation of social categorization is cognitive. Second, the Social Identity Theory was not developed independently from Social Cognition. As we will see, it is theoretically interested in inter-group relations and social aspects of stereotyping, but methodologically it cannot deny its roots. This has implications when attempting to study stereotypes as overt conversational patterns.

We will look at those elements of Social Cognition that are relevant to all aspects of stereotypes and their study. We will look at the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory to understand the social aspect of the phenomenon. When it comes to stereotypes in talk, we will look at restrictions and possibilities of these theories and turn to discursive approaches.

2.1.1 Social Cognition, social categorization and stereotypes as socially learned prototypes

Social Cognition has been a broad and much debated area of research in psychology. It deals with the individual's person perception and impression formation with a focus on information processing and memory. It emphasizes processes instead of outputs. Motivation and affect are not seen as equivalent to cognitive variables. It studies how individuals acquire, represent and retrieve person information as well as the relation of these processes to perceiver judgments. The information is processed on the basis of social categorization. Categories are defined as “abstract structures of knowledge that groups things that hold together on the basis of coherence”. Individuals that are perceived as sharing certain attributes like skin color or age are organized into a coherent category (Hogg, 2003; Leyens et al., 1994).

Social Categories are energy saving devices, i. e. they allow us to compare a perceived person against a template instead of having to build up a completely new impression every time we come across someone. The inevitable need for such a device is obvious considering the mass of individuals we walk past every day. Perceiving each of them as an individual would overstrain our mental capacity. Social categorization is an automated cognitive process. A perceived person may be untypical, partially typical or very typical for one category or another. So what are individuals compared against?

One possibility is that the center of a category is a prototype, the most typical representative. Prototypes are abstract referential category exemplars. That means, that they do not actually exist physically. Instead, they are abstracted from observed traits and behaviors of individuals perceived as belonging to a category, for example because of their skin color. The observed traits and behaviors are then defined as prototypical for the category. Interestingly, the tendency of assuming a correlation between a salient category and a salient trait or behavior seems to be deeply rooted in human nature and has been coined illusory correlation. The learning process we just described is founded on a distinctiveness-based

illusory correlation, i.e. two randomly co-occurring distinctive stimuli are perceived as correlated (Leyens et al., 1994 ; McGarty et al., 2002). The problem of the prototype-model is the fact that people are aware of the intra-categorical variability, which cannot be explained based on prototypes.

This led to the suggestion of the exemplar-model, according to which information is not guided by prototypes but taken in unguidedly. People only store exemplars of certain categories and rely on them when encountering another member of that category. The effect is strengthened as people encounter more exemplars of a category. These exemplars may differ in certain details and account for the perceived intra-categorical variability. (Fiske & Taylor, 2010; Forgas, 1981; Oakes et al., 1994; Leyens et al., 1994).

Both models have been regarded as insufficient on their own. People use both exemplars and prototypes to organize their social environment. The reliance on both or only one of them depends on the task, on the available information, and the familiarity and involvement with a certain category. There is evidence that in early ages people first store exemplars of a new category they encounter. Once a certain number of related exemplars is gathered, they may be abstracted into a category prototype. Ultimately, people store both the prototype and a set of exemplars for a category. The former serves as a summary and the latter helps to handle inconsistencies. The more unfamiliar people are with a category, the more will they rely on prototypes due to a lack of stored exemplars and often due to a lack of motivation to consider individual information (Fiske & Taylor, 2010).

So prototypes are beliefs about a social category. The more unfamiliar we are with a category, the less concrete exemplars do we have for it, and the more will we rely on prototypes. This definition links them to stereotypes, and indeed stereotypes are considered a form of prototype, but there is an important difference: Stereotypes, as also stated by the Social Learning approach, do not form autonomously within the individual through perception, but they are socially and culturally shared and learned. This includes all kinds of

social sources like the family, friends or the media. Stereotypes are also said to carry a negative evaluative meaning (McGarty et al., 2002; Pennington, 2000; Verkuyl 1998). In relation to the negative meaning, Brown (2000) argues that stereotypes cannot clearly be defined as negative but carry both a negative and a positive content. More importantly for Social Cognition, he also points out that this approach is generally interested in the cognitive process involving stereotyping, while a negative or positive meaning refers to the content of a stereotype, which is not a matter of study within this theory.

A generally important aspect of the social learning of stereotypes is pointed out by Fiske and Macrae (2012): Many categories and their corresponding stereotypes are acquired in early childhood via verbal cues transmitted by the family. Often a stereotypic picture of a category forms without the child ever encountering an actual member of this category. Instead, a mental picture is drawn on basis of what the child hears. The longer the stereotype remains unchallenged, and the more elaborate it is, the harder will it be overcome due to counter-exemplars, because these are acquired after the stereotype has formed (Bar-Tal, 1997).

Categorizing the social environment and assuming that every category can be described by certain traits or behaviors seems to be a part of our human nature. When we process information about categories we are very familiar with or we even belong to, we make assumptions based on personal prototypes and exemplars that are based on earlier observations. These cognitive entities generate a certain expectation when engaging in interaction with a member of that category. Even when being confronted with a category we are unfamiliar with, and have never interacted with or observed before, we look for a source to predict its traits and behaviors. And here the only sources are our stereotypes, only that they are potentially inaccurate and based only on our early social environment.

This is especially problematic because the most unfamiliar categories are the most salient ones and determine the impression we form about a person. The impression forming

impact of the most salient attribute is called primacy effect. Several studies have proven that unfamiliarity increases salience (see f. ex: Cochran & Warren, 2012). This means: If only one salient feature of a person is unfamiliar to us, i.e. if we have never observed it before, then this feature will trigger the priming category and determine the theory we form about that person's traits and behaviors. And this theory will have to rely on stereotypes, due to the lack of any other sources for impression formation (Fiske & Taylor, 2010; Leyens et al., 1994; Pennington, 2000).

The expectancy that an unfamiliar person will behave according to the stereotype-information we have about her category is called expectancy-based illusory correlation (see: Hamilton & Rose, 1980). According to McGarty et al. (2002), a series of experiments to reproduce this effect led to the interesting observation that people try to make assumptions about categorical traits and behaviors, even when they have no information whatsoever available. The reason for this lies in the way we conceptualize categories and groups. For us to cognitively grasp a category as coherent, it must have clear boundaries that differentiate it from another category and allows inter-category comparison. The features that give meaning to a social category are, as we saw, traits and behaviors. This means that we can only mentally represent a category if we define it by certain traits and behaviors that make it unique. In other words: A category exists because it can be differentiated from another category in certain aspects.

This leads us back to the accentuation effect we briefly discussed earlier: In order to differentiate groups, we assimilate intra-category differences and over-emphasize inter-category differences. This maximizes the comparability during inter-category interaction. The accentuation effect is also connected to inter-group phenomena which will be discussed in the next chapter (Eiser & Stroebe, 1972).

From our discussion of the Social Cognition approach we can summarize the following: Our perception of the social world is categorized and for a category to be valid, it

must carry certain features, in this case traits and behaviors that allow us to set boundaries between categories. We have discussed three sources for category definition: Exemplars and prototypes are generated through personal observation and learning. Stereotypes are socially learned from our environment and are based on no personally made observations. The cognitive advantage of this pattern is the possibility of comparing an observed behavior against a prototypical or stereotypical behavior, instead of taking the information in unguidedly. This perception of the social world allows us to lower the cognitive workload, but it has implications not only for our individual processing of information. If we assume that every individual is a member of categories and that this category membership generates predictable patterns of behavior, this assumption will have an influence on our attitude towards social groups and on our actions in that context.

This leads us to the Social Identity and the Self-categorization theories by Tajfel and Turner. They are interested in group membership, inter-group phenomena and the content and functions of stereotypes. Since social interaction is achieved through communication, these theories can explain, why we use stereotypes in talk.

2.1.2 Social Identity, Self-categorization and the effect of the stereotype-functions on their content

Based on what he called the “Robbers Cave experiment”, Muzafer Sherif (1961) hypothesized that groups that are assigned collaborative tasks, engage in inter-group harmony and those assigned with competitive tasks engage in discriminatory behavior. The groups consisted of randomly selected participants. The group members had no common history and the groups had no equivalent in the reality of the social world. The relevant conditions of the experiment were the division into groups and the tasks they were given. This study was the basis for further experiments and vivid discussions (see Bar-Tal et al., 1989).

The assumption that a competitive task generated inter-group conflict could be

confirmed in the experiments. What surprised the researchers was the fact that even the groups that were assigned collaborative tasks showed discriminatory behavior. The results seemed to indicate that the mere division of individuals into groups would create discrimination. Under the label of the “minimal inter-group paradigm”, the researchers searched for the minimal set of conditions necessary to create discrimination. (Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Leyens et al., 1994; Oakes et al., 1994).

We do not want to go into the details of this discussion, but Henri Tajfel argued that under such minimal group conditions without any common inter-group history, the discrimination of out-group members was the only way to enhance the self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Together with his student John Turner he conducted a social-psychological analysis of inter-group relations that led to the development of Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1982) and Turner's Self-categorization Theory (Turner & Hogg, 1987), in which they combine the distinctive reality of group life with the cognitive analysis we discussed in the previous chapter.

Social Identity Theory expands the definition of social categorization given by Social Cognition: Social categorization structures the social environment for causal understanding, allows predictions and offers a plan for action. As we assumed earlier, it has a strong impact on the relations between groups in general and during interaction. We will therefore examine the concepts of social categories, social groups and social identity in detail:

By identifying the relevant social categories and giving them meaning and value, the individual can allocate the 'self' within the social environment by acting according to the norms attached to a category. When individuals engage in interaction and social categories divide them into different social groups, action and behavior within this context carries the significance of inter-group relations (Oakes et al., 1994). Individuals are not born into their social groups, with exception of the most basic ones like ethnicity, nationality and gender. Becoming a member of a group is the basis of a positive social identity. Tajfel and Turner

define social identity as the part of the self-concept derived from the individual's knowledge of his group membership and the value and meaning he attaches to this membership (Oakes et al., 1994; Baker, 2012; Nijstad, 2009). The individual's need for a positive self-evaluation includes a positive social identity, which is achieved by group-membership and a positive distinction of the in-group from relevant out-groups. Social Identity Theory is therefore a conflict theory but, compared to the real conflict theory briefly discussed earlier, the positive distinction of the in-group leads to a degree of out-group derogation that can have effects like negative stereotypes (McCarthy et al., 2002).

A social group is not a physical reality in the same way as an individual is. Social Identity theorists argue that social groups are context-bound constructs in the sense that a set of individuals at a certain time perceives itself as belonging to the same group, which is defined by a common social category. Gender, ethnicity, nationality and religion are some of the fundamental categories that people use as basis for comparison. Some categories have a higher potential for identification than others (Tajfel, 1982; Malhi, Bonn, & Rogers, 2009).

So the social function of categories is the same as the earlier discussed cognitive function: To define the boundaries and the meaning of a social group at a certain point in time. The context determines the defining categories and what features of a category are relevant because they are more salient than others. It also determines whether categorization takes place at a more individual or a more social level. Social Identity Theory suggests a simple mathematical formula, the meta-contrast ratio, which is the inter-group difference divided by the intra-group difference. The higher the ratio, the higher is the social categorization. The lower it is, the higher is the individual categorization. This means, that a high inter-group difference and a low intra-group difference lead to a high degree of social categorization in inter-group interaction (Hogg, Abrams, Otten, Hinkle, 2004; Oakes et al., 1994).

The Self-categorization Theory by Turner elaborates the Social Identity perspective further and explains why social groups act coherently when engaging in interaction. In

contexts where we rather perceive ourselves as part of a social group than as individuals, we adopt the norms, traits and behaviors of this group. This may go as far as to ignore our personal norms and values in order to emphasize our group membership.

The simultaneous Self-categorization of several individuals leads to coherent group behavior. When no social category is salient, members of this group might behave differently because they perceive themselves more as individuals than as group member. It is important to note though, that a person always has an individual and a social identity. The emphasis of the former or the latter changes along a continuum depending on the context-bound factors like the degree of in-group identification, the meta-contrast ratio and the current need to satisfy the individual or the social identity (Oakes et al., 1994; Turner & Hogg, 1987).

We now understand that a social group is the situational manifestation of a social category by collectively adopting its norms, values, behaviors, etc. This happens only if the emphasis of our category-membership enhances our social identity. In-group categories only allow a positive social identity if they can be positively differentiated from their corresponding out-group categories. This is the point where stereotype content comes into play, since, as we learned, stereotypes are those prototypes transmitted only by our social environment. They shape our impression of unfamiliar, i.e. out-group categories. The content of these stereotypes must enable a positive differentiation of our in-group categories to ultimately generate a positive social identity. To achieve this, the stereotype content is shaped by the three group-functions formulated by Tajfel: Stereotypes are conjointly used to reach a positive group identity by explaining social events, justifying possibly discriminatory behavior and reaching a positive inter-group differentiation. The group-level of stereotyping is therefore the context-dependent process representing the changing nature of an inter-group relation. Or in other words: If the relation between two groups changes at some point, their new relation must be somehow represented in the out-group stereotype (Oakes et al., 1994).

Following this line of thought and an interest in the content of stereotypes, Self-

categorization Theory acknowledged a social representations perspective, seeing stereotypes as elaborate, symbolic and widely shared representation one social group has of another at a certain point in time. Even more, this consensus is reached in a continuous effort to maintain an inter-group differentiation through active communicative acts between group members. When used as communicative items, stereotypes are not devices to simplify a complex world but rather complex constructs used to elaborate the social world through communication. Some stereotypes are less stable, continuous or socially shared than others and also not all stereotypes are social representations. Certain social categories like race, nationality and gender seem to have a higher significance in society than others (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998).

To understand the relation between social identities and categories, we need to point out that individuals have multiple social identities, each of them being indeterminate, situational, dynamic and interactively constructed. These identities change depending on our age, our income, our place of living and numerous other social factors. As they change, different social categories gain or lose importance. Some categories are more permanent than others (f. ex. “Australian” vs. “teenager”), others refer to personal preferences like “skater” or “punk”. A single category can have different names when referring to in-groups or to out-groups and contain different evaluative sub-meanings (f. ex. “ecologist” vs. “greenie”). Every individual has a more or less elaborate stereotype attached to these categorical terms, depending on his own individual and social identity (Spreckels & Kotthoff, 2009).

With the concepts of social categorization, social identity and the functions of stereotypes now clear, it seems that the here discussed theories would be interested in studying concrete situations where the group functions manifest. This is not the case. Instead, they are basically interested in empirically measurable content. Stereotypes are treated as relatively permanent societal belief systems rather than verbal function-fulfilling tools during communication. These belief systems allow a social group to fulfill the group functions of

stereotyping and to maintain a positive group identity. Once an inter-group relation changes, the social group re-adjusts the stereotype by conjoint communicative acts (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; McGarty et al., 2002). This large-scale approach may be valid, but it ignores a key question: If we assume, that stereotypes as larger-scale social representations are created and maintained by communicatively fulfilling the group-functions of stereotypes, as the Social Identity Theory claims, then the application of stereotypes for these functions during a concrete communicative situation must be observable. If this is not the case, the assumption lacks a fundament (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

So what are the reasons for this shortcoming when it comes to studying the concrete moment of application of stereotypes? What other approach is suitable for this purpose? We will discuss this issue in the following chapter.

2.2 From mental states to discursive tools: Stereotypes as the discursive application and management of psychology

As we just saw, the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory treats stereotypes as permanent belief systems attached to a category. They merely assume that their content is the result of communicative function-driven acts, but they do not study these situations. On the other hand, communication is the key process by which stereotypes are created, maintained and adjusted. The reason for this paradox is meta-theoretical and based on the social psychological adherence to a realist epistemology, according to which all aspects of human nature can be explained by a domain of facts, which in turn can be discovered through science in the sense of systematization and rationalization (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998).

Based on this paradigm, researchers in these fields use scientific methods to test hypotheses formulated on the basis of a theory, i.e. a core value of their research is predictability in the sense of being able to reproduce a finding. Findings that do not allow

reliable predictions are discarded or modified. This principle is called 'positivism' and has two consequences we want to highlight. First, it requires the quantitative analysis of massive amounts of numeric data from randomly selected and assembled samples in order to be representative. Second, the most common method of gathering data is the laboratory-based experiment, ensuring that the sampling environment remains identical in order to correspond to the principle of reproducibility. Even non-experimental methods such as surveys are random, quantitative and systematized (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; McGarty et al., 2002; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008).

This research paradigm is the root problem for Social Psychology and the reason, why the field carries a simplifying and over-generalizing category in its very name: The term 'social' refers to all the countless chains of parallel or consecutive, dependent or independent, small-scale or large-scale communicative acts taking place every day everywhere. What the term 'social' does is to give the irreproducible the label of reproducibility. More explicitly: Social Psychology's topic of interest is at the same time a positivist's nightmare. The course of communication is unpredictable and therefore by nature incompatible with the methods and paradigms applied by classical Social Psychology, it does not allow for any general claims or predictions.

Potter and Wetherell (1987) published an influential critical discussion of the issue, among others. They claim that it can only be addressed by a fundamental paradigmatic shift, from the study of mental states as the result of discourse to Discourse Analysis. This approach analyses qualitative data generated from non-experimental settings like case studies, interviews, focus groups and other methods. It analyses the data using different methods like Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Discursive Psychology and Content Analysis, depending on the research interest and the kind of data. This means, instead of using massive data from experiments or surveys, discursive research is focused exclusively on analyzing different kinds of discourse (see also: Billig, 1996; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008).

The shift of paradigm consists in assuming a social constructivist perspective, viewing discourse not as a mere medium through which the inner world of individuals can be discovered, but as a phenomenon on its own right. Constructivists argue that all aspects of social life are constructed through discourse, instead of merely existing as a social domain.

The term 'discourse' can be both understood in the sense of talk, as well as in the sense of the long-term societal discourse that is represented in the media and other societal channels. The key claim applies to all forms of discourse: Communication is not simply the overt representation of an inner cognitive world, it is performed action. Communication constructs a certain version of the social world, and the nature of this world depends on what is to be achieved by the performed action. During conversations, the construction of reality is the conjoint process of creating, negotiating and establishing a version of the world that is acknowledged by all interlocutors (Wetherell, 1996, 2007; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008).

This perspective emphasizes that the construction established by a conversation does not fully reflect the inner cognitive world of any individual speaker. Therefore, Social Constructivism would neither neglect the existence of cognitive representations of the social world, nor would it deny that there is a relation between these cognitive belief systems and the initial versions speakers create during conversations. The situational, motivational, purpose-driven and group-based nature of talk does simply not allow for any fundamental claims about the inner world of individuals. Even more, many researchers would argue that talk does not allow any assumption that goes beyond the immediate situation of talk (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004).

The field of Discursive Psychology by Edwards and Potter (1992) expands Potter and Wetherell's criticism of Social Psychology and demands a critical review of theories and methods based on Cognitivism. The field is, as the name indicates, interested in psychology as discursive action. While social psychologists view external behavior as the representation of inner mental states, discursive psychologists claim that the discursive broadcasting of

psychological states and affairs is motivational and purpose-driven, as well as subjected to a constant attempt to anticipate possible reactions of listeners (Fitch, 2005; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008). We can exemplify this in a simple way: A friend asks us how we are doing and we answer by saying “I am doing well”. A social psychologist's interpretation of this statement would be: “He says he is doing well, so he is”. A discursive psychologist would ask: “He says he is doing well, but why?”. Especially statements about mental states are highly ambiguous because the speaker is aware of the listener's possible reaction to a negative statement. An external projection of a positive state may correspond to the way someone wants to be seen, while being the total opposite of the real mental state.

So, generally speaking, Discursive Psychology observes the application and management of psychology through discourse, although we have to specify that discourse, in our case, refers to talk. While the field originates from Discourse Analysis, it has therefore been converging towards methods of Conversation Analysis. These methodological details will be discussed later (Potter, 2012).

Despite being largely based on a critical revision and re-specification of Social Psychology, the definition of Discursive Psychology as either a paradigm or method on its own, or as an approach embedded in a larger theoretical framework, has been a matter of debate (see: Hammersley, 2003; Potter, 2003). Within this debate, Stubbe et al. (2003) argue that “Discursive Psychology is not so much a method as a theoretically informed analytic approach for understanding social psychological phenomena such as identity, inter-personal and inter-group relationships, persuasion, discrimination and prejudice“. Ladegaard (2011a, 2011b), argues that instead of replacing traditional approaches, Discursive Psychology should focus on offering a new perspective on existing theories of Social Psychology, as well as on the study of areas not addressed by these theories.

The earlier discussed concept of a 'stereotype' as defined by the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory, as well as at the discursive psychological perspective as described

above, indicate a high compatibility. Tajfel's definition of the group functions of stereotypes is basically the manifestation of what a discursive psychologist would call a purpose-driven application of a mental state. The observation of these functions in action during a group conversation using qualitative methods would strongly act in support of their validity. Furthermore, the observation of categorization during talk is a topic of interest for a discursive psychological study. Beyond the mere disposition to categorize, the data allow us to observe varying patterns of categorization, differing f. ex. in the displayed degree of applicability of a category.

Ladegaard's discursive psychological study of stereotypes in talk (2011a, 2011b) highlights a second key aspect we already addressed more in general: The management of stereotyping during talk. Given that the application of stereotypes can have potentially negative social outcomes, speakers apply certain patterns to mitigate those effects and to embed exceptions from a stereotype and other inconsistencies (See also: Tusting, Crawshaw, Callen, 2002).

We therefore argue that Discursive Psychology offers a qualitative approach to observing the application and management of stereotypes within their immediate conversational context, without any interest in making further-reaching claims. Such a study is a valuable addition to the so far described quantitative study of stereotype content, because it can act in support of the discussed Social Psychological theories concerning categorization and stereotyping, as well as making aspects of the topic accessible that can only be studied qualitatively.

Before we discuss the methodological details of a discursive psychological analysis of stereotypes in talk, we want to re-specify the kind of stereotype we are interested in. Since this paper is rooted within the field of Intercultural Communication, we will now discuss the impact of national and ethnic stereotypes on intercultural relations as a large-scale form of inter-group relations.

2.3 National and ethnic stereotypes as communicative representations of intercultural relations

As we learned when discussing the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory, stereotypes attached to certain categories have a higher social or societal significance than others. The strongest stereotypes are defined as widely shared and enduring social representations, and they frequently refer to national and ethnic categories. The reason for this lies in the cognitive function of categorization as means of group differentiation. National and ethnic boundaries are particularly powerful for category differentiation, because they are by nature large in scale, and because they mostly apply from birth on. Therefore, large generations of individuals learn national and ethnic stereotypes from their social environment during early childhood, maximizing the learning effect (Bar-Tal, 1996).

We also discussed that the priming category we base our impression on is always the most noticeable and most unfamiliar one. Members of national or ethnic cultures are often separable by language and even by appearance, offering particularly salient stimuli during person perception (Fiske & Taylor, 2010; Leyens et al., 1994). Bar-Tal (1997) points out further reasons for the impact of national stereotypes. On the one hand, they are highly elaborate because they have been shaped by decades of cross-national relations. They are also historically rooted. The association of the category 'German' with the concept of the 'Nazi' and the historical figure Adolf Hitler is a good example for such a historically rooted and widely shared stereotype.

On the other hand, Bar-Tal points out that cultural stereotypes referring to nationalities and ethnicities are transmitted by numerous significant societal channels. Beyond family members and acquaintances, they are largely transmitted by the media, they can be found in language learning books, and they form a part of the political discourse.

The discussed features of cultural stereotypes make them highly relevant for Intercultural Communication. Bennett describes their impact as follows:

Stereotypes arise when we act as if all members of a culture or group share the same characteristics. [They] are problematic in intercultural communication for several obvious reasons. One is that they may give us a false sense of understanding our communication partners. (...) Additionally, stereotypes may become self-fulfilling prophecies, where we observe others in selective ways that confirm our prejudice. (Bennett, 1998, p. 7)

The definition of stereotypes as a widely shared belief that shapes the perception of and relation between groups is adopted from Social Psychology. The focus on national, ethnic, or otherwise cultural categories basically specifies their type and features. The stereotypes Intercultural Communication is interested in are largely shared, relatively elaborate social representations reflecting intercultural relations (see also: Gudykunst et al., 2003). The prevalent theoretical separation between Social Psychology and Communication studies is based on different areas of interest and differing definitions of certain key concepts such as the term 'social', on the one hand referring to social groups as opposed to individuals, and on the other hand relating to the social act of communicating (Abrams & Hogg, 1990).

The fact that the theoretical boundaries are not rigid can be exemplified by the Communication Accommodation theory: It applies the concepts of social and individual identity to communication. It states that interlocutors seek to accommodate within a conversation by either converging towards or diverging from the other group members. They do this by discursive, para-verbal and non-verbal means and with the goal of maximizing their self-esteem. Furthermore, the theory claims that an inter-group context motivates individuals to adopt communicative group norms in order to accentuate their in-group coherence and maximize the inter-group differentiation (Gudykunst et al., 2003; Spreckels & Kotthoff, 2009).

The interface between Intercultural Communication and the study of discourse is far more extensive, considering that communication and discourse are linked together. There are several qualitative analyses of discourse addressing the construction of culture, groups, identities and stereotypes. Many of these studies are concerned with prejudice as an outcome of stereotyping, with the derogation of minorities and other negative effects (see: Ali, & Sonn, 2010; Barr & Neville, 2008; Eagleman, 2011; Hatoss, 2012; Kawai, 2009; Kobayashi, 2011; Martínez, 2011; Malhi et al., 2009; Merino, & Tileagă, 2011).

While the negative effects of stereotypes on intercultural relations and communication may be a frequent matter of study, cultural stereotypes are not seen as generally negative or even evaluative in nature. Petkova and Lehtonen (2005) offer a comprehensive overview over the concept and the possible effects of cultural stereotypes within Intercultural Communication. In fact, their discussion conveys the impression that the concept of cultural stereotypes is basically a cluster of fragments originating from different theories, such as the ones we discussed in the theoretical section. The authors gather numerous social and cognitive effects that stereotypes may have or may not have, such as unconscious cognitive bias or prejudice. So while the definition of what a stereotype can do is clustered, we get a more precise definition of what it is. A cultural stereotype basically represents a perceived collective identity of the in-group and out-groups. It is transmitted by all kinds of everyday communication. The stereotype-identity of the own culture may be negative in some aspects, and likewise stereotypes about foreign cultures may be positive. Also, stereotypes can either represent actual impressions of our in-group and an out-group's traits, or they refer to how we think a cultural group is generally characterized by outsiders.

Petkova and Lehtonen list two current areas of interest in studying cultural stereotypes, one of which is the question, how stereotype consensus is reached among group members. This research question shifts the interest from stereotypes as expectations during intercultural contacts to stereotypes as tools to create and maintain a coherent group identity during in-

group communication. As we discussed in the chapter about Social Identity and Self-categorization, stereotypes achieve this goal by fulfilling the three group functions. They enable a positive in-group differentiation and they offer collective tools for explanation and justification.

Researchers interested in the way cultural stereotypes are consensualized must study their construction, negotiation and function during talk among members of a cultural group about another. Our earlier suggested discursive psychological study of the application and management is suitable for this purpose of study. A specific interest in cultural stereotypes has of course implications for the study design.

We will therefore now turn to discuss the adequate approach to gathering and analyzing discursive data containing observable cultural stereotypes. First, we will formulate our research question based on our theoretical review. Then we will turn to discussing the methodological details.

3. Research questions and issues of data gathering and analysis

3.1 Objectives of the study – Defining the research questions

Our study is based on the following 5 research questions:

- I. Do speakers apply patterns of cultural stereotyping to fulfill the group functions laid out in Social Identity Theory?
- II. How do speakers manage the negative and the over-generalizing nature of stereotypes?
- III. Does the data rather reflect a high disposition or a strong inhibition to apply patterns of stereotyping?
- IV. Are discursive stereotype-constructs gradually consensualized or shared a priori?
- V. Do speakers express awareness of their reliance on cultural stereotypes? Do they make use of the label ‘stereotype’ and in what context?

Based on these questions we will now discuss two methodological issues. On the one hand, Discursive Psychology is positioned between Discourse Analysis as its origin, as well as Conversation Analysis, reflecting the interest in patterns of talk. We will discuss the implications for our study design (McKinlay & McVittie, 2008; Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

On the other hand, we need to gather data where speakers express and use cultural out-group stereotypes. The seemingly most adequate source for discourse is naturally occurring talk, but there are other means of data collection that, for very specific reasons, may be more adequate in our case.

3.2 Methods of data gathering and analysis

3.2.1 Discursive Psychology – Observing the manifestation of psychological affairs during conversations

The field of discursive research can be broadly categorized by two main aspects. First, they differ in the communicative channel they study. Fictional literature or historical texts can be analyzed as representational accounts of a past or current *Zeitgeist*, societal channels such as the mass media display today's public discourse about certain topics, and moments of group or inter-personal talk are analyzed as short-term verbal negotiations.

Second, they differ in the topic of interest. The representation of certain structures of inequality in literature throughout the course of time can be one possible topic, as well as language code switches among bi-linguals depending on certain contextual factors (Wetherell, 1996, 2007; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008; Silverman, 2011a).

This indicates that the corresponding definition of discourse of each field varies along two inter-related dimensions: Highly variable short-term discourse vs. relatively stable long-term discourse, and small-scale vs. large-scale discourse. Some approaches are defined in a way that allows a clear positioning along these dimensions. Contrariwise, Discursive Psychology's inter-dimensional variability has led to discussions concerning the adequate methodology. As we know, Discursive Psychology originates from Potter and Wetherell's (1987) specification of Discourse Analysis in response to the shortcomings of Social Psychology we discussed earlier. At this early stage, the authors' interest is to provide a broad critical review of the whole field. They claim that scientific work is a form of discourse itself and far beyond being objective. They problematize the application of surveys to gather quantitative data, since the so-called respondent bias falsifies the result. Their earlier discussed criticism that cognitions are not projected by language, but that their representation in talk is purpose-driven and contextually shaped, is another area they address.

This criticism led to the development of a new field of research named Discursive Psychology which, with the time, developed a strong interest in the manifestation, application and management of psychological affairs in talk. The fact that talk is by nature a highly variable, short-term, and small-scale kind of discourse caused a methodological shift towards Conversation Analysis (Edwards, & Potter, 1992; Potter, 2012).

Conversation Analysis is based on the ethnomethodological work of Garfinkel (2002). He argues that our perception of and action according to societal norms is based on our ability of interpretation. Furthermore, meaning does not exist, meaning is constituted by people in interaction, by displaying an understanding of other people's action in a way that in turn can be understood by others. Since interpretation and subsequent action are highly contextual and individual processes, there is no such thing as a permanent sense and meaning that can be experienced. Based on Garfinkel's work, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) developed Conversation Analysis in order to study how talk as an inter-personal verbal interaction functions under naturally occurring conditions. They claim that conversations are structured by rules. These structural rules basically concern the way in which speech acts build upon and are related to each other. Thus, Conversation Analysis is interested in overtly observable structural attributes of a conversation like turn-taking, the repair of "defective" pieces of talk, the opening of a conversation, mitigation and numerous other aspects. Conversation Analysis is also interested in the way that interlocutors create and maintain inter-subjective reality, but more in the sense of a mutual inter-personal understanding than in a macro-societal sense. In their analysis, researchers are interested even in the smallest bits of meaning such as 'mm hm' or 'oh', which gain meaning only through context and allow a speaker to display minimal feedback like understanding or other functions.

The field's area of interest is not the negotiation of a topic through talk, but a detailed analysis of the way talk itself functions. Consequentially, conversation analysts rely only on very fine-grained transcriptions of naturally occurring talk and study only what is made

explicitly relevant through it. They search for the tools people use in conversation to create meaning, to interpret it and to display understanding. It concentrates on sequences of talk, chains of actions and reactions that create and maintain meaning. Using the two dimensions we listed above, we can say that Conversation Analysis focuses only on short-term and small-scale pieces of discourse (Hammersley, 2003; Mc. Kinlay & Mc. Vittie, 2009; Silverman, 2011a, 2011b).

In relation to Discursive Psychology, the tendency towards Conversation Analysis is not unproblematic, since the field is not interested in talk alone, but in different manifestations of psychological affairs within talk. Unlike the conversational situation, the content of these affairs may carry long-term and large-scale features. This problem is especially prominent for a discursive psychological study of stereotypes in talk. Stereotypes, as we saw, may be long-term and large-scale representations that are used for a short-term and small-scale purpose. The researcher faces the question of how to handle possible extra-conversational aspects of a stereotype. This problem has been largely debated within the field (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Hammersley, 2003; Ladegaard, 2011a).

Since we have defined Discursive Psychology as a theoretically informed method to observe the application and management of stereotypes in talk (see: Stubbe et al., 2003), we do not want to discuss any meta-theoretical issues. Instead, we treat the issue described above as a methodological one as well. Since even small details in the research questions have large implications on the kind of discourse we are interested in, we want to review our research questions in order to specify our methodological position.

Our study is interested in the overtly observable application and management of stereotypes during a group conversation. We have discussed the Social Psychological claim that stereotypes are simplifiers and serve certain functions. Based on these claims, we are interested in the simple questions “Does it happen?” and “How does it happen?”. We are not interested in analyzing, why a certain stereotype was chosen instead of another. This research

interest indicates a high tendency towards Conversation Analysis, because group aspects of stereotypes during talk are basically created and made observable through chains of statements and feedback. For instance, a successful achievement of a group function can be observed by overt displays of agreement. On the other hand, disagreement may mark a shift towards the earlier discussed management of a stereotype. The consequential negotiation may then lead to an alteration of the stereotype, or to other outcomes we cannot and do not want to predict at any moment. So, while we are interested in the content of talk, we always have to understand it as part of a turn-based interaction.

Since we aim at a detailed analysis of talk, we also need to represent this in our transcript of the data. A transcript is, briefly spoken, a written representation of talk and ideally allows the reader to comprehend the transcribed conversation in all its verbal and para-verbal aspects. For this purpose para-verbal features like pauses, emphasis, vowel elongations, etc. are marked in the transcript accordingly. Since conversations develop in turns, interruptions and simultaneous talk can occur. Also these are represented in the transcript. The transcript must be completed in a way that allows the reader to follow the flow of a conversation since the study relies on conversational data and a wrong representation would impede the reader from understanding the insights gained from this data. It is logical that talk cannot be perfectly represented in text and while the highest possible degree of detail may sometimes be crucial for the transcript's quality, it can also lower the comprehensibility for the reader. The reality of research is that studies that, like ours, are based on a more specific topic than talk in general, rely on rather closed transcriptions. An explorative purpose, on the other hand, relies on very open transcriptions. In any case, the transcription should be as open as possible, but as closed as necessary (Jenks, 2011).

When studying stereotypes in talk, we are mainly interested in the content of the conversation, i.e. what is said. There are, however, several reasons to be interested in para-verbal features. We have, for example, seen that stereotypes are possibly problematic for the

speaker, which can be observable through large pauses or other non-verbal cues. Also the distinction between the utterances 'no' and a 'NO: : : :!' is relevant for their immediate meaning. We have also seen that stereotypes in talk are tools for conjoint elaboration, which involves interruptions and simultaneous talk. This can allow fruitful insights f. ex. into the speakers' ability to construct a story together and keep up the flow of the conversation. Finally we have seen that, although this study looks at talk with a specific interest in mind, we want to prevent bias as much as possible. It is not our intention to ignore certain aspects and to focus the reader's attention only on what we deem relevant. This is especially important because interpretations about the data should be made cautiously. Since talk is a very complex and multi-faceted aspect of social life and since the researcher is not able to access the speakers' minds, he has to rely on what he sees in the data. This doesn't allow for any resilient and all-embracing claims. The researcher can merely present a possible interpretation and observe one of possibly several functions of an utterance. Since the transcript should also allow alternate observations, the several aspects of the conversation should not be included or excluded selectively. They should be displayed coherently throughout the transcribed data. Our transcript will therefore represent pauses, emphasis, interruptions and simultaneous talk, pitch raise and fall, vowel elongations and forte or piano speech. For an introduction on the representation of talk in a transcript we recommend Jenk's handbook (2011).

3.2.2 Focus groups – Between critical topics and natural conversations

Our focus on talk as a highly uncontrollable and multi-directional form of discourse, combined with our specific interest in the function-driven verbal manifestation of cultural stereotypes, raises another methodological problem that is connected to the problematic application of conversational analytic research norms we just discussed. Since the purpose of this study is to observe the application and management of cultural stereotypes during an in-

group conversation about an out-group, we must define the setting for such a conversation. The use of a focus group setting seems suitable, because it allows the researcher to control the characteristics of the groups and to induce talk about the topic of interest. Our study purpose requires a group of people sharing the same national culture that talks about other cultures. The use of focus groups is, however, not accepted by Conversation Analysis.

The reason is that, within Conversation Analysis and, thus, some strands of Discursive Psychology, focus group interviews are rejected as non-natural and research-driven forms of talk. For instance, Edwards and Stokoe (2004) have criticized a study that uses focus group data and the positioning theory (among others) while assuming a Discursive Psychological standpoint. We do not want to discuss the criticized article in detail, but discuss some of the points the authors make regarding focus group data.

Focus groups are often used based on the assumption that they offer the possibility of eliciting the participant's attitudes, opinions, etc. through talk. While the discursive situation may be relatively close to everyday-discourse, we must not forget that it is guided by a moderator who is interested in bringing to the surface certain aspects that are relevant to the research. It is therefore problematic to claim that what participants of a focus group interview say, reflects exactly what they would say in any other situation. This is the authors' main criticism. Additionally, the criticized article makes possibly premature assumptions about the participant's underlying identities and about their 'self' in general, thus going beyond the conversation itself (Edwards & Stokoe, 2004).

While we agree with this criticism, we must also point out that there is no clear definition of a valid source for discursive data. For instance, criticism against using interview data has been answered by arguing that even what might be called naturally occurring talk has still been selected according to a certain research interest (Gubrium, 2012). Within this debate, we argue in favor of the pragmatic standpoint that a discursive psychological approach may use focus group data, as long as the researcher is aware of and relies on the

unique features of this discursive situation, and in what respect it is different from “naturally occurring” talk. We base this position on the fact that discursive research has relied on this kind of data when the topic of interest was something that people do not usually talk about or that is of a critical nature in some other way. An example is an analysis of a focus group where women talk about breast cancer, as well as the importance of projecting a positive attitude (Silverman 2011b).

Discursive Psychological studies on stereotyping have used focus groups as well. Tusting, Crawshaw and Callen (2002) have analyzed focus group data to see how students use their personal experience in a foreign culture to legitimate their expressed stereotypes. They found several situations in which the participants drew very heavily on what they claimed to be direct observations. Their use of these accounts as well as of mitigators displayed that they did not feel fully comfortable with what they wanted to say in that situation. Ladegaard's (2011a) study used focus group data gathered in a Danish company where participants displayed strong stereotypes and the same kind of mitigation and justification to soften their negative effect. Both studies avoid any kind of generalization and rely on what is observable in the data.

Of course we agree that the researcher could put a lot of effort in order to gather naturally occurring talk about such critical topics. On the other hand, we doubt that focus group talk about such topics should be regarded as inappropriate for research, especially since their design has a strong influence on the talk that they generate. Krueger (1988) defines focus groups as “carefully planned discussions designed to obtain perceptions about a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment”. The moderator has the option to set clear rules for the discussion and to avoid any deviation from the topic. He has also the option of initiating a non-directed conversation using open-ended questions, without setting any boundaries for the discussion.

According to Puchta and Potter (2004), a high moderator influence during a focus group interview is common in marketing, since the goal is to elicit the participant's attitudes and evaluation towards a new consumer's product. The “noise” created by group talk is more of a burden, since the object of interest is the opinion of each participant. For our study, this noise is a very important source, since we are not only interested in individual moments of stereotype application and management, but also in the subsequent feedback and elaboration. In order to encourage this, we need to design the focus group setting in a way that approximates it to a natural conversational situation. A crucial adjustment concerns the moderator role, since he must create an improvised and informal atmosphere. Although it might seem unprofessional at first glance, the use of slang, humor and an introductory small-talk have proven to create a floor where group participants are not constrained by the constant awareness of a controlling moderator and the research purpose, thus feeling more motivated to open themselves up to problematic topics such as cultural stereotyping. At the same time, the moderator can identify some characteristics of the participants and become more sensitive to their signals (Krueger, 1988).

Given that our study requires conjointly negotiated and elaborated, participant-driven data, the moderator must initiate talk in a way that requires no or only minimal further involvement, allowing the participants maximum control while acquiring valid data for research. During the conversation, the moderator has the mere possibility of deepening certain topics by simply repeating what a participant said or by asking short open questions about the background. He must avoid interrupting the flow by asking a completely different question (Morgan, 1988). Therefore, the crucial task of the moderator is the induction of stereotype talk. The achievement of this initial task allows him a passive role during the subsequent conversation.

Ladegaard (2011b) has conducted a focus group study to address stereotypes in discourse among Hong Kong University students. These were invited to join a casual

conversation about different national cultures. No researcher was present and the moderators were student colleges. Prior to the conversation, the participants were asked to write down their immediate impressions of five national cultures in three to five adjectives or nouns. These were then read out and discussed by the group. The moderators had no other task than asking the participants to move on to the next culture. A review of the study shows that asking the participants to deliver a written list prior to the discussion has three advantages: First, the lists offer a base for the discussion that allows the moderator to return to the topic without interrupting the flow. Second, the lists may contain opinions that were not expressed during the conversation. Third, the participants cannot simply ignore what they have written. During the discussion they have to cope with the reactions. They may feel the need of justifying their view instead of simply keeping it to themselves.

Ladegaard's study also shows that asking the participants to list their impressions about several different nations allows a certain comparability. Some national cultures may be characterized more negatively than others. Exploring these differences may allow fruitful insights and therefore participants in our focus groups will be asked to characterize at least two cultures. Additionally, Ladegaard points out that story-telling is not desirable during normal focus group discussions, but he argues that in a discussion centered on attitudes, opinions and stereotypes towards other cultures, stories told by participants may be an important discursive tool that should not be ignored. We even go further and argue, that these accounts may even contain references to other aspects of stereotyping that go beyond the conversational context, such as accounts about historical factors or stereotype sources.

Having addressed the methodological issues of data collection and analysis, we can now turn to the concrete features of our focus group study and analyze the data based on our research questions.

3.3 Design and participants of the focus groups

The study was conducted in the year 2013 at the University of Jyväskylä in Finland. Data was collected from three groups of five to six Finnish students and employees of the university. The group number and strength is in line with Morgan's (1988) and Krueger's (2009) recommendations for a study like ours. They argue that smaller groups are more suitable for topics that are familiar to the participants, since this generates a higher involvement of each individual.

The sole common feature of the participants is their Finnish nationality, in order to make sure that this category is salient for the in-group identity. If Tajfel's claims about the group functions of stereotypes are correct, there should be a common pool of out-group stereotypes observable in action. This doesn't mean that nationality is the only category that is salient during the conversations. The participants, at the time of the interview, were in some way related to the university as well. As a matter of fact, we have learned that there are always several parallel identities at play, making it impossible to make any assumptions about this issue. Such assumptions should even be avoided, since they are very likely to create bias. Beyond determining the common nationality, we want to enable a free interaction and negotiation between the participants. We also want to again point out that we are interested in observing stereotypes in action, not in their content. Therefore it is not crucial for us to determine, based on what identity participants are currently applying or managing their stereotypes (Greenbaum, 2000; Krueger 2009).

In relation to the recruitment of participants, multiple methods (see: Greenbaum, 2000; Krueger, 2009; Morgan, 1988) were used, like the broadcasting of newsletters and direct face-to-face recruitment. Potential participants were invited to join an open conversation about other national cultures, about their experiences, etc. This approach is based on the fact, that finding a high number of candidates in a short time, and gathering them on one certain day at a certain place is only possible, if all possible recruitment channels are used. Furthermore,

since the features of our groups are not highly specific, the preference of one channel over another is neither necessary nor desirable.

The focus group interviews took place in a recording room with a recording device in the middle of the table. After some introductory words the moderator asked the participants to write down adjectives or nouns that came to their mind and that corresponded to the members of certain cultures, f. ex. Germany, the United States of America, Russia or Sweden. The conversation about every culture was introduced by this short writing activity. Afterwards, the participants were asked to read their words and, if necessary, to explain their choice. The moderator tried to restrict his input to a minimum and to mainly use questions that motivated the participants to elaborate a bit on the words they had written down. The atmosphere was kept as relaxed and improvised as possible to prevent any pressure that would constrain the participants in their talk. Furthermore, some of the participants were loosely acquainted with each other, which turned out to raise the disposition of displaying more problematic attitudes towards other national cultures.

4. The function-driven application and the management of stereotype-patterns during talk about different cultures

Our analysis in this chapter is divided into two main areas. We first want to look at excerpts that display applied patterns of cultural stereotyping in order to fulfill group functions laid out by Tajfel. Since the justifying function involves behavior against another group, its observation is likely to require situations of inter-group contact, which does not correspond to our focus group setting. We will exclude this function from our analysis and concentrate on the differentiating and the explanatory function. These are more relevant for an in-group conversational setting (Oakes et al., 1994).

After addressing the group functions, we will look at two patterns of stereotype management. We will discuss the softening of stereotype patterns by means of certain discursive tactics. Then we will turn to the management of inconsistencies and contradictions. Our reference to ‘stereotype-patterns’ accounts for the fact that we analyze discursive constructions linking traits to cultures. We want to avoid prematurely putting these patterns on an equal level as stereotypes.

4.1 Discursive stereotype-patterns as context-bound markers of similarity and difference between or within groups

According to Tajfel, stereotypes are used to mark the boundary between an in- and an out-group for positive differentiating purposes. However, Our data shows that the differentiating function is applied in a much more flexible and varied way. F. ex., it can also be applied to the in-group. We therefore rephrase this function as follows: Stereotypes are used to differentiate. This definition should be sufficiently open and allow us to observe more in detail, what kind of differentiation takes place and how. Let us start by looking at the following passage:

you' more honestly than an American would. While it is likely that this construction contains some kind of evaluation, we cannot say this for sure.

What we can observe is the differentiating function: On the one hand we have the national culture of 'the American', and on the other side 'the Finn' as two abstract representatives of their cultures. AV points out that the sentence 'I love you' would have a different meaning for Finns and Americans, which is connected to the fakeness of the latter. At the end of the conjoint elaboration process stands the observable statement: "We would use this sentence this way, they would use it in another way because they are fake". This is a clearly observable pattern of inter-group differentiation. We can also observe that NO shows approval for AV's example by repeating a part of what the latter says. A similar example can be found at another point in the discussion about the Americans:

----- Excerpt 2

MI: ... sort of it always seems to float somewhere [AV; NO: Yeah] does never never really go anywhere It's just sort of like uh like talking around [like

OL: [Yeah small talk.

MI: Yeah [small talk small talk and] yeah

NO: [Just talking for talking]

MI: Talking for talking yeah that's [exactly

AV: [And the Finns we don't know how to do it [ALL:

(laughter)] you gotta talk [if you have something to say

NO: [If you have something

OL: Uh yeah if you talk with American they are expecting to get some small talk back [NO:

Yeh (laughs)] (inaudible) say ↑ok ↑yeah like commenting all the time like between the lines

but if there's Finn and American talking American says something Finnish just quiet and waiting for it ok. Go on.

Here MI talks about how he thinks conversations with Americans never go into any direction. People are 'talking around'. OL then establishes the term 'small talk' and NO specifies further that small talk means that people are 'talking for talking'. After having reached consensus on their common concept of small talk, it is again AV bringing the Finns openly into play, by saying that they do not know how to do small talk like the Americans. Instead, in Finland you 'gotta talk if you have something to say'. We cannot make claims about any positive or negative evaluations, also because AV says that Finnish people do not know how to do small talk instead of simply stating they don't do it or don't need to do it. But what the speakers in this excerpt do is again to establish the way of their in-group and how the allegedly out-group does it differently, emphasizing a boundary. In the last turn of this excerpt, OL clarifies this point further by constructing a theoretical encounter between an American and a Finnish person, where the American expects the Finn to react and the Finn expects the American to Finnish his story.

Let us look at this next example, where another group has been talking about how Germans and Finnish people are similar. EL expresses disagreement, claiming that she does not believe both national cultures are so similar:

----- Excerpt 3

MOD: Would you like to just say or try to say in what way you disagree?

EL: Uhm well I think it's this (1.0) uh attitude of life or some kind of way of thinking and behaving (1.3) and maybe the sociality is the big (laughs) question too

MOD: Because who is uh how is the sociality different?

EL: Uh well Finns are not so social and (.) I I thought it's a big (.) contrast between Finland and Germany

MOD: Ok so you think that maybe the way they communicate is different?

EL: Yes

AN: Well I think it's the well I (inaudible) you know we talked about we are so polite we don't take cookies. But you know German would be like OH MY GOD, CAN I GET, CAN I get and that maybe they are more arrogant than Finnish and sometimes maybe that [mh

EL: [Yes [AN: Yah] we kind of shame of ourselves you know [and they

AN: [And the Germans they are open and there and [you know

EL: [Yes, [this is me and I am here

SU: [They are like proud of them[selves

AN: [Yeah yeah [exactly

EL: [Yes that's the way (.) we are always like sorry sorry

HA: And maybe they do more what they want to do than Finns that I think that Finnish people think o:h I would like to that but I'm not gonna do that [because

ALL: [Yeah yeah

SU: [We think too much what other think about us

AN: Ye[ah exactly]

EL: [Yes exactly]

This excerpt shows one thing particularly well: For the observer it can be very difficult to identify a positive or a negative evaluation. In this case EL is asked to say why she disagrees with the Germans and the Finnish being similar. She says that the Finns are less social. As she does not continue after the moderator's question, EL takes the turn and, like in the previous excerpt, compares both national cultures in a theoretical situation, where the Germans take cookies and the Finnish don't. AN explains this behavior with the Germans

possibly being arrogant and EL adds that Finnish people are ashamed. SU claims Germans are proud. This passage underlines why a very careful and reflected analysis is required in these and all other cases. What we can say is: This is a case of differentiation because AN says that both cultures would behave differently in a situation. Also in other turns we see patterns of the kind 'culture x does a, while culture y does b'. These are comparison patterns that serve to point out an inter-group difference in the sense of Tajfel's functions. On the other hand, the coined traits change quickly, arrogance turns into pride, Finns are first less social and a few turns later even ashamed. The shift between different evaluative meanings of arrogance, pride, etc. could be the result of language problems, different standpoints of the speakers or many other circumstances. So if EL says that Finns are less social and this might sound like a negative evaluation, there is no proof that she means it in a negative way.

Coming back to the differentiating function, the three excerpts show that inter-group differentiation between national cultures is an observable function, which is achieved by ascribing opposing traits to both and comparing them. Let us quickly remind that the participants receive the mere task from the moderator to describe typical traits of national cultures. The participants themselves bring the differentiation patterns into play and assume their roles as Finns, which can be seen for example in the excerpt 3 above, where AN says that "we are so polite we don't take cookies", while the Germans do it because "they are more arrogant than Finnish". So besides naming the groups, participants also mark their membership and coin the out-group. On the other hand, the data does not show a generally negative standpoint towards the out-group. The participants merely create comparability by using traits that seem to be commonly known to all participants in the three passages, since the conversation keeps fluent and the different speakers construct specific traits conjointly. For example in excerpt 2 the group compares the need for small talk of the Americans with the Finnish rule only to talk when there is something to say. OL exemplifies this further with a theoretical intercultural encounter.

The following a bit longer excerpt is another example for differentiation, but with an interesting difference:

----- Excerpt 4

HA: [that's that's a very common stereotype what I get yeah

NI: Yeah

HA: Why are you talking so much, you are a Finn

RI;NI: Yeah

NI: Like my because I am an international tutor at the moment and my tutorees and my adopted tutorees they call me the crazy Finn because I'm a bit I'm not I'm very atypical fin very like I'm not like at all a typical fin so it's (laughs) there comes in the crazy Fin.

MOD: What do they mean by that?

NI: I'm like so energetic and [uh talkative and so social sociable like and I'm yeah I'm just very

ALL: (inaudible)

NI: Like very atypical Fin (laughs)

HA: The same happened for me in Germany as I was in Bonn [NI: mhh] they called me [NI: yeah] yeah the crazy uh uh Finnish heavy metal man (laughs) I was like flattered by that

NI: Yeah, Yeah I was very flattered be that when they call me like crazy Fin that's [HA: Ye] like an honor

ALL: (laughter)

HA: We have been noticed

NI: Yeah [ALL: (laughter)]

MOD: So uh you think when when people say they that your are not a typical Fin [NI: mh] that's actually for you flattering.

NI: Yeah [yes

HA: [Yes somehow

NI: Somehow (laughs) [somehow

HA: [We we had want to

NI: Because the stereotype of Finns it's not very flattering [like

HA: [That's true

NI: Finns don't talk Finns are violent Finns drink a lot

RI: Yeah

NI: Who wants to be like that

ALL: Yeah

NI: (laughs) No one

What we can notice right away is the absence of what we would call an out-group in the sense we have observed in excerpt 1 to 3. Although HA talks about an experience in Germany, the talk about culture is restricted to the Finnish one, to which all participants belong to. Nevertheless we have here a case of differentiation, as shown by NI. She reacts to HA, who says he has been asked why he as a Fin talks so much.

She retells an experience or several experiences she has had with her tutorees in the university. They called her the 'crazy Finn', which she explains by her atypical behavior which differentiates her from 'a typical Finn'. The moderator then asks her to explain in what sense she is atypical, to which she replies she is 'energetic', 'talkative' and 'sociable', finishing by repeating that this is atypical for a Finn. In the next turns HA tells a similar story about having been called a 'crazy Finnish heavy metal man' and both point out they are flattered by being seen as atypical, i.e. as not typical for their own national culture. Even more interestingly, NI uses the 'stereotype of Finns' for comparison, according to which Finns don't talk, are violent and drink much. NI also points out the negative character of the stereotype. This pattern shows a new case of differentiation, where the speakers differentiate themselves from their

own national culture or at least from what is typical for its members. NI and HA do not act in their roles as Finns, as we have seen in earlier excerpts, but they highlight their individuality by pointing out the differences between themselves and their in-group.

We have earlier discussed the influence of motivational and contextual factors on the salience of the individual or the social identity. While the excerpts 1 to 3 indicate that an inter-group context triggers a stronger identification with a set of typical in-group traits, the in-group context in excerpt 4 displays the differentiation of the individual from the in-group by means of the exact same trait set, only that the entity for comparison in this case is not the in-group, but the constructed out-group impression of the in-group, i.e. the stereotype others may have. This observation supports current claims that the application of stereotypes is a highly variable process determined by aspects such as motivation or context (Oakes et al., 1994; Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005; Turner & Hogg, 1987).

We want to point out another observation concerning the evaluative aspect of stereotypes. If we compare NI saying that Finns don't talk to what EL says in excerpt 3 about Finns being 'not so social', we can argue that they basically describe the same trait. But while EL does not distance herself from this trait, NI points it out as negative in her opinion. So we can note that similar traits can carry different meanings depending on the speaker, the situation and possibly also the point the speaker tries to make. So if NI's goal is to emphasize her sociability, she expresses the stereotypic Finnish characteristic of not talking in a more negative manner than EL, who apparently wants to describe where she sees general differences between Finnish and German people.

Besides differentiation, stereotype traits can also serve for out-group inclusion, as the following excerpt indicates:

----- Excerpt 5

ME: Yeah [...] when I was in Slovakia studying for three weeks and there were people coming coming from all over the world from Korea and New Zealand and where ever (.) and the:: people that the Finns got th- uh the best along were the Germans and the Austrians [HA, NI: mhh yeah] and that's [MOD: O:h] (1.2) that's how I still

MOD: Oh [...] like why might it be:?

HA: We have long history (.)

also (.) [couple of wars and something like that but another thing]

ALL: [(laughter)]

[2 turns left out]

HA: Yeh uh yeh but I I have to second uh with this story about that we relate with the Germans very easily I was u:hm studying in Bonn (.) uh and there was uh only one guy in my dormitory with over 40 (.) 40 students that was (1.0) whole German the others were international students and he was like yeh yeh (.) u:::h he (1.3) thought that yeh I as a Fin u:::hm I am very European and we have more in common than those [NI: Mh] who came from u:::hm China or [MOD: uh hu:h] Japan or something. I I felt at home ↑oka:y yeh I have this German friend who showed me everything where you can buy cheap food and [MOD: Okay] what a student would like to have.

MOD : So he actually said that you both as as good Europeans [HA: Yeah] get along if you compare it with people from

HA: Yeah yeah because (.) uh we found found tha:t yeh for instance we were shocked about these 2 Japanese girls at our dormitory who always left uh uh egg u::h [NI: Shells] shells in the sink it was [ALL: (laughter)] a:::h disgusting like we were talking about [NI: Yeah] that a lot. [NI: Yea:h] And of course (.) uh the German guy then said to these girls yeh you should stop with ↑that

ALL: (laughter)

RI: Yeah our cultures are quite near to uh to each other...

NI: Yeah the habits like the what we (.) do::: [like the everyday life and yeah rules]

HA: [And ru:::les some
rules] have to be

What HA says shows how stereotype traits can serve as points of connection between groups, in this case even the in-group and an out-group. In HA's report about his study time in Bonn, we can make two interesting observations. First he tells how his roommate said that they as being both Europeans are closer to each other as compared to people from Japan or China. He also claims to have felt at home with his German friend. When the moderator asks again about this common European identity, HA gives an example where both he and the German were shocked by the behavior of two Japanese girls who left egg shells in the sink. This report is supported by NI and HA emphasizing the common habits and the importance of certain rules in Finland and Germany.

This excerpt shows that, in the context of multiple relevant cultural groups, two formerly differentiated groups can be constructed as highly similar, as long as this similarity can be emphasized by the differentiation from another cultural group, in this case Japan. This shift from differentiation to consolidation is possible by changing the meta contrast, i.e. by constructing a common higher-level identity like 'the European culture', which is compared against another higher-level cultural group such as 'the Asian culture' (Oakes at al., 1994). The same principle can be applied to the consolidation of two out-groups:

----- Excerpt 6

OL: [maybe not too much they are showing [of

AV: [Because yeah in in many (.) I've I've seen
lot of them like acting really stupid around the world and they are like oh but we're French

we I can do this [like

NO: [Yeah

SE: Really?

AV: Yeah also but also Americans do that

MI;OL: Mh mh

AV: and [and I think also Spanish and Italians

[4 turns left out]

NO: Everyone else but finnish people [

If we compare this excerpt to excerpt 5, the pattern seems quite similar, only that out-groups are connected to each other. In this case AV talks about a certain behavior she claims to have observed among French people, that they act stupidly and claim they may do so because they are French. From her wording you we can observe a negative attitude toward this behavior. She then does not really reply to SE's brief question "Really?". Instead she turns over to claim that Americans, Italians and Spanish do the same. It is not clear what exact purpose this drawing of connections has, whether it is used to back up her prior remark or has another specific function. Ultimately, NO differentiates the Finnish culture from this constructed cluster of out-group cultures.

Tajfel hypothesizes that stereotypes are used to positively differentiate the in-group from a relevant out-group. Our observations indicate that the differentiating function during talk is highly flexible and determined by the immediate conversational context, especially by the amount of relevant cultural groups and their constructed traits. On the one hand, the characterization of the in-group is not clearly positive. Especially excerpt 3 offers an ambiguous picture concerning the evaluative aspect of what is said, which leads us to acknowledge the possibility that the differentiation between social groups can also be performed in a more neutral and not clearly positive manner. Furthermore, as we saw in

excerpt 4, the differentiation can apply to the in-group, when members of a national culture emphasize their individual difference from their own culture. When this happens, speakers show awareness and make use of negative stereotypes about their own culture. By explicitly using the term 'stereotype', they additionally separate the momentarily present in-group from the general stereotype, thus avoiding provoking the other speakers.

Not only is a differentiation possible: As the excerpts 5 and 6 shows us, groups can also be merged by means of stereotype traits. This applies to the in-group and a allegedly similar out-group, as well as to several out-groups. Additionally, this constructed group-conglomerate can be again differentiated from further groups.

Finally we can also observe what Tajfel calls a 'relevant' out-group. Excerpts 1 and 2 indicate that the choice of stereotype traits depends on the personal cultural perspective. As an example, in excerpt 2 the American way of smalltalk is characterized as talking for the sakes of talking, whereas Finnish people only talk when there is something to say. Traits that are perceived as relevant for the in-group are preferably used for inter-group comparison, thus being more likely used for the construction of out-groups.

4.2 Stereotype-patterns as explanations for group behavior

Another possible function we have discussed earlier is that stereotypes may be used to explain events, circumstances, experiences, etc. When exploring this in our data, we again want to take a step back and formulate the function more openly in respect to the relation between the event and the stereotype. What we mean is that a stereotype can be used to explain an event, but an event can also be used to explain a stereotype. Since in our case the starting point of the conversation is the list of typical traits, we can only observe the latter. Indeed our data shows that participants use events to confirm stereotypes.

----- Excerpt 7

OL: I got one ex example I've wrote about Germans that they are civili (.) civilized (0.4) but if we if I think about Americans I think they are not so civilized than Germans in a kind of way I think [MI: mh] uhm what they know for example about rest of the world (laughs) [AV; NO: mmmh yeah] outside of their country and a a dangerous example was uh the beginning of this year in the spring those CIA some kind of (.) uh scientist or or agent or someone (.) very high person in United States and do you remember how they confused Check Republic and and uhm [MOD: Chechnya] Chechenya [ALL: mmhh] do you remember that?

AV: Yeah (.) [yeah for the Boston

OL: [There was some kind there was Boston bomb strikes and and the CIA guy said in public that it was uh 2 guys from Czech Republic [MI: Yeah] ok? And I was in Czech Republic and there were girls from United States close friends of mine and they felt unsecured in Czech Republic because of (0.8) can you see that how [ALL: Yeah] how people around them were like ok we are not dangerous and [...]

What OL does here is quite straightforward: He starts by saying that in his opinion Americans are less civilized and know less about the world than others. Then he tells the story of how he was in the Czech Republic during the Boston bombing and says that a CIA scientist or agent publicly mixed up the Czech Republic and Chechnya. He does not say from what source he himself learned about this. Again, we do not want to jump ahead or go several steps too far. What we see here is that OL says the Americans know less about the rest of the world and backs this up by the publicly broadcast report of a CIA official mistaking one country for another. The fact that he connects the stereotype and the event is clearly indicated by him calling this an 'example' for the Americans being less civilized.

In the next example, the event being talked about is not a publicly broadcast, but a personally experienced one:

-----Excerpt 8

NO: And one thing also about the he helpfulness oh I mean Asiakaspalvelu in [in

AV; SE: [Customer service

NO: E:::actly thank you [AV: Yaah] You go to an te:: for example I was in Paris to u::h and and I wanted to ask something in the (0.6) in the ↑metro I don't remember what is was but I had a problem and there was a info (.) counter (.) I went to ask some help the guy who was working there his job was to give customer service to give me instruction what I needed [AV: mh] and he was looking at me like ↓what the hell are you doing [here

OL: [Yah did you speak France?

NO: I I do [OL: (laughs)] speak French and was speaking [French to him]

OL: [French to him]

NO: and and I was like oka::y tha mhh can you help me please excuse me ladidah all that stuff really you know like apologetic I'm sorry I come to distu:::rb you in your busy working [AV: mhhh] day and he was just like what the hell are you doing can't you see I'm busy

AV: [Mhhh

NO: [It's just the thing here and like (1.5) the who:::le (1.0) it's like every person (.) every French person thinks they are like the (1.4) ruler of the world if you if you will (.) like (.) they are so important and uhm even though I'm just sitting in the metro tunnel waiting for something to happen I am the most important [AV: (laughs)] person in this in this [AV: mmhh] in this world and like (.) they don't

OL: So is it [self confi self confidence?]

NO: [It's it's it's it's] the arrogance

AV: [They they're not humble]

OL: [Self confidence?]

NO: [Yeah I don't know] yeah maybe [that, too

OL: [(inaudible) it goes too far [(laughs)]

NO: [Yeah

In this case NO talks about an experience she made in Paris where someone working in the Metro's customer service did not adhere to her need for information, at least so she tells it. OL asks if she spoke French, possibly because the French people's attitude towards their language was thematized several turns earlier:

----- Excerpt 9

MI: And it used to be la lingua franka for [example it used to be

AV: [Also yeah like the language of arts and knowledge

MI: Hmmm hmmm

OL: So they they're thinking too much about themselves

In excerpt 9 the group constructs the French as people who put a high value on their language. According to her report in excerpt 8, NO took this trait into account when addressing an employee at a metro station. Nevertheless, she claims that, despite her best effort, she wasn't well attended to. After finishing the report and without any significant pause she gives her explanation for what she reported, but refers to "every French person" instead of just this one employee working at the counter. The pattern of explaining an individual event by her general impression of the French is observable in the line "... they are so important and uhm even though I'm just sitting in the metro tunnel waiting for something to happen I am the most important [AV: (laughs)] person in this in this [AV: mmhh] in this world...". NO coins this trait 'arrogance', while AV calls it a 'lack of humbleness'.

It is worth noting that the discursive switch from an individual behavior to a constructed cultural collective in order to present an explanation is performed in a fluent and quick way. While her turn could be interpreted in such a way, we cannot determine whether

NO actually refers to absolutely every French person, or whether this generalization has the discursive purpose of presenting a quick explanatory solution and to avoid ambiguity.

The excerpts 7 and 8 display well observable cases of the explanatory function of stereotypes for publicly transmitted or personally experienced events. On the other hand, events can also be used reflectively to contradict a stereotype.

----- Excerpt 10

NI: [...]what is it li like the state (.) is it state loan like they got a hue hue state dept they are hu::ge they are very deep in dept they are like they are like that's so em- their economy is in very bad shape actually [HA: mmh] so it's they're not doin very well uuh like uhm they are not very good at capitalism. [HA: Yeah] They are not like they are not very good at it

MOD: But still

NI: Like everybody seems to think that it's very:: like capitalism is American [HA: Yeah] but they are not doing very well in it because they've got such a huge dept like tha because of the
↑wa::r

Prior to this excerpt the group had talked about different aspects of the American public policy such as insurance and the situation of poor people. NI then talks about the bad financial situation of the USA and juxtaposes this with the image the world has of the country, which we can see in the line “...everybody seems to think that it's very:: like capitalism is American...”. This is an interesting moment of stereotype reflection. First, it relates to Petkova and Lehtonen's (2005) claim that people are aware not only of the way their own country is perceived by foreigners (see excerpt 4), but even of the way other countries are characterized from outside. This constructed external perception of the target country is then contradicted by an event report, which turns Tajfel's explanatory function upside down. The motives for this stereotype reflection remain unclear, but the pattern we observe here displays a

completely new way of relating a stereotypic perception to an event report.

A more concrete way of using the explanatory power of an experience report to contradict a stereotype statement is shown in the next excerpt.

----- Excerpt 11

SUS: To be honest the first thing that came to my mind was their obesity because it is a huge problem there and people just eat a lot of fast food and a lot of people don't really care about their health and about exercising and stuff like that

SU: I have to disagree because (.) I've been in California and there (.) well ok there's the fat people and then there's the super skinny people. Because I think especially there they care about their health because it's like

(1.3)

MOD: Especially where?

SU: In California because there is warm and there is the beach and people want to look good so they exercise there a lot and in schools the uh (.) the sports system is very uhm important and then they take it very seriously because after the school the (0.8) this practices [MOD: mh] Everyday and I I think they exercise a lot but then there's the other and which are the obesity [obese people

SUS: [I've also (.) uhm heard that in California and Los Angeles and Hollywood especially it's really important to be really skinny and really beautiful and stuff like that but I don't know I think that well probably where the movie industry and things like that are very big maybe there it's more superficial and people duff more care about their image and looks and whatever but I don't know maybe in some (.) u::h smaller places or like in the mid country or where's not that I don't know if like in those places people maybe (.) don't really pay so much attention

AN: In my opinion there is like u::h exactly it's the two far ends it's the obesity and then the

uh very health living and I don't think they have like mmh (.)

The contradiction in this case does not refer to an alleged external stereotype, but to a concrete statement of another speaker. SUS expresses the first trait that she says came to her mind, which is obesity. The reason she gives is that many people in the USA eat a lot and don't care about their health. Her statement, despite the lack of a clear source, explains the obesity problem by a generally unhealthy lifestyle and a lack of exercise.

Now SU shows direct disagreement due to what she knows from having been to California. Immediately afterwards, she softens her disagreement by clarifying that there are both very skinny and very fat people in California. Having made her position clear she turns to deliver her own explanation for what she experienced, which is basically that many people are skinny due to the presence of a beach, which makes people want to look good, and due to the schools' sports system promoting frequent exercise.

We can observe the following in SU's turn: First, the talk about the USA changes to talk about California. Second, the skinniness is added to the obesity instead of replacing it. Third, this generalization about skinniness in California is based on a personal experience. Fourth, SU's explanation for this experience is general, but it refers exclusively to California. SUS elaborates this spotlight on California and adds her own explanation for why people there are often very skinny: She thinks the movie industry has an effect and the people are more superficial and care about their image more. Excerpt 11 allows us to observe the discursive negotiation between a generalized stereotype-confirming statement and a specific stereotype-contradicting report. Interestingly, the explanatory power of both statements is ultimately acknowledged, instead of omitting SUS' rather vague generalization. This observation is related to a pattern of stereotype management we will analyze later.

Similar to our discussion of Tajfel's differentiating function of discursive stereotypes, their explanatory function is far more variable and multi-directional than its original definition

implies. First, speakers generally rely on some statement that confirms their stereotype. While this statement is phrased like a reality report, it may reflect a personal experience, a publicly transmitted event, or a mere elaboration of the stereotype itself. Second, a statement referring to an experienced or publicly transmitted event may be used to contradict a stereotype.

During talk, confirming and contradicting statements can be negotiated in a way that preserves the explanatory power of both by readjusting the reference level of the statement.

We will discuss this pattern of management later.

4.3 The discursive expression of stereotype-awareness and mitigation

We have been able to observe the application of discursive stereotypes for differentiation and explanation. Since these patterns seem so naturally embedded into the conversation, we could assume that speakers generally apply them without an awareness of what they are doing. On the other hand, we have already seen cases where speakers displayed awareness that stereotypes are involved. Such patterns have already been reported in earlier studies, as well as an awareness of negative aspects of stereotyping (Ladegaard, 2011a). We want to observe further cases where an awareness of stereotypes and their nature is involved. We also want to examine the discursive context of these situations.

----- Excerpt 12

MOD: [...] (.) I can also participate [HA: Mh] try the same thing wi:::th (1.2) Americans

NI: O:::h (laughs)

HA: A:::h

LA: Oh no

NI: Oh this will be [interesting

RI: [(inaudible) this will be bad

ME: Now I'm so [(inaudible)]

The moderator opens a new round of listing traits and announces the Americans as the target culture. Following the moderator's turn, the whole group displays an observably coherent reaction. NI's and RI's statements indicate the reason for this coherence. It seems that the group has a common expectancy concerning the result of the trait listing. Furthermore, RI specifies this prediction by saying “[[(inaudible)] this will be bad”. This prediction is confirmed by ME's following turn.

----- Excerpt 13

ME: I'm a horrible person (inaudible) the first thing tha- (laughs) I wrote was fat and stupid

NI: O:.....h (laughs)

All: (Loud laughter)

We can agree that "fat and stupid" are traits of a negative evaluative meaning and could be perceived as blatant, superficial and over-generalizing if a speaker simply says "The Americans are fat and stupid". That in turn can have a negative effect on a listener's opinions about the speaker. In relation to that, we can make two interesting observations:

First, what ME expresses coincides with the discursively overt awareness the group conjointly constructed in excerpt 12, because her traits comply with the common expectation that the traits might be "bad".

Furthermore, ME herself expresses awareness and self-reflection concerning the content of the traits she is about to reveal, and what reactions they could provoke under certain circumstances. This leads to a form of overt self-criticism by calling herself a horrible person for what she wrote down.

We cannot say to what extent she expects negative reactions, but the construction "I'm a horrible person" preemptively signals that she is aware of the negative content of the two

traits she lists. Together with the construction "the first thing tha- (laughs) I wrote", she displays an act of self-observation or self-reflection, since she expresses some sort of surprise about the result she herself generated during the trait listing activity. If we compare ME's turn with the phrase "I think the Americans are fat and stupid", we notice that the relation between ME's expressed traits and her real opinion has been discursively blurred. A listener evaluation of her attitude is not possible. The two preceding excerpts display patterns that offer a potential for mitigation, i.e. working against a possibly negative outside-reaction caused by the expression of derogatory or otherwise negative stereotypes (Ladegaard, 2011a).

In excerpt 12 the participants prepare a discursive floor for the "unsanctioned" expression of negative traits about Americans by emphasizing a conjoint expectation of this exact outcome. This way, the inhibition for each of them is lowered because expressing a negative trait is now highly unlikely to cause negative states of surprise. At the same time, a humorous atmosphere is created, indicated by the laughter accompanying the turns. Despite the preceding conjointly achieved mitigation ME goes even further. She displays a pattern of individual mitigation by expressing a preliminary self-reflection and self-criticism. Instead of phrasing a statement, she discursively constructs some sort of surprised observation about her own displayed opinion towards the Americans, as if she was talking about someone else. Furthermore, she criticizes herself by calling herself a horrible person, and only then she reads out the traits.

These observations indicate that overt anticipation of negative stereotypes or criticism is a discursive mitigation technique, which can be performed both by a group and by an individual in potentially countless different ways. Speakers discursively show they are aware of what they will say and how this might sound to theoretical others and that those others might react negatively under certain circumstances. We say 'theoretical others' and 'certain circumstances' because there is no indication that speakers really expect negative reactions in that particular situation. It rather seems that this pattern is used to lower any possible odds of

such a reaction.

Let us look at another excerpt directly following the previous one:

----- Excerpt 14

HA: Yeah but I think it's (.) the Fin[nish way we we ↑say how the things ↑are↓]

NI: [But yeah (3.0)] we say how
the things are (1.5) like the German people [(inaudible)]

LA: [Yeah let's be honest (laughs)]

HA: [Yeah yeah

HA in this case explains ME's behavior of calling the Americans 'fat and stupid' with the generally Finnish way of saying 'how things are'. The excerpt would also have belonged into the prior discussion concerning the use of stereotypes as explanations. However, it would be brave to claim that this is a seriously meant attempt to explain ME's behavior with the help of a stereotype. The context and the overall presence of laughter and giggles indicate the possibility that what HA does is simply to humorously blame ME's individual behavior on an auto-stereotype (see: Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005) in order to support her in the mitigation we observed in excerpt 13. Humor has a potential mitigation function, simply because humor and good mood lower the risk of individual tension and group conflict, and because they create an easy-going atmosphere. On the other hand, humor is a problem for the researcher because it changes the content of an utterance: In our case it is possible that HA actually thinks Finnish people are generally honest, or that they at least are more direct. But humor and irony render a remark so polysemic that it loses almost all observable explanatory power.

We can exemplify this by pointing out two of several potential mitigation patterns applied in excerpt 14: The first is that HA actually mitigates ME's stereotypes by lowering her personal accountability for what she said, because she did what the typical Finn would do.

The second is that HA expresses an explanation for ME's behavior that is so obviously inadequate and over-generalized as an excuse, that the ironic character becomes apparent to the other participants and creates a humorous atmosphere. This atmosphere in turn mitigates the negative content of ME's stereotypes. In both cases the objective is the same, but the two way of achieving it is different.

The next excerpt reveals another problem we must consider when addressing the discursive mitigation of stereotype effects.

----- Excerpt 15

they come from East Germany originally an I think they hate any kind of dictatorship so

(.) [I don't really

RI: [Well there is one word what comes to the mind also from Germany like there was all the nice things but then also the Na:: [Nazis] it's [always

HA: [Yeah]

NI: [Course well I don't know why do anyone of us say Nazis as one of the first things that come to our minds (.) none none of us thought of that I was I thought [that (inaudible)

RI: [Because we were talking like about so nice things [and so] (laughs)

HA: [Yeah]

NI: Well ma- maybe that's because we all like German people

ALL: (laughter)

RI's first turn shows that she is hesitant about bringing up the term 'Nazi'. After she does it, NI asks why no one in the group has mentioned this term before and RI says that they were talking about 'nice things'. NI adds that they all like Germans and this might be a reason.

This reminds us of the most effective mitigation technique available: the avoidance of a certain stereotype. Openly displaying a stereotype of such a negative nature that it requires mitigation must have a reason. Otherwise it would be easy to keep the most problematic stereotypes out of the conversation.

In our case, like in Ladegaard's studies (2011a, 2011b), the task given to the participants is likely to be the reason for such a display of stereotypes. Nevertheless, the chronologic observation of the excerpts 12, 13 and 14 displays several patterns that arguably lower the uncertainty concerning the listeners' reaction to a stereotype. The individual and the conjoint display of awareness about the negative evaluative content of a stereotype is one example, generating a humorous atmosphere is certainly also supportive. On the other hand, excerpt 14 reveals the ambiguity when it comes to an in-depth analysis of discursive mitigation techniques. We argue that this should be a topic on its own, studied in different conversational contexts.

We will now turn to another aspect of stereotype management which we briefly addressed earlier. It is observable when speakers are confronted with contradictions or other cases where the use of stereotypes becomes problematic.

4.4 Generalization, accentuation, juxtaposition, individuation - Constructing cultural uniformity and diversity in discourse

After a short moment of self-reflection we all would agree with the claim that no population in any country can be fully described by a stereotype or a generalization. Instead, anyone would accept that there are different people in each country. Nevertheless, our discursive data shows that the participants embrace the moderator's task and display a disposition to generalize by means of stereotypes and to utilize these generalizations as explanations or as differentiators. No one refuses to adhere to this task or comments that the activity would

generate erroneous stereotypes that have nothing to do with reality. It would be very easy to claim that the participants' talk about 'them', 'the Germans', 'the Americans', etc. shows a strict connection between a national culture and a stereotype.

However, our data contains talk which breaches the national boundary, changes the reference of talk, or acknowledges the diversity of a culture. We are interested in observing these situations in higher detail because generalizing a whole culture and at the same time acknowledging exceptions or diversity seems like a contradiction that might interrupt the flow of the conversation. How do participants manage such situations? Let us first look at an excerpt we discussed earlier:

----- Excerpt 11b

SUS: To be honest the first thing that came to my mind was their obesity because it is a huge problem there and people just eat a lot of fast food and [...] don't really care about their health and about exercising [...]

SU: I have to disagree because (.) I've been in California and there (.) well ok there's the fat people and then there's the super skinny people. Because I think especially there they care about their health because it's like

(1.3)

MOD: Especially where?

SU: In California because there is warm and there is the beach and people want to look good so they exercise there a lot and in schools the uh (.) the sports system is very uhm important and then they take it very seriously because after the school the (0.8) this practices [MOD: mh] Everyday and I I think they exercise a lot but then there's the other and which are the obesy [obese people

SUS: [I've also (.) uhm heard that in California and Los Angeles and Hollywood especially it's really important to be really skinny

and really beautiful and stuff like that but I don't know I think that well probably where the movie industry and things like that are very big maybe there it's more superficial and people duff more care about their image and looks and whatever but I don't know maybe in some (.) u::h smaller places or like in the mid country or where's not that I don't know if like in those places people maybe (.) don't really pay so much attention

AN: In my opinion there is like u::h exactly it's the two far ends it's the obesity and then the uh very health living and I don't think they have like mmh (.)

In SUS first turn we can still observe the discursive generalization of the Americans by using the constructs "their obesity", "there" and "people". SU interrupts this routine by referring to an experience she herself made in California. Her talk about experienced characteristics that are inconsistent with the preceding generalization is what we want to call discursive accentuation, i.e. highlighting a part of the entity formerly treated as a whole, as well as certain features or characteristics of this part.

First, it is especially interesting to observe that SU's and SUS' following talk about the accentuated region and features is very similar to the talk about the USA in general. Let us clarify this by directly comparing SUS' remark about the USA "... their obesity because it is a huge problem there and people just eat a lot..." with SU's comment about California "...there's the fat people and then there's the super skinny people. Because I think especially there they care about their health [...] and people want to look good...". Despite the acknowledged difference between the nation and the region, the phrasing of the accentuation is itself generalizing. Instead of a general claim about Americans we now observe a general claim about Californians.

Even more, both speakers construct California in a way that accommodates both the initial generalization and the inconsistency. First, SU approves of the partial existence of obesity in California, then she accentuates particular features of California accounting for the

skinniness. We can observe this for example when she says: "...there is warm and there is the beach and people want to look good...". So the accentuated Californian warmth and the presence of the beach makes some, not all, people differ from the American stereotype. SUS joins this effort to accentuate features that account for the difference by adding the movie industry. Then she juxtaposes California with another region she vaguely defines as "smaller places" and "the mid country". The features of these regions are constructed as consistent with her initial generalization about the national culture and serve as a its regional representative.

We ultimately observe that, despite the statement "... I have to disagree...", the following turns do not express a real disagreement, but show a remarkable ability to consolidate the generalization and the inconsistency. While the former is rephrased as partially adequate, the latter is accommodated by accentuating features that are ascribed only to the region where the inconsistency was observed. This accommodation can be further supported by constructing a region where these accentuated particular features do not exist, leading to a higher or maximum degree of consistency with the generalization.

In the next excerpt the participants talk about Germans loving beer and the moderator asks why the group believes this generalization actually applies.

----- Excerpt 16

MOD: Yeah? Why

MI: Well:::: uh (0,8) according to my experiences because I I don't think that I coulda when I was in when I was in (0.5) Bremen I don't think that I could walk 20 meters without meeting a bar so or finding a bar that is i::s [MOD: Okay] and with the locals that's what we basically did and it was a weekday. So it sorta gave me the impression that it it wasn't that uncommon to have have have beer in Germany.

MOD: Ok

NO: And like we were in Berlin just a couple of weeks ago and we went (.) we were just

walking down the street and we were window shopping and then there was this one u::h clothing store where there was a party or something like that launching party and there were waitresses giving out beers. Usually in events like that or well well I I (.) what I've seen or heard it's usually Champagne but in Germany it's beer [MOD: Ok?] And and you are like only in Germany can you shop and have beer at the same time it it was a bit of a joke

This excerpt shows that accentuation can offer a support for the generalization. It is triggered as the moderator asks why the generalization applies. Instead of accentuating inconsistencies, MI and NO accentuate generalization-consistent features. The credibility is raised by reporting a personal experience. MI's and NO's intention to express the consistency of the accentuation with the generalization is observable in MI's final comment "So it sorta gave me the impression that it it wasn't that uncommon to have have have beer in Germany." as well as when NO says "... only in Germany can you shop and have beer at the same time...".

Our observation that an accentuation requires certain triggers is further supported by the following excerpt. It shows a situation where the report of SUS is not interrupted or followed by any further question or request for more detail:

----- Excerpt 17

SUS: [Their school system sucks (.) it'ss really [bad

HAN: [I heard it, [too

SUS: [And the it's like they're they're very strict there like if you're late (.) that's very big thing and like the (.) you (.) they have this like dress code in the school, too [EL: Mh yeah] that (0.5) if you (.) are wearing something that your shoulders show then they then you get this uhm like a punishment or something (0.5) and they have these ru::les and regulations and (1.0) that's too much because I thought

first before I went to the United States that everything is there very uhm (.) like it's liberal and li:ke free and uhm [you can do what]ever you want(.)

HAN: [That's not true]

SUS: But that's not [true]

[No:::] (.) no I think

ANNE: That's I I wrote here (laughs) (0.8) uh I ↑wrote here the paradox of liberal and conservative [HAN: Yeah] because they are (.) really liberal (.) but extremely conservative at the same time. [...]

Similar to excerpt 11b, which takes place prior to this excerpt, SUS talks about an experience or observation she made. This observation contradicts her own expectations before the travel. We know that SUS visited California, but looking at her report we find no reference to this detail. Rather it seems she talks about the whole school system of the United States when she f. ex. says: "... I thought first before I went to the United States that everything is there very uhm (.) like it's liberal and li:ke free...". This is especially interesting because in excerpt 11b she reports an aspect of the Californian school system that according to her differs from the rest. Why does she treat something as a whole that in an earlier part of the conversation had observable regional differences?

It is hard to say if she relies on the group's awareness that she was in California, because it would not require a high effort to say "California" instead of "the United States". It would even seem that it is safer for her to openly restrict her experience and opinion to the area she referred to earlier, but also this aspect seems irrelevant. We can hardly find reasons for her reference to the whole country. So what observable difference between excerpt 11b and excerpt 17 may account for the different levels of reference? The data indicates that an accentuation is triggered by listener feedback. In excerpt 11b it is the expression of a contradiction that marks the change of reference level. The turn in excerpt 17 remains

basically uninterrupted, except for some confirming feedback, and it is embedded into the overall generalization-discourse of the conversation, i.e. the group is talking about the USA in general and there is no reason for SUS to change the reference.

Having these observations as well as the whole data in mind, we observe that the general discursive level of reference is a national culture as one uniformly describable entity like 'the Germans', 'the Americans', etc. Under certain circumstances speakers abandon the generalization. In our cases they accentuate parts of the former 'whole' as well as certain features of these parts. By accentuating these features the referred part can either serve as an approval of the generalization or accommodate an inconsistency to the generalization. Once this business is managed, the speakers return to the discursive generalization.

What we can further say is that there seems to be no observable conflict for the speakers in making generalizing statements about a national culture and acknowledging exceptions to those generalizations. This observable awareness of the cultural diversity and the simultaneous construction of a culture as a describable unity raises the question whether constructs in talk such as "the Germans" or "they" have any stable relation to mental representations of cultures. Our observations rather indicate that these constructs are discursive abstractions that can be negotiated as well as compared against certain accentuated affirming or contradicting features. This would also be in line with the juxtaposition we saw in excerpt 11b, where California is identified as different from the USA in a certain aspect and then juxtaposed with a region that is supposed to be less different from the USA in the same aspect. It would also indicate a reason why generalization and accentuation can coexist in a discursive context.

The following excerpt contains further indications that discursive generalizations are flexible.

----- Excerpt 18

NI: I've also got sports because they are very good at many many sports they are so good at many sports that

RI: There're [so many people] [(laughs)]

MOD: [It's a big country]

NI: [Yeah so many people (.) so many people and bu- I also got diversity because I know that because there are the stupid and fat ↑Americans [(laughs)]

ALL: [(laughter)]

NI: ↑Ya::: but like there are also the intelligent and very tolerant and uh (.) mhh Americans who're like

HA: It's really a country of uh [contrast (inaudible)]

NI: [Yeah so diversity] there's (0.8) co- country of contrast?

MOD: Mh

HA, RI: [Yeah (inaudible)]

NI: [Like or or the diversity is very like [HA: Yeah] (0.6) lots of different types of [people]

MOD: [Where do you think so::: what what is diverse the diverse part what is the (.) fat and stupid [of the US]

ALL: [(laughter)]

NI: Do we have to put it on the map?

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD: No no no you don't have to do anything but

HA: Bible belt saying some[thing?]

NI: [Bible belt?]

ALL: (Laughter 1.5 sec)

NI: U::h southern::: maybe [south] (laughs) I dunno [yeah]

RI: [Yeah]

MOD: [Yeah I [...] when I hear about this uh uh cultural diversity I of course always think about New York u:h [as (3.4) the melting pot]

ME: [Yeah yeah New York I if you would say New York] I wouldn't then say fat and [stupid because it's ↑totally different

HA: [Yeah I (1.0) I I think it'sss u:::h you more li- like european cities [ME: Yeah] or very very

ME: So it's you know the Texas [u:::h

NI: [Yeah probably like when you first (inaudible) that we think all when we say fat and stupid Texasssss (1.0) [for some reason Texassss

This excerpt is especially interesting when observing the construction of cultural diversity as we get to explore different aspects of this construction. The reference to the USA as a uniform construct changes due to what seems to be a random remark: NI's comment that the Americans are "very good at many many sports" triggers RI's open acknowledgement that the population of the USA is huge. NI then adds the trait "diversity" to the features of the USA and exemplifies this diversity by juxtaposing ME's initial trait "fat and stupid" we saw in excerpt 13 with "intelligent and very tolerant". HA further diversifies the USA as a "country of contrasts".

The talk surrounding NI's "diversity" trait helps us to explore the nature of discursive generalization and stereotyping more in-depth. Our data contains many comments following the logic of connecting a national culture to a trait: The French are arrogant, the Americans are fat and stupid, the Finns drink too much, etc. We have called this kind of talk 'discursive generalization'. A stereotype, if we choose a more open definition, is the perception that a certain group shares features, symbols, values, etc (McGarty, et al., 2002). So the discursive

generalization as we defined it can also be called discursive stereotyping, because the discursively constructed national groups are treated as uniform and are ascribed certain shared features. On the other hand, the trait "diversity" in the excerpt above shows us that a discursive stereotype is a highly abstract construct, which only on the surface refers to the entire culture. NI's diversity-trait reads like any other discursive stereotype or generalization we saw, but contains a contradiction in itself: The group treats the national culture 'USA' as one unity with shared features and then refers to a specific feature contradicting the act of stereotyping. More precisely, the discursive stereotype "The Americans are diverse" reads like any other, but it contradicts the act of stereotyping itself. This indicates that discursive stereotypes treat national cultures as unities but do not define them as such.

Rather, a discursive stereotype is an abstract image linking a feature to a constructed cultural unity. In the moment of talk this image can be negotiated with other speakers and it can be compared against parts of the constructed unity. In excerpt 18 the participants are able to identify stereotype-coherent regions like "the Bible belt" or "Texas" which correspond to their national generalization. New York on the other hand does not correspond to the discursive stereotype and this circumstance, similar to excerpt 11b, is accommodated by accentuating a more "European" character of the city which accounts for the difference.

Cities within a country sometimes seem to be detached from the stereotype about the country they are located within, as we can see when ME says: "[Yeah yeah New York I if you would say New York] I wouldn't then say fat and [stupid because it's ↑totally different". The same is indicated by the following excerpt:

----- Excerpt 19

AV: In Berlin you see [that a lo::t] yeah

SE: [Mh (1.3) yeah]

MOD: But how much (.) what do you think how much then if you if you say Berlin how

much uh Germany is there in Berlin

AV: (Laughs) [I don't think at all

NO: [(inaudible)

MOD: Why

NO: Is like Berlin is Berlin and then there's Germany [but it's] the same in every country

AV: [Yeah]

OL: In Finland in [Prague and Czech Republic yeah]

NO: [Helsinki there's Helsinki] and there's Finland there's Paris and there's [AV: Mh] France [so::

MOD: [Ok but then if you compare Berlin to (.) u:h to the uh the other parts of Germany then what do you think would make the difference

NO: I I wouldn't know I I haven't been I only been to [(.) Berlin so]

AV: [Yeah the same]

MOD: Ok so it's just a few [then

NO: [I would like to go to [(0.8) see the actual] Germany

AV: [See the actual Germany yeah]

Prior to this excerpt SE comments that when she thinks about Germany she also thinks about sub-cultures and youth-cultures like the punk movement, and AV emphasizes the presence of these sub-cultures in Berlin, which leads the moderator to ask about the perceived relation between Berlin and the country it is located in. Instead of elaborating this, the participants interestingly display a general tendency to separate the culture of a capital from the culture of a nation. NO and AV, who had traveled together, even agree that they, having been only to Berlin, have not yet experienced what they call the "actual Germany". This at first surprising statement that 'Berlin is not Germany' makes sense if a discursive stereotype is not a mere image, but rather an abstract template. Its source, its boundaries, and its relation to

reality change depending on a certain context. This lack of consistency makes it impossible to describe the nature of these abstractions. What we can observe is NO's and AV's expectation that other regions of Germany correspond to their stereotype in several aspects, while Berlin apparently has no connection points with it. In the same way, several capitals seem to have only few connection points to national stereotypes. They rather seem to have their own stereotype set.

Seeing a discursive stereotype as an abstract template is also compatible with our earlier observations where speakers were able to name regions within a country that corresponded to their stereotype. The expressed regions differed from each other in specificity ("The mid country" versus "Texas"), indicating that some speakers may have more elaborate templates than others. The concept of a template is also in line with the accentuation mode discussed earlier. Features of a region which are not captured within the discursive stereotype can be accommodated by accentuating regional particularities located beyond the stereotype-boundaries. Features of a region, which lie within the stereotype-boundaries, can also be accentuated in function of a general stereotype-approval.

Our observations also indicate that speakers strongly differ in the extent to which they relate their stereotypes to reality. This may be caused by theoretically infinite individual differences: How much of a country and its people has an individual experienced, what are the sources of his stereotype, how flexible is his stereotype in discourse, etc?

At one point of the group discussion MI indicates that a stereotype as a template becomes more irrelevant, the smaller the target and the closer the relation to it:

----- Excerpt 20

MI: I never really met a (0.4) nice smart American man I have never met met that

NO: I have I [have

MI: [Uh uh no wait excuse me excuse me. Once but the majority has been (.) excuse

me. Once a certain musician a friend of mine he's I forgot completely that he is actually an American. But (.) most of the time the discussions are very loud and non-existing basically it's [NO: (laughs)] always like gossiping with someone which is something I do I don't do. [...]

The fact that MI in the moment of the conversation almost forgets that he has an American friend indicates that the use of the 'American'-stereotype as a template is irrelevant for this individual. We can rather observe some kind of discursive individuation, i.e. actually treating a person as an individual rather than as a category-member. This doesn't mean that MI is absolutely unaware of the nationality of his friend, but the category doesn't activate a stereotype, possibly due to the high amount of personal information MI possesses about this person. Discursive individuation doesn't necessarily mean that speakers are unable to apply stereotypes as templates to their acquaintances when asked about this. The effects of individuation may be manifold. F. ex. a speaker may express a clearly negative stereotype about a national culture, but be much less critical if a friend behaves in a stereotype-consistent way. Due to the amount of questions that cannot be addressed by our data, we argue that we cannot go beyond than the mere observation of the act of discursive individuation. We cannot estimate the complexity of this aspect at this point.

To sum up the construction of cultural uniformity and diversity, we can say that stereotypes in discourse construct a national culture as a carrier of a set of traits. While being phrased as a generalization, this does not indicate that a speaker is unaware of cultural diversity. Expressed inconsistencies can be accommodated by accentuating regional particularities that are not covered by the national stereotype's boundaries. On the other hand, the accentuation of specific stereotype-consistent reports experienced regionally can support a generalization. We have also observed patterns of juxtaposition when dealing with inconsistencies. In these cases, a stereotype-consistent region can be constructed in the moment of talk. Very small regions, f. ex. big cities, can also be constructed as independent

from the country they are located within, possessing their own stereotype traits.

The observations we discussed in the last four chapters allow us to answer our first two research questions. We have observed that Tajfel's group functions of differentiating and explaining on basis of a stereotype can indeed be observed in talk. Therefore we have no reason to argue against the claims made by his Social Identity Theory. We must, however, point out the fact that in talk these functions are applied in a much more variable way than Tajfel indicates (Oakes et al., 1994).

As for the management of stereotypes, we have observed patterns of overt anticipation to lower the odds of negative effects caused by the expression of stereotypes. On the one hand, the group expressed a preemptive awareness that their stereotypes of Americans are to some extent negative. On the other hand, we saw that overt self-reflection and self-criticism prior to the expression of stereotypes lowers the listener's potential of interpreting the speaker's relation to them. These patterns relate to the findings discussed by Ladegaard (2011a, 2011b). Finally, diversity can be managed without omitting stereotype-based generalizations. For this purpose, the reference level is changed from a national culture as a whole to a region in particular. Lower-level references then allow accentuations and juxtapositions in order to consolidate a stereotype and an inconsistency.

Beyond these specific patterns of application and management, we have observed a high disposition to generalize and to express discursive stereotypes. We even argue that the term 'disposition' is not the adequate one. Rather, speakers express stereotypic statements in a seemingly unreflected manner. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that a stereotype statement reflects a mental stereotype, as well as it would be wrong to assume the opposite. The widespread tendency of emphasizing the negative nature of cultural stereotypes has already been a matter of past debates. When it comes to talk, such a definition is especially problematic (Gudykunst et al., 2003; McGarty et al., 2002; Oakes et al., 1994; Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005).

We therefore want to look at the use of stereotype discourse in a less critical way, offering a perspective that does not assume a prejudiced personality. This discussion is based on the remaining research questions which are relevant for the general relation between a speaker and his discursive stereotype.

5. Conceptualizing heterogeneity in talk – A new perspective on the conjoint construction of cultures and the significance of stereotypes

After offering their comprehensive review of the several definitions of the term 'cultural stereotype', Petkova and Lehtonen's (2005) conclude that this term is a stereotype itself. It seems ironic that the definition of the practice of simplifying and generalizing a complex matter is itself a simplification and generalization. Nevertheless, we agree with this observation. Different theories have concentrated on certain aspects of the phenomenon. While the definitions offered on basis of this aspect may reflect a kernel of the truth about stereotypes, the consequence of such an emphasis is the ignorance of other aspects, as well as possibly to rigidly worded definitions. This issue relates to Potter and Wetherell's (1987) critique of academic work as a form of discourse itself. A certain definition may be phrased in a sense that over-emphasizes the research interest of the field. An example we discussed earlier is the fact that Tajfel's group functions (see: Oakes et al., 1994) are concretely observable in talk, but in a varied and complex form that cannot be represented by the very specific definition originally given by Tajfel. In the same way a more open definition of these functions was more adequate to describe stereotypes in talk, we argue that stereotypes, in our case their discursive manifestation, deserve to be treated separately and more open-mindedly. Our third research question, concerning the disposition of speakers to treat national cultures as uniformly describable by traits, can be answered quite clearly: The conversations we observed were based on this pattern. We only encountered references to diversity in cases of

inconsistency, as we saw in chapter 4.2.4. Does this mean that we observed prejudiced personalities derogating other cultures for the sakes of self esteem? Or are speakers cognitively incapable of accounting for diversity, thus unconsciously engaging in over-generalization? Rather than arguing against such explanations, we want to offer an alternate view on stereotypes in talk, based on Saussure's ([1916]1983) diadic relation between a signified reality and the signifier representing it.

5.1 The conceptualizer, the conceptualized and the concept – Making talk about cultures possible

The act of relying on discursive stereotypes as we defined them is what we call discursive generalization. This means that a conversational situation is generally characterized by the establishment, negotiation and application of discursive stereotypes. An overall exploration of our data gives us the impression that discursive generalization as we defined it is a natural element of talk. On the one hand, we acknowledge that in our data it is initiated by the moderator, who defines the task and the target cultures, thus inducing the generalization-mode. On the other hand, the pattern is so prevalent that we have no reason to assume that speakers would not apply them in other situations. Our initial suspicion that the research setting inhibits such a behavior was clearly not confirmed.

Our data indicates that no particular speaker-disposition to generalize needs to be established, generalization seems to be something speakers rely on naturally. In the light of this line of thought the claim that stereotypes, also in discourse, are generally negative signs of prejudice and over-generalizing in nature would be an ungrounded jump to conclusions about speakers underlying intentions (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005).

A far less proleptic perspective on why generalizations are a part of talk can be found

in a fundamental idea behind the social cognitivist approach we discussed earlier. McGarty et al. (2002, p. 4) describe the notion of categorizing as follows: "In particular, treating people as group members saves energy because it means that we can ignore all of the diverse and detailed information that is associated with individuals".

These authors also point out that categories are based on the assumption that everything is unique and separable from each other due to certain characteristics. We offer two arguments in favor of the possibility that talk about national cultures, as well as other cultures, is only possible on the basis of the same two principles. First, constantly treating a national culture as an assembly of individuals, and accounting for every single detail, does hardly seem possible, given the fact that conversations are dynamic and their duration can vary significantly. Second, referring to a category that has no unique features would make this category redundant.

Talk about national cultures is basically the act of describing the indescribable. The same counts for talk about 'trees' or 'fish'. But while no one would argue that the statement "I don't like fish" indicates that the speaker ignores the high variety of fish, the term 'stereotype' often carries this claim. We do not say that this claim is generally wrong, but we recommend to separate what stereotypes are, and what effect they can *possibly* have. Given that the term 'stereotype' carries so many connotations and that it is rather static, we want to separate it from the dynamic process of talking about cultures in general. For this, we modify Saussure's ([1916]1983) concept of meaning as the sign relating to a reality, the signifier, and the reality that is referred to, the signified. Based on the way talk represents cultures, we call formulations like 'Germans' or 'they' discursive *conceptualizers*. We use the term because talk requires a concrete concept of something that has none of its own. The referred culture and their people are the *conceptualized*. This diadic definition accounts for the fact that a word does not carry an extensive or stable meaning of its own, as well as for the unstable relation between the word and the thing it describes.

We want to expand the diadic definition to a triadic one. Depending on what talk must achieve, speakers use the conceptualizer to negotiate a description of the conceptualized. This creates a *discursive culture-concept*, which we will simply label *concept* in our following discussion. Given the complexity of the conceptualized, the traits we connect to a conceptualizer must be taken from other sources. Let us now look at the role of stereotypes as information sources for concept construction and negotiation.

5.2 Reference or description – Concepts are elaborated based on the function they are created and negotiated for

Let us start with some basic definitions: Conceptualizers, compared to stereotypes within social psychology, are not mental representations, but mere labels for concepts of something naturally complex. Context and stake have a fundamental impact on the concept complexity. The concept is created in the moment of talk, and dies once its function has been exhausted or the topic changes. In the course of the conversation, it is molded conjointly by several speakers instead of being created by an individual (see also: Ladegaard, 2011a).

We do not deny that people have sets of mental stereotypes about different national cultures, but these cognitions only have a partial relation to concepts, depending on their function. A merely referential conceptualizer does not require an elaborate concept, since the function is solely to give the conceptualized a label. An example can be the statement “The Germans are coming to visit me today”. In that case the function is just reference clarification and the concept meaning may narrow down to “The Germans, not anyone else”.

A more concrete and elaborate concept is necessary if the conceptualized is a key topic, like in our data. In these cases speakers may selectively transfer those features from their mental representations to the concept that are relevant. Unnecessary details are ignored. Furthermore, we do not want to exclude the possibility that other sources are used. To

exemplify this, let us look at a short excerpt:

----- Excerpt 21

ME: [We- Well this is (.) not my opinion but (laughs) usually people say that u:h the Germans are very humorless and they ha- they [HA: Hyea] have bad sense of humor so ↑could someone like explain me ho- why:: (.) why uh why that is?

Of course it is possible that ME applies a mitigation technique to soften her own stereotype, but there is no reason to exclude the possibility that ME brings a trait from an external source into play, in order to gather information about its validity. This is indicated by the phrase “↑could someone like explain me ho- why:: (.) why uh why that is?” and reminds us of something that even Social Cognition approves of: That talk is also a sharing of information, and that the conjoint construction of a concept allows speakers to fill in knowledge gaps about the conceptualized. An approval of the trait in question may cause ME to transfer it back to her mental representation, i.e. her stereotype. That is basically the nature of social sources of stereotypes and this regressive relation between a descriptive concept and a stereotype would be an interesting matter of study. Furthermore, this model accounts for the fact that the information given by others may itself be based on erroneous stereotype beliefs (Bar-Tal, 1997; McGarty et al., 2002; Pennington, 2000; Verkuyl, 1998).

The points we discussed are also related to our fourth research question concerning the consensualization of stereotypes. We observed situations where certain concept traits were already consensual, for example when referring to the in-group culture. We saw cases where the speakers consciously added shared stereotypic traits to the concept in order to mark their individuality (see chapter 4.1). Of course it is also possible that a a concept at some point is ascribed a trait that does not have to be overtly named, since speakers assume that the trait is already consensual and therefore automatically added to the concept. We also observed many

cases of consensualization in the sense that speakers negotiate certain traits in order to clarify the concept (see chapter 4.4).

For the relation between a stereotype and a concept this means that a certain conversational context or stake may lead to the connection of pre-shared stereotype traits to a conceptualizer, causing an overlap between the stereotype and the created concept in that specific aspect. Nevertheless, the relation remains partial and the concept has no explanatory power concerning the attitude of the individuals towards that stereotype trait, except if this attitude is overtly expressed.

The triadic definition of conjoint culture conceptualization and the relevance of stereotypes we just discussed is in line with the current tendency to understand stereotypes as dependent on the general context, the speakers, the individual and conjoint discursive agendas, situational discursive purposes, patterns of stereotype-negotiation, and many other factors (Augoustinos, & Walker, 1998; Fitch, 2005; Ladegaard, 2011a, 2011b). Separating the discursive construct from the mental representation, and relabeling it as a dynamic process of objectification is merely a further step in the same direction. The main achievement of this separation is to emphasize the relevance of the very nature of talk, as well as the unstable relation between a word, its reference and its meaning.

5.3 Discursive culture-concepts and their ascribed features adhere to a comparative function

Up to now we have separated the culture concept from the stereotype in relation to their content, but they share a key function: Comparability. In the chapters 4.1 and 4.2 we observed the explanatory and the differentiating group functions of stereotyping in talk and adhered to this separation. If we reflect on our observations, we can argue that both functions are basically acts of comparison, which relates to the Social Cognitivist assumption that

categories exist only if they are describable by traits that allow comparing them to reality and to other categories (Oakes et al., 1994; McGarty et al., 2002).

It is true that the explanatory function as defined by Tajfel (Oakes et al., 1994) applies to cultural concepts in the sense that f. ex. an experienced event can be reported and then explained by a concept, or a concept is elaborated in a certain way and then explained by an experienced or perceived event. What we need to clarify is that the term 'explanation' in discourse is misleading and rather expresses an act of comparing a created concept against a specific observation that confirms its validity. This act is 'disguised' as an explanation. The dependence on comparability restricts the actual explanatory power of concepts. As we saw in chapter 4.2.4., when speakers deal with concept-inconsistencies, they simply rely on another conceptualized and create a parallel concept that covers the inconsistency.

So when a concept and an observed or experienced event match each other, a discursive explanation can be constructed, increasing the concept's credibility and validity. When a concept and an observed or experienced event don't match each other, people for example conceptualize a region in a way that accounts for the inconsistency by unique features, and maintains a common ground with the conceptualized national culture by common features. Again, all these are fundamentally patterns of discursive comparison. The other comparative potential of concepts is their power to quickly create elaborate links and boundaries between groups, as well as between groups and individuals or even between individuals only. Most cases we observed are boundary-constructions between the in-group and a referred out-group using concepts.

Again there is a partial correspondence to Tajfel's differentiating function of stereotypes in general (Oakes, Haslam, Turner, 1994), but we observed that culture concepts are not restricted to positive in-group differentiation. We also observed a situation where two out-groups concepts were connected by common constructed traits, as well as the connection of the in-group and an out-group and the separation of this conglomerate from a third, more

culturally distant out-group.

Another interesting comparative function can be observed when looking at concepts about the own national culture. Our data shows that these can be used to individualize the 'self' by separating it from the in-group. In these cases we can observe that speakers overtly rely on quite negative in-group stereotypes. So while the concept and the shared stereotype are similar in this case, another particularity comes into play. As Petkova and Lehtonen (2005) explain, people in these cases transfer traits from stereotypes they think foreigners have, not their own. This is related to our last research question, and another good reason to separate discursive concepts from stereotypes.

5.4 Speakers are aware of stereotypes and their sources, and use this awareness for discursive purposes

One last aspect we have not addressed in the previous chapter are situations where speakers discursively identify certain concept traits as stereotypic, thus displaying an open awareness that stereotypes are a relevant part of their talk. Although one could suspect that this overt display of stereotype-awareness would lead to stereotype-rejection or problematization, we can on the other hand observe another aspect of stereotyping that has been coined already in the very early years of research: The theory of the kernel of truth simply claims that every stereotype includes a reference to a certain part of reality (Prothro, & Melikian, 1955).

We can exemplify this by two short excerpts demonstrating situations where speakers talk about actual stereotypes and also identify them as such. Interestingly one excerpt contains talk about in-group stereotypes:

-----Excerpt 22

ME: And also the silence::: (.) factor uh Finns are considered very silent and uh unsociable people which is (.) ↑ probably also partly true because it's OK for us to be quiet [every now and then and it's

NI: [Ye::a:h

The second one refers to the Germans as out-group:

-----Excerpt 23

ME: punctual definitely (1,5) [Do you want me to explain

MOD: [What do the other

NI: yeah, that is a stereotype [that Germans are always on time

HA: [yeah

RI: Yeah

NI: Always on time

HA: but [there are always exceptions for the rule.

RI: [at least they are

NI: Yes

In both excerpts we find markers indicating the speakers' awareness that they are dealing with stereotypes rather than facts. In excerpt 22 ME does not say that the Finns are "very silent and uh unsociable" but rather that they are considered as such. In excerpt 23, NI makes it more obvious by saying that the German punctuality is a stereotype.

On the other hand we find no reason to believe that speakers perceive stereotypes to be completely detached from reality, even in relation to their very own national culture. ME states that the stereotype "silent and unsociable" probably applies to a part of the Finns and

then includes the present speakers by explaining "... because it's OK for us to be quiet [every now and then...". She does not talk about Finns anymore, but about "us".

HA approaches the matter from the other side. Once NI says that the connection of Germans and punctuality is a stereotype, HA comments that there is always an exception for the rule. Even if he doesn't mean it in such a generalizing way, we observe the statement that there are exceptions from the stereotype, which indicates a higher stereotype validity than saying that merely a few Germans may be punctual. So speakers do not stop the stereotyping-process once they are aware of it. This gives us a hint that stereotypes may be considered valid aspects of talk about national cultures, and this in turn may be partially caused by the speakers' belief that stereotypes only exist because they at least incorporate a kernel of truth. Whether some speakers consider stereotypes to contain kernels or rather cores of truth is a more complicated question that must be addressed separately.

Another display of awareness concerns the sources of stereotypes. Bar-Tal's earlier discussed model for the formation of national stereotypes coins the stereotype-transmitters the "mediating variables". Two of them are the family circle and the mass media as part of the public discourse (Bar-Tal, 1997). Excerpt 24 shows us an example for the family circle as source:

----- Excerpt 24

ME : Well I have written hard working this is not based on my experience because I haven't worked with a German [HA: Ah] but this is based on my dad's u::h experience who lives in ↑Sweden and u::h works a lot with people from Norway:: Germany:: Denma::rk and uh he always says that it's very nice to work with the German people (.) compared to for example (.) ↑Gree::k people

This excerpt reminds us that the awareness of the source of a stereotype doesn't automatically mean that a speaker is also aware of the stereotypical nature of their remark. A stereotype acquired from a person as trusted as the own father may even be given a relatively high credibility, but of course we cannot observe whether ME gives credibility to the stereotype herself or is rather aware of it as something her father said. At least her report is quite elaborate and even contrasts the German trait of being hard working with another national culture, the Greek one. The next and last excerpt reveals TV shows as possible sources of stereotypes:

----- Excerpt 25

LA: I have the fla:g

NI: Yeah the flag [LA: Yeah] I always think of the flag when I hear a country (.) like always the flag comes to my mind

LA : Yea:h and I have been watching too for example American Dad and Family Guy and stuff (laughs) so::: there you haveat first (.) flag.

ALL: (laughter)

Although this is no stereotype in the sense we have looked at before, the source of it is clearly stated by LA who says that her impression partially comes from the TV shows "American Dad" and "Family Guy". At another point in the data the group talks about TV shows in general that might be possible sources of their opinion about typical German traits.

These findings speak against defining stereotypes as negative and unconsciously applied (see: Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005). Stereotypes are no hidden aspect of talk, they not only have an unnoticed impact on the speakers' conversations without ever being identified as what they are. This indicates a whole new dimension of stereotypes in talk, where they are not only sources to add meaning to a conceptualizer, but

that the very nature of a stereotype offers a meaning of its own. Even if we do not have sufficient data to look into this topic in-depth, the field of Discursive Psychology has a claimed interest in studying speakers' displays of awareness of stereotypes, as well as of different aspects of stereotyping we partially discussed in the chapters about the theoretical background.

It seems that under certain discursive conditions speakers may reveal interesting insights into the construction of stereotype validity. The claim that a stereotype is an over-generalizing belief about a group of people would make such an approach redundant, because a belief is something that we relate to our understanding of truth. The relation between stereotypes and reality is far more varied, dynamic and interesting and if discursive data itself contains overt clues about this relation, it should certainly not be ignored.

6. Constructing stereotype uniformity and diversity in academic discourse

It is impressive how our observation, analysis and reflected discussion of stereotypes in talk can be applied to the academic perspective on the phenomenon. As Potter and Wetherell (1987) point out, discourse remains discourse, even if it is labeled as academic. The long history of the academic study of and debate over stereotypes, as well as the directions research took, have connected a quite generalizing, simplifying and partially negative concept to the label 'stereotype', which is also pointed out by Petkova and Lehtonen (2005). On the other hand, the label appears in contexts that are as different as 'cognition' and 'talk'. The reaction to this conflict has been an ongoing attempt to re-specify and diversify the phenomenon, thus attempting to work against the connotation of the label. But is this the only possibility?

The title of this last chapter is partially copied and modified from the title of chapter 4.4, and this has a reason. The patterns observed in that chapter reveal another possibility of handling the issue we described above. In the same way that speakers, when describing cultures, handle contradictions by constructing a new concept with a label and certain unique traits, we have rejected the notion of 'stereotypes in talk' and created the labels 'conceptualizer', 'conceptualized' and 'concept' for the discursive construction of cultures.

The reason is simple: In the same way we separate 'boots' and 'shoes' instead of naming the former 'shoes for rainy days, or when it is muddy, or if you are a farmer, although in certain situations you can wear boots like shoes', we have used labels to acknowledge that the construction of cultures in talk is different from the concept of a stereotype. And much like the Social Cognitivist assumption that categories need to be somehow unique in order to be comparable to others (see: McGarty et al., 2002), our conceptualization of the conjoint construction of cultures creates the distance to the concept of the 'stereotype' we need to study their relation, to compare them, and to find differences and similarities. Ultimately we achieve a core function ascribed to stereotypes themselves: Structuring the world for a better

understanding (Gudykunst et al., 2003; Leyens et al., 1994).

Such an approach accepts the static definition of cultural stereotypes as elaborate and relatively stable representations of cultures with cognitive and social functions. As we saw, the former aspect has been largely studied by Social Cognition, the latter by the Social Identity and the Self-categorization Theory. The social functions of stereotypes as defined by Tajfel account for their content and reflect inter-group relations, but in a macro-societal sense. The sources of stereotype transmission, like early childhood education and the mass media, are the cause for their socially shared character.

When conjointly conceptualizing a culture, stereotypes are sources for concept construction, they are not the same as concepts. The transmission of stereotype traits and the choice of traits are determined by countless potential factors, like the context, the speakers, as well as the function of the concept. As we saw, this function may be explanation or differentiation, but not in the sense Tajfel phrased it. Conversational situations require a much more flexible and variable function-achievement, and even the phrased explanations be observed were basically acts of concept validation through comparison with a reality.

There are certainly many more differences between stereotypes and discursive culture conceptualizations we did not address. Nevertheless we have pointed out arguments in favor of labeling and treating the discursive culture construction separately. The study of the varied and complex relation between the two phenomena would allow interesting insights (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Fiske & Taylor, 2010; Ladegaard, 2011a; McGarty et al., 2002; Oakes et al., 1994; Spreckels & Kotthoff, 2009).

Finally, we agree with Potter and Wetherell's (1987) problematization of certain methods to gather quantitative data, f. ex. the falsification of survey data due to the respondent bias, i.e. the possibility that a respondent answers a survey in a socially acceptable rather than an honest way. The several implications of the nature of discourse for the academic study of social phenomena are certainly an important topic that must be discussed in order to find the

most adequate methods for every area of interest.

7. The study of stereotypes in talk – A critical evaluation of our research process

Based on a critical retrospective on the research process of this study, we want to outline two major challenges when studying stereotypes in talk. We will also point out possible approaches to these challenges.

The first challenge is the selection of the adequate method to study stereotypes in talk. Our discussions in the sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 indicate that there is no method that can be determined as the most adequate. Stereotypes are a specific research topic and while we agree that naturally occurring talk is the most desirable sampling source, it may only offer small portions of analyzable data. The reason for this is that topics during conversations evolve and change quickly, sometimes displaying stereotype-patterns in one sentence only. For Conversation Analysis this is not an issue, since talk itself is the topic of interest. A specific interest in stereotype-patterns allows the application of methods that generate more topic-centered data. Focus groups are acknowledged as adequate methods, as long as their nature as non-natural conversations is taken into account. Their design, especially the definition of the moderator's role, can work against their unnatural character.

Based on the rejection of the realist epistemology, our study is not concerned with data validity. It is the credibility of the analysis that determines the value of a study. On the one hand, every detail of talk should be analyzed in-depth. For instance, para-verbal features have shown to be relevant for a better understanding of certain excerpts we looked at. Much more importantly, the researcher must be aware that his analysis is never exhaustive. This also applies to naturally occurring talk. Other researchers' analyses of the same data may lead to other observations. Discursive research accepts this fact as a nature of academic discourse itself. Therefore, a discursive analysis should never lead to conclusions that are claimed to be

exhaustive or even reproducible. It should purely rely on the observable data and remain within its boundaries, no matter if the source was a focus group discussion or naturally occurring talk (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Krueger 2009; Hammersley, 2003; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008; Stubbe et al., 2003; Wetherell, 2007).

The second challenge of studying stereotypes in talk is the concept of the stereotype itself. It is important to understand the different aspects of the phenomenon, but the vast amount of definitions is problematic for a discursive study. Especially the definition given by the Social Identity Theory bares the risk of prematurely being transferred to an analysis of stereotype-patterns in talk. While the theory is interested in the social aspects of stereotyping, we have identified fundamental differences between the social psychological definition of the term 'social' and group conversations as social settings. Our approach was the separation of stereotypes and discursive conceptualizations of cultures, and there are certainly other possible solutions.

Nevertheless, we want to give a recommendation for the study of social psychological topics in discourse. The relation between phenomena reaching beyond the discursive situation and their manifestation during talk is highly complex and varies in the degree of overlap. In the case of stereotypes, what we observe during a conversation may merely be a fraction of any individual mental representation. Discursive Psychology is interested in the study of social psychological phenomena in talk, but such a study must consider the complex relation between cognitions and discursive constructions. A direct transfer of definitions from one field to the other is very likely to create results that rather reflect self-fulfilling prophecies than a solid analysis of the data (Augoustinos & Walker, 1998; Bar-Tal et al., 1989; Gudykunst et al., 2003; Ladegaard, 2011a, 2011b; Leyens et al., 1994; McGarty et al., 2002; McKinlay & McVittey, 2008; Oakes et al. 1994; Petkova & Lehtonen, 2005).

REFERENCES

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances*. New York: Springer-Verlag Publishing
- Ali, L., & Sonn, C. C. (2010). Constructing identity as a second-generation Cypriot Turkish in Australia: The multi-hyphenated other. *Culture & Psychology*, 16(3), 416-436
- Augoustinos, M., & Walker, I. (1998). The construction of stereotypes within social psychology: From social cognition to ideology. *Theory & Psychology*, 8(5), 629-652
- Bailenson, Jeremy N. & Nick Yee. (2008). Psychology in Communication Processes. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Donsbach, Wolfgang (ed). Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.communicationencyclopedia.com/subscriber/tocnode.html?id=g9781405131995_chunk_g978140513199521_ss113-1
- Baker, C. A. (2012). Social Identity Theory and biblical interpretation. *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture*, 42(3), 129-138.
- Barr, S. C., & Neville, H. A. (2008). Examination of the link between parental racial socialization messages and racial ideology among black college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 131-155.

- Bar-Tal, D. (1996). Development of social categories and stereotypes in early childhood: The case of “The Arab” concept formation, stereotype and attitudes by Jewish children in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3–4), 341-370.
- Bar-Tal, D., Graumann, C., Kruglanski, A., Stroebe, W., (1989). *Stereotyping and prejudice : Changing conceptions*. New York: Springs.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1997). Formation and change of ethnic and national stereotypes: An integrative model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21(4), 491-523.
- Becker, J. C., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Consequences of the 2008 financial crisis for intergroup relations: The role of perceived threat and causal attributions. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 871-885.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings*. Yarmouth (Maine): Intercultural Press.
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking : A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (New ed. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(6), 745-778.
- Cargile, A. C., Bradac, J. J., & Cole, T. (2006). Theories of intergroup conflict: A report of lay attributions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 25(1), 47-63.

- Cochran, J. C., & Warren, P. Y. (2012). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in perceptions of the police: The salience of officer race within the context of racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 28(2), 206-227.
- Eagleman, A. M. (2011). Stereotypes of race and nationality: A qualitative analysis of sport magazine coverage of MLB players. *Journal of Sports Management*, 25, 156–168.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology* (Vol. 8). SAGE Publications Limited.
- Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (2001). Discursive Psychology. in: McHoul, A.W. and Rapley, M. (eds.) *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. London: Continuum, pp. 12 - 24.
- Edwards, D., & Stokoe, E. H. (2004). Discursive Psychology, focus group interviews and participants' categories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(4), 499-507.
- Eiser, J. R., & Stroebe, W. (1972). *Categorization and social judgement*. London: Academic Press.
- Fiske, S. T., & Macrae, C. N. (Eds.). (2012). *The SAGE handbook of social cognition*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2010). *Social cognition: From brains to culture* (International ed. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Fitch, K. L. et al. (2005). *Handbook of language and social interaction*. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Forgas, J. P. (1981). *Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding*. London: Academic Press.
- Harold Garfinkel (2002). *Ethnomethodology's Program*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gollwitzer, M. (2004). Do normative transgressions affect punitive judgments? An empirical test of the psychoanalytic scapegoat hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1650-1660
- Greenbaum, T. L. (2000). *Moderating focus groups : A practical guide for group facilitation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gubrium, J. F. (2012). *The sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (2. ed. ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Abrams, J., Andersen, P. A., Barnett, G. A., Chen, L., Choi, J., . . . Ting-Toomey, S. (cop. 2003). *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hamilton, D. L., & Rose, T. L. (1980). Illusory correlation and the maintenance of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(5), 832-845.

- Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: Methods or paradigms? *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 751-781.
- Hatoss, A. (2012). Where are you from? Identity construction and experiences of 'othering' in the narratives of Sudanese refugee-background Australians. *Discourse & Society*, 23(1), 47-68.
- Hogg, M. A. (2003). *Social psychology. vol. 1, social cognition and social perception*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hogg, M. A., Abrams, D., Otten, S., & Hinkle, S. (2004). The social identity perspective: Intergroup relations, self-conception, and small groups. *Small Group Research*, 35(3), 246-276.
- Jenks, Christopher Joseph (2011). *Transcribing talk and Interaction : Issues in the representation of communication data*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kawai, Y. (2009). Neoliberalism, nationalism, and intercultural communication: A critical analysis of a Japan's neoliberal nationalism discourse under globalization. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 2(1), 16-43.
- Kobayashi, Y. (2011). Global Englishes and the discourse on Japaneseness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 32(1), 1-14.
- Krueger, R. A. (1988). *Focus groups : A practical guide for applied research*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage.

- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M.A. (2009). *Focus groups : A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz, B., & Ross, A. (2004). *Social learning, inclusiveness and exclusiveness in Europe*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2011a). Stereotypes and the discursive accomplishment of inter-group differentiation: Talking about 'the other' in a global business organization. *Pragmatics*, 21(1), 85-109.
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2011b). Stereotypes in the making: Prejudice and cultural generalizations in Hong Kong students' discourse. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 21(1), 133-158.
- Lasorsa, Dominic. (2008) Stereotypes. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Donsbach, Wolfgang (ed). Blackwell Publishing, 2008. Retrieved from http://www.communicationencyclopedia.com/subscriber/tocnode.html?id=g9781405131995_chunk_g978140513199524_ss106-1
- Leyens, J., Yzerbyt, V. and Schadron, G. (1994). *Stereotypes and social cognition*. London: Sage.
- Malhi, R. L., Boon, S. D., & Rogers, T. B. (2009). `Being Canadian' and `Being Indian': Subject positions and discourses used in south Asian-Canadian women's talk about ethnic identity. *Culture & Psychology*, 15(2), 255-283.

- Martínez Guillem, S. (2011). European identity: Across which lines? Defining Europe through public discourses on the Roma. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 4(1), 23-41.
- McGarty, C., Yzerbyt, V. and Spears, R. (2002). *Stereotypes as explanations : The formation of meaningful beliefs about social groups*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- McKinlay, A., McVittie, C. (2008). *Social psychology and discourse*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Pub.
- Merino, M., & Tileagă, C. (2011). The construction of ethnic minority identity: A discursive psychological approach to ethnic self-definition in action. *Discourse & Society*, 22(1), 86-101.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage.
- Nijstad, B. A. (2009). *Group performance*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A. and Turner, J. C. (1994). *Stereotyping and social reality*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pennington, D. C. (2000). *Social cognition*. London: Routledge.
- Petkova, D, & Lehtonen, J. (2005). *Cultural Identity in an Intercultural Context*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä

- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2003). Discursive Psychology: Between method and paradigm. *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 783-794.
- Potter, J. (2012). Discourse analysis and Discursive Psychology. In Cooper, H. (Editor-in-Chief). *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Vol. 2. Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 111-130). Washington: American Psychological Association Press.
- Prothro, E., & Melikian, L. (1955). Studies in stereotypes: V. Familiarity and the kernel of truth hypothesis. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 3-10.
- Puchta, C., Potter, J. (2004). *Focus group practice*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.
- Rokeach, M. (1970). *Beliefs, attitudes and values : A theory of organization and change* (3rd pr. ed.). San Francisco (Calif.): Jossey-Bass.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*. 50 (4), 696–735.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de ([1916] 1983). *Course in General Linguistics* (trans. Roy Harris). London: Duckworth

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Wood, B. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The robbers cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Book exchange.

Silverman, D. (2011a). *Qualitative research: Issues of theory, method and practice* (3. ed. ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Silverman, D. (2011b). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction* (3rd ed. ed.). London: SAGE.

Spreckels, J., Kotthoff, H. (2009). Communicating identity in intercultural communication. In H. Kotthoff, & H. Spencer-Oatey (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 415-435). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stereotype, n. and adj. (n.d.). in *OED Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189956?isAdvanced=false&result=1&rskey=8z9gpm&>

Stubbe, Lane, Hilder, Vine, Vine, Marra, Holmes, Weatherall (2003). Multiple discourse analyses of a workplace interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(3), 351-388.

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations* (1. paperback print. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole .

Turner, J. C., & Hogg, M. A. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group : A Self-categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tusting, K., Crawshaw, R., & Callen, B. (2002). 'I know, 'cos I was there': How residence abroad students use personal experience to legitimate cultural generalizations. *Discourse & Society*, 13(5), 651-672.

Verkuyl, H. J.,. (1998). *Stereotyping, prototyping and figurative use: Towards a proper semantic analysis*. Utrecht: Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS, Utrecht Univ.

Wetherell, M. (1996). *Identities, groups and social issues*. London: Sage.

Wetherell, M. (2007). A step too far: Discursive Psychology, linguistic ethnography and questions of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 661-681.

Yu, T. (2006). Challenging the politics of the "Model minority" stereotype: A case for educational equality. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 39(4), 325-333.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTS OF THE DATA

GROUP 1

MOD: I will uhm as a starter I will I would like to if you think about your your uh impression of the of the Germans and uhm if you uh think about your well your perspective and your impression that you could uh I would ask you to take your time to write like 3 to 5 adjectives or nouns that spontaneously come to your mind

NI: about Germans

MOD: yes

NI: . and German culture Or [whatever (inaudible)]

MOD: [Yes, what ever I am not whatever you come up with

NI: Yeah ok ok

MOD: and we also going to play this game with some other

NI: Adjectives like

MOD: I am not going to put any restrictions on this

NI: ok, just words

MOD: also for example if you have something on your mind but you do not know it in in English you can talk about it in Finnish and then you may find a way to explain or something

NI: My mind is like empty (1,2) It's mostly like food that comes into mind can i write food

MOD: yeah

HAN: are you thinking Lidl there (laughs)

NI: no actually no i was thinking of Bratwurst and Beer (laughs) so

MOD: why Lidl

MOD: why do you why do you come up with Lidl right away

HAN: because Lidl is advertised here in Finland quite radically nowadays

MOD: and

NI: and is quite popular

HAN: it's quite popular

MOD: Ok but Lidl is Lidl

HAN: yes but it has been seen that it represent a certain view of Germany (inaudible)

NI: yeah (inaudible)

NI: yeeah and one of the , one of the most uh well not the nicest nicknames for Lidl is Natsimarket

HAN: (laughs) yes I have heard that

ME : yes I have heard that before

NI: yeah I know some people call it Natzimarket so ah uhm so interesting

ALL: (laughter)

MOD: aaaah

HAN: Really interesting

NI: uhm but Lidl has got many many nicknames (laughs)

MOD: Ok yes so uh Lidl in somehow also is connotated with Germany

NI: yessss very much.

MOD: Ok, because I I actually thought that it is from an other country

NI: no, no.

MOD: damn me

ALL: (laughter)

HAN: you didn't know that Lidl is from Germany

MOD: In All i know about Lidl is it is cheap ass food

ALL: (laughter)

NI: it's like for us it's a German supermarket

HAN: Yeah

NI: Yeah

HAN: It is

MOD: and when you think about this that the people say "Nazimarket" how do you think that they mean that actually?

NI: as a joke, as a joke

HAN: Definitely as a joke

MOD: so you think that uh (.) when Finnish people use this for example for Lidl this Natzi-conotation is it somehow ironic or

NI: is ironic like because Finns like to call Swedes as gay they are gaaay but no one really thinks

HAN: uhhuh

NI: that all the Swedish people are gay it's like a joke. So that kind of a same thing the

HAN: how would they

LA: something that's connected to to Germans

NI: yeah we Finns we Finns we have a very weird sense of humor

HAN: Yeah

NI: very dark weird (general laughter) sense of humor

MOD: What do you mean, dark sense?

NI: Like very like dry dark sometimes that it's like well like calling the Lidl like Nazimarket, that kind of dark humor. It's not funny, it's not funny calling someone a Nazi but like not (0.5) not really

MOD: But we have

NI: but like in a way it is. (laughs)

MOD: I would (inaudible) Yeah

MOD: that's that's quite interesting, I didn't know about that. Do you have some other example of this kind of humor maybe with some other (.) it doesn't have to be Germany it could be whatever I find it intriguing because I didn't know it. But maybe some other example of this - Russia for example

NI: like jokes?

MOD: yes

HA: Now when you ask it is quite difficult

NI : these just come into ones mind sometimes. (Laughter)

MOD: Yes I mean- people don't run around throwing this out all the time but .this with Lidl - is quite common to connect Germany and Lidl?

NI: yes everyone knows it is German hear (.) it's German (laughter)

HA: yes advertising is as I said before is very radical they are like saying "I am not buying anything from this German shop"

NI: Yeah, they go like:" it is cheap food it cant be good, it cant be good"

HA: yeah it's all from Germany (.) and Lidl goes to this family and says „why are you so upset about this food store because you are driving German car anyway (Laughter)

ME: you like German cars

HA: yes (laughs)

MOD: but on the other hand quite many people also go and by at Lidl

LA: because it is cheap

MOD: yes exactly - but you can see sometimes on the one hand you come up with some things when you think about Germans and some other things when you hear Germany. - We can come back to this later but that's already quite good, but we can do it like this (.) someone

who can start saying one that he considers really in his opinion very German some some that yeah?

ME: punctual definitely (1,5) [Do you want me to explain

MOD: [What do the other

NI: yeah, that is a stereotype [that Germans are always on time

HA: [yeah

RI: Yeah

NI: Always on time

HA: but [there are always exceptions for the rule.

RI: [at least they are

NI: Yes

HA: Having uh

MOD: that's very modest of you

HA: yeah yeah I've been I've been there studying and working for some time and yeah there are people that aren't that punctual and are still Germans it is the same with Finns

UNCLEAR: yeah

HA: somebody would think that we are also punctual

RI: that is like we aren't speaking anything

HA: yes precisely,

RI: yeah, just people who are (laughs) speaking

HA: that's that's a very common stereotype what I get yeah

NI: Yeah

HA: Why are you talking so much, you are a Finn

RI;NI: Yeah

NI: Like my because I am an international tutor at the moment and my tutorees and my adopted tutorees they call me the crazy Finn because I'm a bit I'm not I'm very atypical fin very like I'm not like at all a typical fin so it's (laughs) there comes in the crazy Fin.

MOD: What do they mean by that?

NI: I'm like so energetic and [uh talkative and so social sociable like and I'm yeah I'm just very

ALL: [(inaudible)

NI: Like very atypical Fin (laughs)

HA: The same happened for me in Germany as I was in Bonn [NI: mhh] they called me [NI: yeah] yeah the crazy uh uh Finnish heavy metal man (laughs) I was like flattered by that

NI: Yeah, Yeah I was very flattered be that when they call me like crazy Fin that's [HA: Ye]
like an honor

ALL: (laughter)

HA: We have been noticed

NI: Yeah [ALL: (laughter)]

MOD: So uh you think when when people say they that your are not a typical Fin [NI: mh]
that's actually for you flattering.

NI: Yeah [yes

HA : [Yes somehow

NI: Somehow (laughs) [somehow

HA: [We we had want to

NI: Because the stereotype of Finns it's not very flattering [like

HA: [That's true

NI: Finns don't talk Finns are violent Finns drink a lot

RI: Yeah

NI: Who wants to be like that

ALL: Yeah

NI: (laughs) No one

LA: but I think and I hope that it is actually starting to change a bit. That our generation is
chancing it and we are more social

RI : but it is maybe a little bit still that we like are not unsocial but we like (.) are not like
"häwäwä" like coming on each other

NI: I'm just like that that's why they call me crazy

ME: we listen to each other and

LA: and we like our privacy a lot

Others: yeah

NI: I guess that Germans also like their privacy a lot because one of my German teachers
called me that I'm very German (laughter) and I said ok, maybe I am (laughter)

MOD: he said you that you were very German when he was

NI: I was talking about face book privacy that I like to keep things private on fb so that is
when he called me very German

MOD: interesting

RI: mikä on järjestelmällinen

HA and others: organized

RI: I don't know about punctual but organized (.) so what I have experienced I think that Germans are usually very organized

HA: that is (.) I second you in that

NI: Yes but i think that punctual and organized they are kind of the same thing

HA: you have to have a system for everything. Like I was working on Sylt, it is an island there and I was selling fish at a bistro and everything was just by the clock, you could tell that at 8:30 these and these things are already done till that and like that and it went like a train but it was also less stressful because you knew what you had to do.

LA: I also worked during one summer in Germany but I didn't experience that at all I think that is was a very laid back work place and people didn't follow the clock so strictly

RI: I don't think they are always in time or anything like in time you should be in the lessons that every one is there in time but for example we were travelling in Australia last year and we came this year back in march and there was all the Germans or a little bit older Germans and also younger as well and they were always like "now I have been one month travelling here and this day I want to go there and then I'll go there" and they are showing on the map, also the older ones showing on the map like "then I will be there on the 19th of this month" and everything is already organized, and we „OK“ we don't know where we'll go

HA: My wife and I were in Norway this summer and there were many Germans and I tend to go and speak with the Germans when i hear the language and speak

NI: in German?

HA: yes in German, and they were like also speaking a lot about their schedules, what they were planning to do and planning to see. But they were also layed back guys [imitating the voices] „Yes we will look up if we can do it today then maybe“ (.) they didn't have that tight schedules

MOD : but still they very scheduled somehow. You have also said maybe not so punctual but organized from your experience. Could you share some experience to samplify this „organized“ thing?

RI: Yes that for example what I told from Australia

MOD: Yeah, of course

RI: but yeah, I have been to school or I went to the High school in Germany for one year when I did the exchange for example and yeah it wasn't always that every one was in time or anything but yeah my friends i had some German friends as well when i was in Australia and they usually have a plan and are organized, whereas we were only travelling like should

we go there or should we go there, they always have a plan

HA: precisely

NI: I don't know but one thing that comes to my mind about German culture and being German is that my dad (.) even if he is not German (.)but he admires many, many German things (laughter). He admires the German way of playing football, he admires the German way of being punctual and organized and he loves German cars and he loves many German things and he is always on time and quite organized but my dad is a very German Fin and that actually it makes me think oh my God my mom is calling me anyway it makes me think that one of my best friends is a German girl who is coming to visit me in two weeks but I like think that Finns and Germans quite similar in many ways we get along really well (.) it's easy to get along with German people, at least I think so

HA: yeah .

ME: Yeah I also have this experience because uhm one u:h great experience which I had was when I was in Slovakia studying for 3 weeks and there were people coming coming from all over the world from Korea and New Zealand and where ever (.) and the:: people that the Finns got th uh the best along were the Germans and the Austrians [HA, NI: mhh yeah] and that's [MOD: O:h] (1.2) that's how I still

MOD: oh, I really wonder why that might be in particular because the countries are not exactly very close to each other I mean not far either but it is very interesting to think that exactly the Finnish people and the German people get so well along with each other, like why might it be:?

HA: We have long history (.) also (.) [couple of wars and something like that but another thing]

ALL: [(laughter)

]

MOD: The Germans came punctual to the war

ALL: (laughter)

HA: Yeh uh yeh but I I have to second uh with this story about that we relate with the Germans very easily I was u:hm studying in Bonn (.) uh and there was uh only one guy in my dormitory with over 40 (.) 40 students that was (1.0) whole German the others were international students and he was like yeah yeah (.) u::::h he (1.3) thought that yeah I as a Fin u::::hm I am very European and we have more in common than those [NI: Mh] who came from u::::hm China or [MOD: uh hu:h] Japan or something. I I felt at home ↑oka:y yeah I have this German friend who showed me everything where you can buy cheap food and

[MOD: Okay]what a student would like to have.

MOD : So he actually said that you both as as good Europeans [HA: Yeah] get along if you compare it with people from

HA: Yeah yeah because (.) uh we found found tha:t yeah for instance we were shocked about these 2 Japanese girls at our dormitory who always left uh uh egg u::h [NI: Shells] shells in the sink it was [ALL: (laughter)] a:::h disgusting like we were talking about [NI: Yeah] that a lot. [NI: Yea:h]And of course (.) uh the German guy then said to these girls yeh you should stop with ↑that

ALL: (laughter)

RI: Yeah our cultures are quite near to uh to each other

NI: Yeah the habits like the what we (.) do::: [like the everyday life and yeah rules]

HA: [And ru:::les some rules] have to be

ALL: (Laughter) yeah

ME: And one thing what we definitely share there is he same taste in music.

ALL: Yeah. Yeah.

ME: because Finnish bands do really well in Germany like Nightwish the Germans love our music (.) it's great

HA: Sunrise Avenue

ALL: Yeah (laughter)

HA: that thing I don't really understand

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD: the only fin iIknow is „freestyler“ from the Bomfunk MC's

ALL: (Laughter) oh yeah

NI: but that is quite old already

MOD: I was also young sometimes

ALL: (Laughter)

NI: oh you were (Laughs)

MOD: we Germans we come out of eggs already fully evolved

ALL: (Laughter)

NI: one oft he things is that Finns used to study German a lot more like back in the days like couple o decades ago it was quite popular to study German (.) it is quite popular even now a days but it used to be more popular like decades ago half of the generation studied German half English now it is more English

HA: true, I think that there is a very strong stereotype that if you learn German you will have very many possibilities like in your working life.

ALL: yeah

HA: for instance if you are studying for engineer or something I was thinking first that I could become an it engineer or something and I started with the language but I liked it that lot that I continued to study only the language.

MOD: Then the people learn the language and go to Germany for engineering or

HA: Both there are many big companies from Germany like car manufacturers and electronic companies that also have Finnish staff.

ME: It is somehow considered the language of economy and engineering and if you know German you'll do really well

HA: well put

ALL: (Laughter)

NI: Yes that is what we Finns tend to think

HA: Yeah. It's that somehow you think you are such a fool if you .

LA: Businessman with a suit and stuff

HA: yes with German but I'm not sure if it is true.

LA : But what I have experienced while being in Germany that while I have tried to speak the language my German is not that good but I have tried to speak it Germans usually tend to switch to English because they want to speak that [ALL: Yeah] which I don't get at all (.) because I was very eager to learn the language but they were like "no, lets talk English"

NI: You should just say: NO, you do

ALL: Yes

HA: I have noticed that but I am very persistent, I know that I can speak that well German that they cannot possibly ask for more. (Laughter) So I tend to use that and you should as well

ALL: (Laughter)

LA: ok

RI: It does not matter what they speak

NI: Just deploy in German

ALL: (Laughter)

HA: Yes that is just what I did, it works.

ALL: (Laughter)

LA : OK. I will the next time

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD: I really didn't think that, why would they

HA: But it is similar, I have heard that French people do the same; they want to have a certain level or something. I don't know why that is but maybe it is also they using English language, they think that

ALL: yeah

NI: they want to use English while we would like to use German

HA: Yeah

MOD: So, also the French prefer to talk in French, or

ALL: Yeah

ME: I have a feeling about the French that they actually prefer French over English

MOD: because they like their language so much

ME: perhaps

LA: nowadays maybe I haven't been in France for a few years

NI: I felt like last year I was in France and I didn't feel comfortable at all because I just don't speak French at all like I couldn't (.) I felt I cannot say a thing here (.) I was like Oh my God I cannot say anything. I got very nervous there, I like

RI: French people are funny, also in Australia they are always in groups and they just speak French together. But then we also met some people that were like "oh I want to be like a different Frenchman or (Laughs) and I want to learn English and I am not doing anything with that

HA: I think yeah that is true, some mate groups like Spanish people do that as well I would say but Germans tend to seek out situations where they can use and better their English for example

ALL: Yeah

HA: That is the real reason why they would like to speak English instead of German.

LA: Hmm, when you are a foreigner in Germany they are really interested in you.

HA: And I noticed also (.) my friend is a Swedish speaking Fin (.) and we used to speak German because we both know German (.) instead of speaking Finnish or Swedish.

ALL: (Laughter)

HA: we both could speak so good Finnish and Swedish that we could do it (.) either language (.) but yeah it felt neutral somehow.

ALL: (Laughter)

ME: You didn't have to decide which one is the stronger one (Laughter)

HA: Nowadays we speak Swedish with each other (.) but in the beginning only German

MOD: Ok, yeah, maybe something else maybe, that someone has written down, some

ME : Well I have written hard working this is not based on my experience because I haven't worked with a German [HA: Ah] but this is based on my dad's u::h experience who lives in ↑Sweden and u::h works a lot with people from Norway:: Germany:: Denma::rk and uh he always says that it's very nice to work with the German people (.) compared to for example (.) ↑Gree::k people because they have the same kind of work ethics like Swedes and Finns.

LA: I have also heard that. My stepfather works a lot with German people as well and he likes to work with them .

Hanna: I have heard they do like longer days as well .

HA: Yeah, at the bistro I noticed they are just crazy those people. (.) At least in (.) this is also a very special field because in these restaurants they are doing longer days also here in Finland but it was greasy, 13 (.) 14 hours a day, those who were in charge, they came there to the workplace first and left last

ALL: Hmmmmmm

LA: And we have the Olkiluoto next to us [ALL: Uh huh] You know Olkiluoto

HA: Yes, the nuclear power plant

LA: Yes, we have so many Germans in Rauma I am from Rauma [Unclear: Ok] and we have many Germans there, I think they

NI: So, they work at the power plants?

LA: yes, there is a lot of Germans there and I think that like in Finland people respect them or something like that, that the Germans are hard working

UNCLEAR: Yes, yes

NI: Germans are very welcome in Finland. I think so.

HA: Yeah, yeah. And I have talked with many Germans, they want to come here instead of some polluted areas like Berlin could be a little bit more polluted in comparison with Jyväskylä for instance (.) if you think about the air or something (Laughter) Yes they like Nordic countries in general. I have met many Germans that very eagerly go to Norway or Sweden. And Finland is on that list too I think.

MOD: Who was it that said that her father preferred to work with Germans over Greek people for example? (Someone: she) Can you did he say something, did he tell why he preferred them in particular over the Greek for example?

ME: He feels that the Spanish, Italian an Greek people are lazier than [(Loud laughter)] (.) He just wanted to be honest, so [ALL: (Laughter) yeah, yeah]

MOD: Of course, but still it is somehow an interesting thing to see. Nowadays it seems you have this separation of the southern and northern countries now with very current affairs that we have at the moment. But can you imagine does this separation actually could it have something to do with the people and their attitude? For example if you look at the situation in Greece, or so? What might cause that you have this strong countries in the north and the crisis countries

ME: Well I don't know

HA: Maybe different kind of mentality. There are also some other things that are important in life than work and I think it is just on other view of life there.

ME: Yeah, one thing that must have an effect is that it is much warmer there. I mean if I lived in Italy or Greece I wouldn't want to work all the time

ALL: (Laughter)

HA: I agree with you (Laughter)

ME: I just want to sleep

NI: Yes, because heat makes more tired, at least heat makes me more tired.

HA: yeah, definitely. Try to run marathon

NI: If it is really hot, yeah (.) try to run marathon

MOD: Yes, now we can use radio silence for everyone to take a cookie (.) who wants.

Because of course you always try to take it very

HA: Yes I did. Laughs

MOD: the guy everybody hates in the cinema

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD: All that popcorn

MOD: Really friendly people. Ok that is nice

UNCLEAR: (Inaudible)

MOD: but I guess that everybody is friendly somehow

ME: No, I don't know, like most My experience was like one of my first experiences about meeting lots of German people was in Australia in 2007 and they were very unfriendly there, they were very rude actually. I know it was like "Oh my God, I don't like German people, they are horrible.

HA: Were they tourist or something?

ME: They were backpackers.

HA: ok, that is odd.

ME: I thought it was very odd. Like gosh, horrible, but I met lots of very nice German people

when I was in London and I was

MOD: Did you say tourist or terrorists

ME: Tourists, not like the backpackers that I met. I don't know they were just weird; maybe I just met some weird Germans, because later I have met some very nice German people. I haven't visited Germany so I cannot really say what it is like there

HA: I can relate to that, I had a very rude boss there at the island. He was only thinking about the money and loosing the money. You have to work very fast But I met one guy here in Jyväskylä in the Sauna and he is the nicest person I think [ALL: yeah] And he is also best friend of mine, so I am a little bit pious by that.

NI: Also one of my best friends is German

MOD: Would you consider those people that you have a special relation with, would you consider them typical Germans or (.) or not so, or don't know .

HA: There are some characteristics that are common, and it is all about this work concentrated or something. Or do you have some other perspective of life, there are also other things that are nice than work, not only getting new Audi or Porsche

MOD: but then actually how generally or not you might see at least the what we have the punctual or organized or hard working is something that we have somehow as an impression in our minds that seems to come up when you ask people more generally or spontaneously (.) we really not have to rush this (.) but any other things that someone maybe thinks that didn't come up yet.

ME: We Well this is (.) not my opinion but (laughs) usually people say that u::h the Germans are very humourless and they ha they [HA: Hyea] have bad sense of humour so ↑could someone like explain me ho why:: (.) why uh why that is?

RI: I don't think so, (Laughs)

ME: but why is it then usually seen so,

LA: I have never heard that

NI: I have heard that

HA: I have heard that

NI: Especially German people saying that people think that German people are very [Chatter]

RI: I think it is because people think they are organized and hard working that people think they are just like

HA: All work, no play

ALL: Yeah (Laughter)

ME: that they cannot laugh

NI: I don't know, Germans are also, like "come on", they enjoy their beer and football [HA: yeah] And like Finns also like their beer (.) but ice hockey instead of football I mostly.

MOD: Can you in any way imagine also with these things that you maybe say you cannot really relate with can you imagine where Finnish people get certain images of the Germans from? Maybe if you think for a moment about it can you imagine or have some example, some perspective where these images come from actually? I mean we are not born and have everything ready made there but

[LONG PAUSE]

HA: Hmmmm, we have some TV programs like

NI: From Germany,

HA: From Germany,

NI: like "Der Alte"

[Laughter]

HA: Ein Fall für Zwei [Loud laughter] and things like that.

NI: And the dog show "Kommissar Rex". Everyone loves that.

HA: Yeah. I think they give us a certain picture of typical German

MOD: Ok, also that they have no humour

NI: NO

HA: No, but there is no humour when people are murdered.

[Loud Laughter]

NI: And there is no humour in being punctual.

HA : Yeah

RI: and also the media like television what comes from Angela Merkel or something like that

ALL: (Loud Laughter) yeah

LA: I would also say that school textbooks might have something to do with it they have always these chapters about some stereotypes

HA: that is very strong propaganda because because it gathers all the Finns for instance

MOD: so, Finnish people do actually watch also German television series

ALL: (Laughter) yes yes

HA: I really love those. Nowadays when it is possible I watch many criminal series from Germany streamed over the Internet its great. (Laughs)

LA: I actually watch what is that comes the soup that is"

NI: Sturm der Liebe

ALL: (Loud Laughter)

LA: I'd better say that I don't watch it any more, but I used to.

NI: I used to watch it every day.

RI: me too (Laughs)

NI: that is like watching "the Bad and the Beautiful" embarrassing

[Loud Laughter]

HA: what about "Marienhof" They don't show it any more, but it is still going strong

[Loud Laughter, (Inaudible) comments]

MOD: OK

HA: Nice.

LA: So there is humour as well

HA: I think that is more laid back, Marienhof

NI: I just come up with Sturm der Liebe

HA: It is so ridicule, it's so weird

LA: It is not meant to be funny, but it is kind of funny.

[Loud Laughter]

MOD: Is there at any time in the Finnish media (.) do you think that from there comes any kind of that the people get a certain image or is it basically irrelevant?

HA: yeah, there

MOD: I mean I don't know what you watch frequently or what ever so

HA: As a male person I have to say that I was very amused by "kummeli" a Finnish comic series, shown in the nineteen's they had this kind of very dark humour about Germans marching on the street and singing something. And the same (.) little bit the same was with this "die Kühe" (.) it was "Studio julma hupi"

NI: Yes

HA: Sind sie A. P. Nikkola?

NI: oh yeah, I know that

ALL: Yeah, yeah

NI: they are like very serious

HA: Like Finnish comedians

NI: Finnish comedians like making fun of Germans of them being very serious.

HA: I think that could have .

NI: . But I don't know why. We don't really know why that is. Why do comedians make German people look very serious?

ME: Well history must have quite a lot to do with that. Because of the wars, [ALL: yeah, yeah] it also very heavily comes from there.

HA: I suppose so.

MOD: so this, if you think like, if you imagine for example what your grandparents thought about Germans it might be somehow different (.) maybe, or

[LONGER PAUSE]

HA: yeah

MOD: Because it still comes from there it seems as it still be carried on in a certain way or maybe you just cannot throw it of in one second. And maybe it is changing, someone had said that maybe also the view of the Finns is changing somehow

HA: yeah, definitely.

MOD: Ok, if there is something else on the list we can also still come back to that. If you now think very generally (.) you have already said a few points (.) but what you think do people from outside think about the Finnish people quite generally. What have you experienced there?

[Pause]

RI: that we are very good in the (.) like studying, we are very clever and

MOD: Clever?

RI: like clever (.) or what is intelligent

HA: they are supposing this because of the Pisa studies(.) that's always in Germany high on course. Imitates: "You come from Finland, you have Pisa" (light laughter)

ME: which is nice to hear (.) because I used to work at the institute.

Laughter, yeah

LA: One thing that comes into my mind is that when I was in London, these Greek girls (.) what they thought of as being a Fin (.) they thought that I cannot tolerate heat. When I told that (.) ok it can be like plus 30 degrees in Finland during the summertime, they were like "wau, iih". And it can be minus 30 in wintertime. That was very difficult for them to realize (.) what does it really mean when it is really that cold. That was quite difficult for them to understand that I can and everyone can take the heat and the cold as that is. I was trying to tell them, oh come on; it is not like our body is different from yours. Laughs

HA: And that is why we have very good quality clouds.

LA: So, that is always one thing what I always run into when I meet foreigners is that Finns cannot take the heat. They somehow really think that our bodies are somehow different, that we cannot handle it. [laughter] (.) They really think so, the Greek girls did (.)yeah they really

think that it is really cold here and there is really no summer ever

ME: They think, how can you live in the houses and then I say that we have things like central heating,

LA: yeah, yeah, (UNCLEAR) laugh

HA: I once visited USA and I was appalled by that they were asking do you have polar bears the walking there down the street and

NI: That might be because .

HA: do you have igloos or something

ALL: (Laughter)

HA: Yeah, we are not like Greenland or anything.

NI: But you know, some Finns like to make jokes about that. When we go abroad we like to say, ok on my backyard I have polar bears [HA: (Laughs)] we do that. We make jokes and we make foreigners believe that we have those things.

ALL: (Laughter)

RI: I have done that as well in front of the class room first I told about going to school with the reindeer [(Laughter)] everybody was like hääh, and it was in Germany [(Laughter)] And then I told them that we don't have shower [(Laughter)] that we go to the see and we are bathing in the see. They were like "what" [(Laughter)]. Even the teacher was she was watching like what.

ALL: (Laughter)

NI: Yeah, I think that tells about our sense of humour, because we like to, yeah I don't know, but

RI: I told them later that it is not like that (.) but one girl somehow mist that it wasn't like that, that it wasn't true. And she said later: "you really don't have showers [(Laughter)] others were like: "No, they have."

LA: And people are usually very interested in our language because they don't know it and many people have come to me like "what is that language you speak, I have been listening to you for long time and I haven't any idea what language you are talking". It is interesting.

RI: yes that's funny. [(Laughter)] everywhere I go

ME: And also the silence::: (.) factor uh Finns are considered very silent and uh unsociable people which is (.) ↑ probably also partly true because it's OK for us to be quiet [every now and then and it's

NI: [Ye::a::h

HA: Yes and another thing is we have invented these kinds of very handy devices like mobile

phones [(Laughter)] that we can stay in our own room and call the people if you want (.) or even better, we can send sms.

MOD: Ok, now what we can quickly do (.) this is going to be even a bit easier I think you have already partially done it. If you (.) now you can write it down, or you just think about it what spontaneously comes to your mind when you just hear Germany, because this might be something different. Just 2 or 3 things, it will be pretty easy I think.

MOD: Yes if you hear Germany what comes spontaneously to your mind. (.) Also you don't have to press it out, as I said this is not about testing how .

NI: I have so many things here, I could write like an essay (.) I don't know why

[PAUSE]

UNCLEAR : I'm done

HA: Me to.

NI: I could write more.

MOD: Someone throw something in spontaneously

NI: The first thing that comes to my mind is the flag. I can see the flag when someone mentions Germany, the colour that is the first thing.

MOD: that is maybe not even so uncommon when you hear the name of a country

NI: I see the flag. (.)

MOD: If it is not some Kuala Lumpur .

NI: I also see the like the, what is it called (.) are those eagles or what? Is it one eagle or two headed eagle or two eagles? Anyway also that goes like Finland has the lion and that thing that sometimes goes on the flag. I do not know if it is that one. Maybe because I am interested in sports (.) so I follow I can see the flag

MOD: something .

ME: one word: Lederhosen. [loud laughter]

NI: Why I did not think of that.

MOD: Thank you

ME: and then Oktoberfest and Dirndl and that stuff (laughs)

RI: Bier yeah

NI: I have got also Football here (.) my dad admires German football. Football that really comes to my mind when I think about Germany.

OL: Hmmmmm (.) I can relate with all of those (.) but I do not know, for some reason I have Volkswagen and great minds: Einstein, Goethe, Marx (ALL: oh yeah) (.) And then I have renewable energy.

NI: Yeah, yeah, that also, yes.

MOD: aha, why did you come up with renewable energy?

UNCLEAR: yeah, why

HA: I have read and I am admiring what they have done in Germany of Green Tech and I really hope that they come up with solutions that can save our planet. I'm relying on Germans on this.

NI: German engineering .

MOD: Do you think that all the people are kind of participating in this somehow (.) or how would the German people do this

HA: I think it is all about making things efficient and they are organizing, scheduling and making efficient that comes very nicely with renewables

MOD: And Volkswagen of course is the same thing as you already mentioned as with Finland and Nokia. (HA: yes.) Somehow you have our Nazimarket

ALL: (Laughing)

HA: So you heard some new things today. (Laughs)

MOD: Yes it spontaneously comes up and the most intriguing thing that you always have this perfect combo of Dirndel , Lederhose, Bier. And what else comes up

NI: Sausages Bratwurst (.) German sausages. (Laughter)

MOD: Bratwurst and .

LA: Currywurst (laughter)

RI: I also think about Lufthansa (ALL: yes)

ME: My favourite airline

HA: Yes and Rammstein of course (.) that was one of the reasons why I wanted to learn German more (.) because I wanted to understand what are these guys shouting. (Laughter) (.)

HA imitates: "Weiter, weiter, wir müssen leben (Lauhter)

LA: It's kind of easy to understand

MOD: Yes they have this interesting pronunciation.

HA: Yes, it is from the Third Reich I know but they are not Nazis they cannot be, they come from East Germany originally an I think they hate any kind of dictatorship so (.) [I don't really

RI: [Well there is one word what comes to the mind also from Germany like there was all the nice things but then also the Na:: [Nazis] it's [always

HA: [Yeah]

NI: [Course well I don't know do anyone of us say Nazis as one of the first things that come to our minds (.) none none of us thought of that I was I thought [that

((Inaudible))

RI: [Because we were talking like about so nice things [and so]

(laughs)

HA: [Yeah]

NI: Well ma maybe that's because we all like German people

ALL: (laughter)

HA: Yes but to be honest, we were also on the Nazi side in the beginning of the war I would say we don't have anything to say about these things.

ALL: Yeah.

HA: But. But I find it very disturbing that many Germans still have to feel sorry for themselves [UNCLEAR: Yeah, yeah] (.) That is (.) it happened 70 years ago and they don't have anything to do with it but still have this stigma. [UNCLEAR: yes Yes.] (.) I had one lecturer in Germany who told us one hour lecture about that how sorry he feels about what happened during the Second World War

NI: I don't think that's right, I think that it is really horrible that German people have to feel sorry about it all the time. They are, they have nothing to do with it. People live nowadays; they have nothing to do with it (.) why would they have to feel sorry for it

ME: For example I watched this documentary about the offsprings of the Nazi leaders (.) I do not remember

HA: I saw this one

ME: yes it was really good. I do not remember who they were but they said that they, she and her brother, they didn't want to have any children with anyone because they didn't want to continue the family

UNCLEAR: What. Oh no, that is bad.

RI: awful.

LA: My German friends tell me that while they were in England some people would actually throw stones at them for being Germans.

UNCLEAR: What

LA: Yes, they told me that.

UNCLEAR: Aaahhh.

NI: what the hell

ME: I think in Finland it is funny, we don't have any grudge against Germans where as against Russians. [UNCLEAR: Yeah] People seem to have everything against them.

UNCLEAR: Yeah

NI: Finns don't like Russians in general.

MOD: What do they think then about the Russians for example?

HA: Unreliable, because you cannot tell if they will attack you again (.) or something (.) That is what we are brought up with. You cannot trust with those

LA: Yes (.) and even they are very close to us they still feel like very distant

NI: Because they attacked us

RI: Yes and I also think the people of Russia have very different mentality So I just talked before with Russian language students and they had been to Russia just like couple of years ago and last year and they said yes it is really hard to make friends with Russian people.

NI: Really?? (.) Well I have never been there but I have got a very good friend of mine who studied in Saint Petersburg and he made very good friends there. (.) But they do not speak English very well, so you have to speak Russian to make Russian friends.

HA: But that is also a very interesting point, why are we not interested in Russia? So many Finnish companies are complaining all the time that we need to have Russian speaking staff (.) and so one. But they can not hire people because nobody wants to learn it. And the even cut here some funding of the Russian language because there were not enough students.

NI: Maybe that is because it would have kind a (.) like we kind of lost the war but we would have lost it like (.) I don't know (.) how could I say (.) can it be that we fear that they would have made us speak Russian and we wouldn't be allowed to speak Finnish. (.) So maybe that is why people don't want to learn Russian because they could have made us speak Russian. (.) I do not know (.) because (.) yeah, I think about that like .

MOD: There is also the thing with Swedish

ME: We do not want to or we wanted un compulsory

NI:) Yes we wanted to have the option to learn it if we wan (.) like, yes we don't want it to be compulsory.

MOD: Okay, then it would be interesting to know what your impression is or what comes to your mind when you think about Swedish people. (.)Of course it is a bit closer than

NI: I don't know, they are fine

LA: They are so happy

HA: yes

NI: I always think that they are like a version of us.

UNCLEAR: (LAUGHS)

LA: The Swedes are the Big Brother

Laughter,

HA: yeah. I ones even heard this saying that Finns are the better Germans meaning that we are doing better work and things like that when Nokia was booming, but I do not know nowadays, but yeah I think we have this little minority complex towards Sweden. Always when they pass a law we do the same 10 years behind.

UNCLEAR: Yeah (laughter)

RI: And my friend told that “yeah you can always see when you go to Stockholm you can see what mode is coming to mode in Finland in two years time or something. [HA laughs] If they have some clothes (.) we will have them in two years.

MOD: So that Swedish people are ahead of the Finns, or

HA: What comes to fashion like Lindex or

NI: Or Ikea, don't forget Ikea .

HA: Yes they always do better in Eurovision than we.

NI: And ice hockey, ice hockey. I am not a huge ice hockey fan but most Finns watch Ice hockey when Sweden plays against Finland That is a serious thing

[Laughter]

NI: A serious thing.

HA: That is a very special thing. And another thing that I have read somewhere is that there isn't that kind of track and field competitions like one country against an other country. But we have Fincampen (.) it is something very unique on this planet. We are competing in all the Track and Field sports every year, either in Finland or in Sweden. And we are like We are there we have to win

NI: And we always loose

HA: Yeah, nowadays even with men. Yeah, because we have so good javelin Throwers that we have won in the last years but nowadays it doesn't work any more.

UNCLEAR: (laughs)

MOD: It sounds almost that you have an old conflict continued in sports.

ALL: laugh and yeah .

HA: I think it is a very healthy way we should have something similar with Russians.

NI: Well Finns like Swedes more than Russians.

UNCLEAR: Yeah, that is how it goes.

HA: They are not forcing a thread.

UNCLEAR: Yeah, laughter.

NI: Well how many wars have the Swedes won? That is a joke. And how many Royals have they.

Loud laughter.

LA: Yes how many Finns love the Royals (.) whereas Putin (.) oh my Good.

HA: Yeah, almost a dictator

LA: Taming tigers.

NI: Yes and riding bears.

HA: And what about the gay and lesbian rights and things like that.

NI: Yeah . (Laughs)

UNCLEAR: (laughs)

MOD: Okay I think that this game with adjectives and nouns was so much fun that we are going to play it again. (Laughter) I thought we are now totally going to leave this German field for a moment and try the same thing (.) I can also participate [HA: Mh] try the same thing wi:::th (1.2) Americans

NI: O:::h (laughs)

HA: A:::h

LA: Oh no

NI: Oh this will be [interesting

RI: [((Inaudible)) this will be bad

ME: Now I'm so [((Inaudible))

MOD: [I would be happy about uh well adjectives and nouns yeah but also what ever else comes into your mind

LA: About Americans or the country?

NI: We can try to speak as American as we can.

[LAUGHTER]

Penns scratching paper

HA: Huuuh

UNCLEAR: Oh my Good.

[PAUSE]

MOD: Yes, obviously it does not take much time .

MOD: This will be the last one. It has been going very well so I am not going to tie you to the table.

HA: Hmmm (.) I am lacking a word .

MOD: You can say it in Finnish

HA: tekopyhä

ALL: Hypocrite (.)

MOD: What was that again exactly?

ME: How would you explain it?

NI: Like you say one thing but you think another thing

ME: insincere in a way

HA: Yeah

MOD: OK

ME: I'm a horrible person, the first thing tha (laughs) I wrote was fat and stupid.

NI: O:::::h (laughs)

All: (Loud laughter)

§ HA: Yeah but I think it's (.) the Fin[nish way we we ↑say how the things ↑are↓]

NI: [But yeah (3.0)] we

say how the things are (1.5) like the German people

LA: [Yeah let's be honest (laughs)]

HA: [Yeah yeah]

MOD: You say how the things are. (Laughter)

NI: You know what I got here. I got Mc Donald's.

RI: Me too. (Laughs)

NI: And Patriotism.

UNCLEAR: Yeah

MOD: Does everybody have patriotism?

HA: Not really

RI: I have got it.

ME: Yeah

MOD: I also have patriotic

NI: but not Mc. Donald's (.) like fat

MOD: It goes along with that

ME: Mexicans are here. They are the new fattest country in the world

UNCLEAR: (Laughter) yeah.

MOD: Ok, what else?

NI: Accent, because the American accent (.) they have more than one accent (.) but I do not like the American accent. So accent is the first thing on my list.

LA: I have the fla:g

NI: Yeah the flag [LA: Yeah] I always think of the flag when I hear a country (.) like always the flag comes to my mind

RI : Yea:h and I have been watching too for example American Dad and Family Guy and stuff
(laughs) so::: there you haveat first (.) flag.

ALL: (laughter)

NI: War, I got war [HA: Hrrrr] War. It's in capital letters: War here

MOD: What else?

ME: Hollywood.

LA: Religion and I got superficial somehow

HA: yeah And hypocrite.

MOD: superficial and hypocrite

NI: I've also got sports because they are very good at many many sports they are so good at
many sports that

RI: There're [so many people] [(laughs)]

MOD: [It's a big country]

NI: [Yeah so many people (.) so many people and bu I also got
diversity because I know that because there are the stupid and fat ↑Americans [(laughs)]

ALL: [(laughter)]

NI: ↑Ya::: but like there are also the intelligent and very tolerant and uh (.) mhh Americans
who're like

HA: It's really a country of uh [contrast ((Inaudible))]

NI: [Yeah so diversity] there's (0.8) co country of contrast?

MOD: Mh

HA, RI: [Yeah ((Inaudible))]

NI: [Like or or the diversity is very like [HA: Yeah] (0.6) lots of different types of [people]

MOD: [Where do you think so::: what what is diverse the diverse part what is the
(.) fat and stupid [of the US]

ALL: [(laughter)]

NI: Do we have to put it on the map?

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD: No no no you don't have to do anything but

HA: Bible belt saying some[thing?]

NI: [Bible belt?]

ALL: (Laughter 1.5 sec)

NI: U::h southern::: maybe [south] (laughs) I dunno [yeah]

RI: [Yeah]

MOD: [Yeah I uh because I'm just asking because I'm always (.) when I hear about this uh uh cultural diversity I of course always think about New York u:h [as (3.4) the melting pot]

ME: [Yeah yeah New York I if you would say New York] I wouldn't then say fat and [stupid because it's ↑totally different]

HA: [Yeah I (1.0) I I think it'sss u:::h you more li like european cities [ME: Yeah] or very very

ME: So it's you know the Texas [u:::h

NI: [Yeah probably like when you first (Inaudible) that we think all when we say fat and stupid Texassss (1.0) [for some reason Texassss

LA: Yes there they have the hillbillies and

HA: Yes it is very international and like European capitals, like Berlin or Paris .

NI: So you think N.Y. is

HA: yeah, yes

MOD: So you think that N.Y. is an international capital such as Berlin or Paris or (UNCLEAR)

LA: I have also heard that Boston is also very European

UNCLEAR: Yeah, Boston

HA: Yes I have here capitalism. I hate their way of thinking that everything must be numbers and figures and Money (.) Money And for what Poor quality dressed in freedom. Yes you have this freedom; you do not have to have health care or anything. I really hate this kind of thinking

RI: It is all about individuals

HA: Yes all about the individual so that you are not allowed as a state to help out those weeks or people who [not that nice life

NI: [Are in a weaker position but like um what is it li like the state (.) is it state loan like they got a hue hue state dept they are hu::ge they are very deep in dept they are like they are like that's so em their economy is in very bad shape actually [HA: mmh] so it's they're not doin very well uuh like uhm they are not very good at capitalism. [HA: Yeah] They are not like they are not very good at it

MOD: But still

NI: Like everybody seems to think that it's very:: like capitalism is American [HA: Yeah] but they are not doing very well in it because they've got such a huge dept like tha because of the

↑wa::r

ALL: (Laughter)

HA: In Finland we have this thinking that if you get into dept you have to pay it of

NI: Yeah, yeah, we do not like dept.

HA: Then we are like 40 years paying off our house dept and not enjoying our lives

NI: But that is where Finnish “sisu” comes in. No matter how long it takes but we I have to do this.

UNCLEAR: Yeah.

MOD: Sisu?

NI: Yes Finnish Sisu

ME : It’s also Interference; they like to meddle with everything and everywhere.

NI: yeah, like they were world police

HA: This world police, I do not like that.

MOD: the world police always sounds like quite a big word actually

LA: It's like so annoying always to hear where where they now went and started a war or [something

NI: [yeah but I I

HA: And for what

LA: Some kind of explanations for that and you [NI: (Inaudible)] read about their explanations [but you don't really understand like ↓why was it actually now (laughs) in the end

NI: [but why?

MOD: Yeah yeah is it oil?

ALL: Yeah

LA: Yes it's actually but they have some other [other explanation

NI: [But in Syria it is not really oil why are they going to Syria

LA: There's something [else, I just heard actually

HA: [Yeah I I I It is making the whole area with the oil (0.3) uh

ME: Unstable

HA: unstable so they have to stabilize it

NI: Yessss of course they have to go to Syria [(0.7) why not

ME: [They have to kill the Syrians

ALL: (laughter)

ME: So Syrians wouldn't kill the Syrians

NI: Yeah yeah yeah yeaah

ALL: (laughter)

MOD: But then did it surprise you (0.2) the turn that this whole thing with Syria took now?

HA: [Yes

MOD: [Or how do you think that it came

NI: ↓Not really because they're Americans I don't know [well *(Inaudible)*

HA: [They they have bold words
and then they can't (1.0) buy it

NI: Well actually I was well I had to say that I was a bit surprised because well well well I guess it doesn't really matter who is president in that country [HA: (Inaudible) yeah] the politics stay the same (0.2) no matter who is the president. Maybe it's because of their political system because they got two main parties only two and like we here in Europe we mostly have different political systems that we have many parties and they got mostly like two. There are different parties but they are not in power really.

HA: Yeah, if you you consider which companies are paying (0,4) the same companies are uuuh financing their uh political rallies and [NI: Yeah] things like that. Both parties. Always. [NI: Yeah yeah] And it's it's crazy. It's like uuuh companies own the government. [MOD: mmh] It's pretty much so. They know if we don't do these things they want (0.3) the companies want uh uh in next 4 years we can say good bye for [NI: Yeah] for White House and so on. Craaaazy stuff.

RI: One day they will come to Finland when we have water

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

NI: Yes we have water

RI: Yeaah

NI: That's we have. And Norway

NI: We northern countries [we have water.

HA: [We are we are really thinking that they are starting a war

ALL: (laughter)

HA: Like in South Park they nuked Finland (.) I can't really understand

ALL: (laughter)

NI: They did.

ALL: (laughter)

NI: They nuked Finland.

MOD: Wait a second. In South Park they nuked Finland?

HA: Yeaah

NI: ↑Why ↓was it actually. ↓Why did they nuke Finland I don't remember that episode [but I watched it

HA: [Yeah yeah they wanted to nuke something

ALL: [(Loud laughter)]

NI: [Yeah because Finland they won't really]

HA: Nobody really cares

ALL: (laughter)

RI: Aaaaaw

NI: So let's nuke Finland

MOD: We we need some place to [calibrate our weapons

HA: [(laughs)

RI: Yeah

MOD: Some blind shots

HA: But it it's great series I [(Inaudible)

NI: [Yeah yeah (Inaudible) South Park. The Sarcasms is [HA: (laughs)] won ↓Yeah South Park, America like that's [(0.3) that's great

HA: Yeah I *(Inaudible)* of course but it's (0.7) [more sophisticated

MOD: [So these are the (0.4) so these are basically the some of the sources where some impressions come from

NI: Uh we uh well yeah (laughs) TV shows [MOD: mh] of course they have lots to do with the stereotypes that we

HA: And (0.8) to be honest we are watching to much Hollywood movies

RI: [Yeah

NI: [Yeah waay yeah yeah (0.4) a lot (laughs)

MOD: Which Hollywood movies come to you?

HA: "Net leaks" and everything

MOD: We are done here. That was great, I

NI: It was fun.

MOD: Thank you for our honesty, especially

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

NI: Don't be ashamed, don't be ashamed.

HA: Well done (.) well done

LA: It was very entertaining, somebody actually said so

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: I would just as a last word I would ask (.) because this is also something I need to answer later in my theses. Now this really of the record, we are not discussing about this topic any more, but do you think that the fact that I am German affected somehow what you said?

NI: Well I know that you are half Finnish also

UNCLEAR: Aha.

NI: And you were born in Ecuador

UNCLEAR laugh

NI: I know that, so

HA: OK.

MOD: I am only asking for safety reasons

GROUP 2

MOD: So for a starter I would like you just to write down (.) to describe Germans in 3 to 5 adjectives or nouns that come spontaneously to your mind.

Unclear Female: fife?

MOD: tree to fife

MI : Adjectives?

MOD: or nouns or what else you think what in your opinion describes the Germans

MI: What is a noun now:::?

MOD: A noun is like "bus" or .

Unclear Male: ok

MOD: Fidelity

Silence

OL: Did you push the record button?

MOD: I am well organized here

MI: He is German.

[LAUGHTER]

Unclear Female: That is the word I was thinking of (INAUDIBLE)

MOD: Thank you.

[LONGER PAUSE]

OL: I am to kind I think.

MOD: Well, I am not going to push you but it is fine if you have spontaneous thoughts and it depends of your amount of honesty how much

OL: I try to keep my mind open, not just to describe you (MOD influence)

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: good point

OL: Luckily I have met German people in Prague, so

MOD: Oh, that is good. Would anyone like to give one that he thinks is quite typical anybody?

MI: Beer.

AV: Oh I have the same. beer loving.

MOD: Does everybody have beer loving?

ALL: Yes (.) No

MOD: What do you think about Beer and beer loving thing. Do you think that it is actually a thing in Germany?

§MI: Yeah I think very strongly that it is some kind of a thing there.

MOD: Yeah? Why

MI: Well::: uh (0,8) according to my experiences because I I don't think that I coulda when I

was in when I was in (0.5) Bremen I don't think that I could walk 20 meters without meeting a bar so or finding a bar that is i::s [MOD: Okay] and with the locals that's what we basically did and it was a weekday. So it sorta gave me the impression that it it wasn't that uncommon to have have have beer in Germany.

MOD: Ok

NO: And like we were in Berlin just a couple of weeks ago and we went (.) we were just walking down the street and we were window shopping and then there was this one u::h clothing store where there was a party or something like that launching party and there were waitresses giving out beers. Usually in events like that or well well I I (.) what I've seen or heard it's usually Champagne but in Germany it's beer [MOD: Ok?] And and you are like only in Germany can you shop and have beer at the same time it it was a bit of a joke

OL: In Prague I saw something like that also but I think that in Germany the beer culture is more regulated than for example in the Check Republic.

MOD: Regulated?

OL: Yeah more regulated. They have rules and in bars you can get smaller beers with higher price for example (.) so it is more expensive in Germany. It is regulated with taxes and stuff (.) more than in Check Republic.

MOD: The beer is more expensive in Germany

NO: beer is cheaper that water or about the same price.

[LAUGHTER]

OL: Of course and much cheaper that in Finland.

MOD: But is beer not also cheaper than wine here in Finland?

ALL: Yes,

MOD: Probably, ok beer is really something that comes up generally when you hear "Germany" or when you think about Germany and also the Germans. Something else, whatever

AV: Well I have efficient (.) actually I have 3 adjectives which are really close to each other. I have efficient, hard working and well organized.

MOD: OK (.) Asks: Do you have similar things?

NO: Yes,

MI: I do not have any of that, because from what I understood it is a bit of a myth.

SE: But is there not a saying in English I think that something works like a German train. Then it works really well, on time and everything.

OL: I do not know German train, but German way .

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: What?

OL: German way. It works like German way.

MOD: OK

MI: Do you use that idiomatic in British English or something?

SE: I just have heard it somewhere, I do not know how common it is, but I have heard it. And I took German trains and they were like

NO: That is true, yes I have done that too

SE: And if you fly on a German air company, or anything basically German, it always works, the cars work, the planes

ALL: Yeah

MI: So high quality

Unclear Females: Yeah.

MI: Yes I guess we could all tie it down to that it is a major economic power in Europe.

ALL: Yeah

MOD: But if you think that it is a major economic power also with the current affairs can you imagine why Germany would be a major economic power. What would make the economy .

OL: Because of these adjectives.

ALL: (laughter)

MOD: Because they are efficient and well organized?

Unclear Males: And hard working

MI: I have here my damp philosophy, I do not know. German philosophers are very common and we relate to this the protestant belief was born in Germany pretty much and that is one of the themes that is very closely tied to this sort of industrious and hard working thing because the thought that ones place on earth is defined by ones own work not by divine intervention. So I think that there is a correlation.

MOD: That is pretty philosophical. I think that I would have never thought that far.

MI: It is much Weber, he tried to find a scientific proof that the protestant countries would have a greater economic growth than for example catholic countries. He tried to find a link (.) a sort of from the very belief systems. But I am not the sociologist I have read only very little Weber, but he had an idea that went along with this.

MOD: I find more interesting that you have written "Bismarck"

MI: Yeah, Bismarck, I guess that it is the things that if you are talking of Germany as it is today you need Bismarck for it, because Germany before him did not exist really.

MOD: I thought that you think that Bismarck is somehow typical German

MI: Yes that might be and it is also because I played a lot of Civilization before in my life and Bismarck is the leader of the Germans, so

ALL: (laughter)

MOD: So this brought this image to your mind.

MI: Yes they are linked, and generally the whole thing is linked because from what I remember Germany was a sort of maze (INAUDIBLE) of these little sort of feudal (.) very small countries and he united them from what I recall. I might be wrong .

MOD: Does someone have anything more general?

OL: Successful. Yes for example you mentioned already economical status in Europe (.) if we think for example of what they have achieved in sports. I think we can talk of any sports (.) for example football and formula 1, the biggest in the world maybe the most champions ever

MOD: I do not know

MI: I agree, I have written cars here. Formula 1 definitely

OL: Rally

MI: Mercedes, BMW

MOD: But they are the brands and maybe not the drivers. I do not really know so much about Formula 1

OL: Schuhmacher (.) he is a legend (.) Michael Schuhmacher

ALL: Oh yeah

MOD: OK

OL: he is the best ever has many titles

MOD: is he still doing anything at all?

OL: I think he did a come back

AV: He is not driving any more.

MI: He did a comeback a while ago. He is the most successful driver. He also had a season where he had a podium finish in every race which is something no one has ever done. He has the most records, basically If you look them up, it is always the same guy.

MOD: OK, these are all very flattering things. Anything else that somebody thinks that has not been said yet.

SE: I think of Germany as a youth culture and like a sub culture. I do not know for example punks or those kind of alternative. yeah I do not know, but it somehow comes to my mind like youth culture, something (INAUDIBLE) the main stream.

AV: In Berlin you see [that a lo::t] yeah

SE: [Mh (1.3) yeah]

MOD: But how much (.) what do you think how much then if you if you say Berlin how much uh Germany is there in Berlin

AV: (Laughs) [I don't think at all]

NO: [(inaudible)]

MOD: Why

NO: Is like Berlin is Berlin and then there's Germany [but it's the same in every country]

AV: [Yeah]

OL: In Finland in [Prague and Czech Republic yeah]

NO: [Helsinki there's Helsinki] and there's Finland there's Paris and there's [AV: Mh] France [so:]

MOD: [Ok but then if you compare Berlin to (.) u:h to the uh the other parts of Germany then what do you think would make the difference]

NO: I I wouldn't know I I haven't been I only been to [(.) Berlin so]

AV: [Yeah the same]

MOD: Ok so it's just a few [then]

NO: [I would like to go to [(0.8) see the actual] Germany]

AV: [See the actual Germany yeah]

MOD: ok,

OL: I have met lot of Germans from different places of Germany and I do not know.

Differences between people (.) I think they are much the same.

MOD: The same in what sense?

OL: Well I could not say if someone is from Berlin or not when I meet someone, but ok, maybe in Check Republic we could say but with Germans it is more difficult.

MOD: The people you met, would you describe them as successful and hard working?

OL: Yes, they were doing exchange studies abroad. Maybe they were university students are a group of people and they are all a little bit same and different from people working on the country side, it is the same here in Finland.

AV: For example if you compare the exchange students here in Jyväskylä (.) take Spanish, Italian and then German (.) I think the Germans might be the only ones who actually do some studying.

[LAUGHTER]

AV: instead of just partying

SE: I think that all Erasmus students (.) regardless of where they are from (.) are pretty much the same.

AV interrupting: No you can tell the difference.

NO: Sometimes you can tell their nationality. But I mean (.) there are regular students and then there are Erasmus students.

AV: But even like, because I have been hanging with them a lot, you can tell the difference between different groups of people.

NO: Yes they have different working ethics (.) yeah.

MOD: So in what sense do you think that you can tell the difference (.) what strikes you as a difference, what is the striking thing that makes the difference for example?

AV: Well like I said, in the parties there are always the same people. You know more like the southern Europeans (.) but then Germans you do not see that often. But I think it quite interesting I have met lot of Germans, but for some reason I have never got to know any of them really well. I do not know maybe they kind of hold back a little bit (.) and you take some Spaniard or French that are more open maybe

OL: I have noticed also that Germans are going to meeting groups with other nationalities, others like Spanish and Italians are always just they. I have noticed that Germans go to speak to others instead of hanging around with other Germans.

AV: Perhaps because they speak better English

NO: I think so yes

OL: Language skills.

Unclear Females: yeah

MOD: So, Germans speak better English

ALL: Yeah, yeah

MOD: than lets say .

OL: I think they are more western.

MOD: Ok

NO: Could be that they are really interested, that they want to get to know other people, at least most Germans that study abroad.

MOD: And people from southern Europe (.) or what ever may come a little bit more for the Erasmus parties.

ALL: Yeah

NO: Or they feel more secure when they have the other Spaniards with them.

AV: It is also because of the language skills. They are not comfortable when they speak

English. They come here and they are really poor (.) or not really poor (.) but they have not practised that much, so then they kind of stick to each other.

MOD: Ok, what interests me and what I have been thinking quite a lot about (.) since I have heard different voices (.) if you imagine you can either write down or answer spontaneously: what do you think or what have you experienced (.) how people from outside experience or what do they think about Finnish people? What is their image of Finnish people?

[PAUSE]

NO: Shy and boring

ALL: Hmmm . Silence

SE: And timid

MI: Heavy drinkers

Unclear Females: Yeah

MI: It is like most typical Fin: silent and drunk.

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

Unclear Females: Yeah that is the stereotype, yes

MI: Even that I do think that it applies to Finns nowadays

Unclear Females: Yeah .

MI: It is like the old post(.)war hero Fin was like that.

AV: Yeah, the old generation

MOD: Was like what?

MI and AV: Silent and drunk.

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: Silent and drunk.?

NO: Now we are just drunk. Giggles

SE: But I think that we are still quite shy and silent (INAUDIBLE)

[PAUSE]

MI: Well you can speak for yourself. I disagree.

SE: Yeah, but like (.) what I think is like (.) we are not easy to approach, but if someone approaches a Fin they can easily .

OL: We are helpful

SE continues: Yeah you help, you are not like “stay away from me” but still our own personal space is much bigger than for example in

NO: Yes that is true actually

OL: But I think we are similar to Germans in that sort of way

MOD: In what way?

NO: That personal space

OL continues: .and how we get to know new people and how we communicate when we first meet someone

NO: Like in a way we hold back a little

AV: But it is also partly because why people regard Finns like as really quiet and shy is because for us it is polite to wait until the other person has finished what he is saying (.) while in many countries it is like everybody is talking at the same time and it is Yes it is usually the Fin who stays quiet and waits until everybody has finished

OL: But if you have to compare Finns with some other European nations (.) my opinion is that Germany is really close

Unclear Females: Yes pretty close

NO: Yes, that is what I have written here, close to Finland.

OL: maybe the closest. Also the Nordic countries, Sweden, Denmark, Norway of course but I think Germany is pretty close to.

SE: Yes there is like you mention the same belief (INAUDIBLE) and the work ethics, we have the same basis

MI: I do not know, how about of the culture of touching. I think that at least in Latin countries, in French, Italy and especially in Spain there is a culture of touching (.) every time you meet them giving the "bijou" (.) you know all this. And I think this does not exist in Germany, I am not familiar but I think it does not.

OL: No, it is the same in Germany as in Finland for what I have seen.

NO: I do not know how it is in Southern Germany because I think there should be a lot of differences in the North and the South.

ALL: Hm m m m m m m

OL: It is a huge country.

MOD: Hm, I do not really know. I mean how do you greet each ALL here and how do you greet each other in Germany, is there a difference or is it similar, I do not really know.

OL: You can tell the difference when you go to France I mean, when you meet someone you are giving the "bijou" and shaking hands.

AV: I met one Unclear Female for the first time, and she came hugging us right a way and she was from the countryside or what ever .

MOD: in Germany?

AV: Yeah, in Germany (.) so, it depends.

MOD: And does that ever happen here in Finland?

NO: No, that never ever happens in Finland.

AV: No (laughs)

NO: Never ever have I seen a Finnish person that come for the first time and gives you a bijou or gives you a hug.

ALL: No, not.

SE: Maybe not the kisses but the hug if you know

AV: When you meet for the first time: my name is this and that, nice to meet you .

MI: I have seen that happen, but if the situation is informal. Finns are very formal when meeting people for the first time. But if it is in a sort of a free environment it can happen.

OL: I think (.) because we have this similarity between Germany and Finland (.) we have a lot of common history (.) so for example our language, written language and grammar are based on German. And all the things we have done together in the wars and that stuff is influencing .

MOD: What do you mean with the war?

OL: Ah, we were on the same side last time in the world II

MOD: OK

NO: And when they first thought if Finland is going to be republic or Monarchy they decided for Monarchy and the king was supposed to be German.

ALL: Yeah

AV: Finland has always admired Germany (.) arts and culture also.

MI: I mean who did not who did not go to study in Germany from Finland. Basically everyone went there.

ALL: Yeah.

OL: Big universities, big tradition .

MI: Especially if you do not count the Arts, who went to Paris, but the rest of the sort of high class was all educated in Germany.

AV: And I think that German is still the most popular foreign language people pick at school. I mean English is compulsory just like Swedish but

NO: (.) No it is not English, it is one language (.) you can choose what ever .

OL: But if you do not count Swedish and English (.) Germany is the third

MI: The law is that English (INAUDIBLE) is compulsory (.) the only way you can get away of it is if you are native. That is basically the only way you are going to get out of it. It is esteemed so important that it is a must be.

MOD: For what I have heard is that you think that Finnish people and German people are

pretty similar anyway. And also the other things that you said that Germany collaborated during the war and things like that might somehow affect the relations. (.)

MOD: Ok, that was interesting (.) Ok, let us do the same exercise again. We can leave the European continent for a second and you write down a few words about your perspective about Americans

Sighs and giggles

SE: I do not know it in English

MOD: Then write it in Finnish

SE: Ok.

MOD: Everybody is free to write in Finnish and then we can talk about it and you can figure that out.

[PAUSE]

MOD: I do not think you should put that away

MI: Probably not, but I am not sure if I am thinking of the right thing. Am I thinking of the American citizen or am I thinking .

MOD: It does not matter which you are thinking. You explain it and then we can come up with what you mean in the end.

MOD: This is not a thinking exercise where you have to go very deep into your persona (INAUDIBLE) and search for the philosophical truth.

NO: . The meaning of life and so on .

MOD: Yeah

MI: Does not exist

MOD: (.) No. (Giggles)(.) Ok, anyone who just wants to throw one in?

NO: Well I put the word that I was thinking about I put in in Finnish it's teennäinen (0.3) I mean in a way they are quite shallow and you know everything is ah everything is so amazing you start [speaking with someone

OL: [Artificial.

MI: Artificial [yeah

NO: [in a in a way artificial yeah like

MI:Fake

NO:Fake

AV: (laughs)

NO: That's the word I'm looking for thank you. Like really (2.0) mmmh (1.0) yeah.

AV: Like for example if a Fin would say that (0.8) that I love you and [then an American

would say

NO: [yeeea]

AV: that I love you there would be a huge [difference]

NO: [A huge or or for example we just met I just met an American and he was uh she was like oh what do you do and I was I am studying French Oh that's amazing [oh my god]

MI: [(laughs)]

NO: And like yeah I went to the supermarket oh really that's amazing [woooow everything is amazing yeah oh yeah]

AV: [Yeah everything was so awesome and amazing (2.0) So you don't actually know like when it's like actually amazing or if it's like you know [average]

OL: [Just a way to say (laughs)]

NO: Yeah yeah yeah and and I don't like the way the mmh the mmh (1.0) it just comes across really (0.6) like like they don't like for example the Unclear Female that we were talking with [AV: mmh] like she didn't hear ctually a word that I was saying because she was so busy repeating awesome and amazing [AV: (laughs)] all the time. Like are you actually listening or are you just like pretending to listen.

AV: Yeah

MOD: So that she was kinda using this word "amazing" or all this big words in some kinda fake over

NO: It was like a (0.5) It was like a uuhm a show she was putting on you know

OL: Yeah about herself

NO: I in a way yeah

MOD: Sorry?

NO; OL: About herself.

NO: It wasn't about [our conversation it it was]

OL: [Showing off I'm nice person]

NO: mhh mhh

AV: Yeah exactly it's like they're over polite yet in the end they don't give a damn [NO: Yeah] what you're saying or [who the other person is]

MI: [Yeah it's basically that's nice dear or is it like (inaudible) story bro. It's the [NO: Yeah] the same sort of thing you know.

NO: Yeah yeah and like yeah that that happens a lot (0.5) [with the Americans]

MI: [Yeah (0.7) I have to say that it's
it's actually that I I put here obnoxious. And that's the same sort of obnoxiousness that I was
(.) looking for because it's it's very very hard to sort of have a a proper conversation (.) where
you would actually go you know couple of layers deeper than the (.) sort of it always seems to
float somewhere [AV; NO: Yeah] does never never really go anywhere It's just sort of like uh
like talking around [like

OL: [Yeah small talk.

MI: Yeah [small talk small talk and] yeah

NO: [Just talking for talking]

MI: Talking for talking yeah that's [exactly

AV: [And the Finns we don't know how to do it [ALL:
(LAUGHTER)] you [gotta talk [if you have something to say

ALL: [(LAUGHTER)

NO: [If you have something

OL: Uh yeah if you talk with American they are expecting to get some small talk back [NO:
Yeh (laughs)] (inaudible) say ↑ok ↑yeah like commenting all the time like between the lines
but if there's Fin and American talking American says something Finnish just quiet and
waiting for it ok. Go on.

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

AV: Yeah tell the whole story [I'm listening

OL: [Yeah yeah then I will tell my opinion yeah [*inaudible*

AV: [Yeah

MI: Or's a as our German friend here put it he he pointed out that when you actually ask a Fin
that how are you doing he will actually tell you [everything as it is

NO: [Yeah exactly

AV: Oh yeah that's

MI: (Inaudible) how are you doing well I'm pissed drunk cause my wife left me

OL: Uh and you should [you say ↓fine, how are you?]

ALL: [(LAUGHTER)] Yeah exactly

MI: Ok

AV: And then the American gets confused like oh my God, I didn't wanna know that like (0.4)
oh that's ↑awesome↓

MI: Wait a minute, broke a record

[LAUGHTER]

OL: Want a second adjective?

MOD: Yeas. Please

OL: When I was thinking what they are for us Finns then I think they are like avant gardist. They are showing us the way to go. We are following them. Anywhere like TV programmes, style (.) I mean cloths and everything are coming from America and a little bit after we are like following

NO: But are we really?

OL: Yes.

NO: Maybe it was before but now . I think in Europe we are really starting (.) or for the few last years it is really “yes we can too.” And America is a bit out

OL: Hmmm

AV: It is not like so shiny, perfect any more.

NO: In the beginning of the nineties .

OL: Yes, it has been big and I think it is still influencing

ALL: Yeah, yeah

MI: But it is still very controversial, saying that (.) because I know what you mean, but then again I say, if you look at Apple, if you look at Google, if you look at Microsoft or at anything basically because the United State has such an enormous contrast inside it, that the top medical research mostly comes from the States, when it comes to technology it comes from there. I mean the whole spaceflight is by Nasa .

MOD: If you hear “Apple” (.) does everybody think about America (.) by the way?

SEN: I think about peaches .

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: OK, but the brand

OL: Yeah, I think it is the first thing

NO: I do not think about anything, I do not really know, I think about money .

MOD: O, but because

AV: Yes money, something out of my bank account laughs

MOD: How is it with the media, the Internet or television consumption or what ever? How is it with the American stuff?

OL: Are thinking about the film industry or tv shows?

MOD: No, what people watch in general .

OL: Yes TV shows, but especially I think film industry. I think Hollywood films are more . We do not watch our Finnish films so much, we are watching Hollywood films.

ALL: Yeah.

OL: Definitely.

NO: But that is why I was (.) not disagreeing with you but I said that I do not feel that we influenced by America. Because I feel that there is a really strong, maybe it is not that big of a group, but still there is a group of people who are really annoyed about this whole Americanization of Finland and more widely also in Europe. It is getting kind of boring.

MI: Yes.

AV: But they say that Finland is the most Americanized country in Europe

ALL: Yes.

OL: But maybe there is coming a change.

NO: I hope so, I hope so. (.) Because I think (.) well personally I do not like American TV shows, because they are so similar, the just the same culture, the same fake ness we talked about earlier, it is this “Oh my God” and everything is so hm, they take the public for a fool I think. Everything needs to be really explained like: ok, here is the couple, now they fall in love and now it is this (.) and are you sure you follow the story now It is the same thing every time .

MI: It actually goes even deeper. If you look at the Hollywood films it is actually the same film over and over again

NO: Exactly. Yes, they take the public for fools, I think. They do not want them to think individually.

AV: That is the public in America.

NO: Yeah, they do not want them to think for themselves. (.) And it goes beyond TV shows, beyond films, everything, the politics and everything. They do not want people to start to think for themselves

ALL: Hmmm,

MI: But yeah yeah, it is crazy (.) but I mean that just looking at Fox News, something that can be broadcasted as news is (chuckles) it that they have some eschatologist talking, the destruction of Damascus is like a sign of the world coming to an end or you know you read it somewhere in the Bible (.) and it is a news show for Gods sake. So this is like taking crazy pills looking at it . It is “What?”

AV: Yes, and the audience just absorbs everything as if it were facts, or TV really controls their lifes

MOD: You said “the Bible”

AV: Yes

MOD: You also have religious?

NO: Yes, I also have religious

MI: And I have “uneducated” there, that is basically a synonym

ALL: (LAUGHTER), yeah.

MI: It actually is.

AV: I was about to put like horse, school, education of my dad .

OL: I wrote “Colourful and rich culture”. They have like different sub cultures. If we compare with Finland we do not have anything else than Finnish and saami groups of people, but in the United States they have Mexicans and Chinese (.) there are so many different people .

ALL: Yeah

AV: The only real Americans are the American Indians who were there before the Europeans came, so

MOD: Ok, something else?

SE: Yeah I wrote down like getting involved to other countries business

AV: I put war and guns [so it's [↑quite the same *laughs*

NO: [Ah yah

MI: [Yeah War crazy you got it

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

NO: Patriotic

AV: That's true [yah

OL: [Yeah I feel they are like control freaks in global politics

MI: mh

NO: Yeah mh

AV: An also [MI: I] I put arrogant and Patriotism also so like yeah America is the best country in the world and [NO: mh] yah we are the super power we [rule this earth

OL: [Ok of course we have also always opinions but (0.6) they are really showing what they want to do [ALL: uh huh] not just talking they are doing actual (inaudible)

ALL: Yeah mh

MOD: So have you also uhm I don't know have you from the from the maybe some Americans I don't know how many American people you have met but have you (.) uhm experienced the same as you know it for example in general from America have you experienced that in the same way from some people that you met for example from the US

MI: I never really met a (0.4) nice smart American man I have never met met that

NO: I have I [have

MI: [Uh uh no wait excuse me excuse me. Once but the majority has been (.) excuse me. Once a certain musician a friend of mine he's I forgot completely that he is actually an American. But (.) most of the time the discussions are very loud and non existing basically it's [NO: *laughs*] always like gossiping with someone which is something I do I don't do. But I I'm mmmh but it's uh yah it's it's I'm I'm pretty sure that it's not founded on only that sort of thing but it's it's really annoying sometimes trying to (1.2) just go to a discussion

OL: I got one ex example I've wrote about Germans that they are civili civilized (0.4) but if we if I think about Americans I think they are not so civilized than Germans in a kind of way I think [MI: mh] uhm what they know for example about rest of the world *giggles* [AV; NO: mmmh yeah] outside of their country and a a dangerous example was uh the beginning of this year in the spring those CIA some kind of (.) uh scientist or or agent or someone (.) very high person in United States and do you remember how they confused Check Republic and and uhm [MOD: Chechnya] Chechenya [ALL: mmhh] do you remember that?

AV: Yeah (.) [yeah for the Boston

OL: [There was some kind there was Boston bomb strikes and and the CIA guy said in public that it was uh 2 guys from Czeck Republic [MI: Yeah] ok? And I was in Czeck Republic and there were Unclear Females from United States close friends of mine and they felt unsecured in Czeck Republic because of (0.8) can you see that how [ALL: Yeah] how people around them were like ok we are not dangerous and

MOD: They were closing in on them [NO: yeah (laughs)] saying we are not dangerous?

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

OL: Ok but can you imagine that

MI: Yeah I [know

AV: [mmhh hm

OL: CIA guy in public and like Fox News and stuff

AV: Yeah

NO: But they they [were not (inaudible)

MOD: [What did what did those Unclear Females say about that this came in the media like this

OL: Oh they were (0.5) uuuhm apologizing (0.5) really humble and and saying sorry for everyone and and and they couldn't imagine how that happened [MI; NO: mh yeah] But that's how the country is I think that was the big big picture that people there don't know enough about eh the world outside of their [country

SE: [I think that is shows how they well (.) America is a big continent and then they think

like well there is Africa they might not think like ok there is Congo and there is [like (.) Chad
[they think like Africa

OL: [oh yeah it's true

NO: [hmhm

SE: and then there is Europe. For us this is really like important that there is Finland is really
tiny country over or for example Luxembourg, but for people who are use to bigger scales
they might see this as just Europe, which is all like all the same

ALL: Yeah

OL: For [us

AV: [There is Paris and London and that is it you know [that's all they know

OL: [For us Luxemburg and Belgium
are like Mississippi and Texas to Americans

ALL: Yeah

SE: Could be

MI: Yeah, but it's then again it's the whole geographical geographical location there behind
the sea completely basically isolated from

OL: Yeah

MI: Iii (.) it's it's sort of is no wonder that it is like that let's put it that way let's say it so it's
like something like 14 % of Americans [actually own passports

OL: [but also I know it from them and we
know a lot about them.

MI: Yeeee

OL: How is the school system are they selfish, are they studying only about [their history
and their stuff?

MI: [No but no we know because of culture I mean you can you can just Marshall Aid
after the Second World War basic the whole Europe is in ruins and the infrastructure of the
States has survived completely they can actually bring their products here not to mention their
film culture industry and so on it's not actually (.) it's not actually so very strange that the
culture flow is from there to here and not vice versa So I would I would put it there, it is due
to the business for it being the well now China has basically caught in but it used to be by far
the economical super power in the world

SE: Yeah of course

OL: But for me it is surprising how they are not interested about the rest of the world

ALL: Hm yeah

OL: If they were they would know more

AV: Hm actually I met like I've met pretty (.) actually like intelligent and nice nice Americans

OL: Yeah yeah [me too

AV: [travelling abroad but basically those are Americans who are interested in other cultures [who come here

NO: [yeah that's what the (inaudible)

OL: Yeah

AV: So all the rest stick there in their own small town and who never cross the State line those are like the stupid majority there

OL: I have a nice example. I was in Prague in exchange and there was a Unclear Female from New York. And she was open minded and wanting to know everything about of the rest of the world. And she was talking on the phone to her dad, and her dad asked: hi Ally, how are you doing in Germany?" She said: No dad, I am in Prague. (.) Oh I am sorry, how is the country, how do you feel, is it a nice country? (.) No dad, this is the capital, I am in a city in Prague. (.) Oh I know, I am sorry, I make a mistake, so Switzerland, is it expensive?

ALL: (laughter)

OL: So the conversation went like that, and they were the same family.

ALL: Yeah.

MOD: Some generation difference?

AV: It is also crazy how your income affects whether you get a good education or not. People are not at the same level at all.

ALL: Yeah

MI: The public school system is basically ran of the mil staff (INAUDIBLE) It is horrible, it is under funded, it is overcrowded, it is well .

MOD: But what reason they have for this income thing and the health care issue. How come that they keep up like this?

MI: hmm that is the one .

NO: It is the rich minority who controls everything: politics, economics

ALL: Yeah

OL: Greed

SE: It is, the whole philosophy of the country is like everyone for themselves .

MI: The American dream, it is .like if you are loosing the game it is your own fault. It is the sort of notion .

ALL: Yeah

OL: I just came up with one idea, I would want to ask your opinion. In Finland we have now also hard times, economical situation is difficult. And I think all politicians are speaking like: we all have to give up something and do something together. I think in Finland is a little bit like that now. The prime minister is like: we have to take some tough decisions in these difficult times. But I do not know (.) in United States they have also difficult times, maybe it is worse than here, but I think they are just competing against each other the two parties. They are not doing sacrifices. (.)

AV: They are just blaming each other

OL continues: They are both greedy and are not going to give up anything.

ALL: Hmm, yeah

OL continues: So that is why they are just fighting , fighting .

MI: In 2013 95 % of the income went to 1 % , it is according to Mr. Obama that it is not a very unreliable source

OL: But we do not know at the moment

MI: No, no, he said it.

MOD: Yes he said it, but we do not know how much truth is behind what somebody says .

MI: Yeah, well but

MOD: but something else now, let us have a cookie brake.

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: Ok, someone still has something about on this that did not still come up?

SE: I have obesity

MI: Yes, fat

MOD: Oh, I red something else first yes, fat and obesity . As we still have a little bit of time, we can do the same thing one last time if that is ok for you

ALL: We have still cookies (.) [LAUGHTER]

MOD: We have cookies and I do not want eat them all alone because I am really getting obese

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: No, I am going to be ok So take a moment to write down your perspective of the French.

[PAUSE]

MOD: Ok, I think we have enough and since you were giggling I give you the first drop

(INAUDIBLE)

AV: Well I wrote: shallow, arrogant, lazy, bureaucratic and proud.

SE: That is nice.

[LAUGHTER]

MI: I have basically the same. I have strict, proud, aggravated, easily insulted and food and vine

MOD: Ok, what about the others?

NO: I have also chic

MOD: Sorry?

NO: Chic like stylish

MOD: Oh, chic . Yes ok, I

AV: Not the Finnish rubber (INAUDIBLE)

MOD: I do not know the Finnish rubber .(INAUDIBLE)

MI: Sorry I broke your pencil

MOD: I broke them all the time. (.) You have chic, anything else?

OL: I wrote impulsive

NO: Passionate

OL: It is quite the same, I would say

ALL: Yeah

MOD: Is it?

NO: In a sense

OL: When they are communicating they are really passionate and impulsive (.) They are not like people who are cooling down.

ALL: Yeah

MOD: Ok

MI: Though they are not very laid back. Passionate, not very laid back sort of type

SE: I wrote demonstration

NO: Yes, lots of strikes all the time, every week something

AV: They think that that solves all the problems, yeah, let's have a strike

[PAUSE]

MOD: Ok, why arrogant?

AV: Because they're

NO: (inaudible)

AV: well it is hardly the same as proud I mean they are proud of their culture (1,0) u:::h in sort of a way also Americans are because they're ye they have the food and the vine and ooh our language and arts and and everything like that so they are like yey we are French and they kinda think that they are the civilization of Europe or something like that [they (inaudible)]

NO : [They are the descendants from the Romans

AV: Yea:::h like

MI: And it used to be la lingua franka for [example it used to be

AV: [Also yeah like the language of arts an knowledge

MI: Mh mh

OL: So they they're thinking too much about themselves

AV: Yeah

MI: Yeah I mean I mean I once [this

OL: [maybe not too much they are showing [of

AV: [Because yeah in in

many (.) I've I've seen lot of them like acting really stupid around the world and they are like

oh but we're French we I can do this [like

NO: [yeah

SE: Really?

AV: Yeah also but also Americans do that

MI;OL: Mh mh

AV: and [and I think also Spanish and Italians

OL: [and Germans (laughs)

NO: Maybe I'm [(inaudible)

AV: [Finnish?

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

NO: Everyone else but finnish people [

AV: [(laughs) [No

NO: [Sorry I exist

AV: Except if you go to Tallinn.

MI: That is a horrible place, like a playground let us not go to Tallinn.

[LAUGHTER]

MI: No, but I was thinking of, once I was discussing with a Frenchman and he said that France is the fifth power in the world. I mean like the fifth strongest country in the world. And this is something that no one else would ever say. I mean can you figure out a Brit saying that: ok, there is the

OL: He was proud?

MI: Yeah, yeah, he like: hey we are something, you know.

[LAUGHTER]

MI: yeah, I mean the fifth it is, would a Britt go like: ok, there is the Yanks and there is the Russians, then there is China, then India and then there is US now.

[LAUGHTER]

OL: Can you imagine how many there are behind us..

ALL: (LAUGHTER) Yeah, yeah.

MI: Yeah, it is, that sort of a thing. To all these we can act as superior and these shags (INAUDIBLE) are bigger (INAUDIBLE)

MOD: I think that you had written lazy or something related to lazy?

AV: I have lazy

MI: I do not

AV: It is a huge contradiction between Germany and France although they are neighbour countries. But you see it is really contrary when you take an aeroplane of Air France (.) you loose your bag, you loose your flight. It is all confused, you get lost in the Charles de Gaulle. (.) And then you take Lufthansa (.) everything works, you have like half an hour between planes, you still get your bags and you get lunch on the plane and (.) exact contrast.

NO: And one thing also about the he helpfulness oh I mean Asiakaspalvelu in [in

AV; SE: [Customer service

NO: E:::actly thank you [AV: Yaah] You go to an te:: for example I was in Paris to u::h and and I wanted to ask something in the (0.6) in the ↑metro I don't remember what is was but I had a problem and there was a info (.) counter (.) I went to ask some help the guy who was working there his job was to give customer service to give me instruction what I needed [AV: mh] and he was looking at me like ↓what the hell are you doing [here

OL: [Yah did you speak France?

NO: I I do [OL: (laughs)] speak French and was speaking [French to him]

OL: [French to him]

NO: and and I was like oka::y tha mhh can you help me please excuse me ladidah all that stuff really you know like apologetic I'm sorry I come to distu:::rb you in your busy working [AV: mhhh] day and he was just like what the hell are you doing can't you see I'm busy

AV: [Mhhh

NO: [It's just the thing here and like (1.5) the who:::le (1.0) it's like every person (.) every French person thinks they are like the (1.4) ruler of the world if you if you will (.) like (.) they are so important and uhm even though I'm just sitting in the metro tunnel waiting for something to happen I am the most important [AV: (laughs)] person in this in this [AV: mmhh]

in this world and like (.) they don't

OL: So is it [self confi self confidence?]

NO: [It's it's it's it's] the arrogance

AV: [They they're not humble

OL: [Self confidence?]

NO: [Yeah I don't know] yeah maybe [that, too

OL: [(inaudible) it goes too far [(laughs)

NO: [Yeah

AV: [mmh

NO: Or may be it is that they are really very proud of their language and their culture and they do not want France to become like Little America. That is why they are really protecting their country and not having everything in English (.) I think it is really important to them.

MOD: Not having everything in English

NO: of course.

SE: I would understand if I were a stupid American who goes there speaking English and acting falsely but maybe it is just that they are annoyed with tourists, or something.

AV: But it is the same everywhere in France and it is like (.) the customers service, they try to get rid of you as fast as they can. Like; no, it is not here, go to the next bureau . Then you go to a bureau to an other and everyone says it is not here, it is the other office. And then you are back in your starting point (.) after going to 4 (.) 5 places.

SE: Then you go a super market and they have these self . Where you can pay your groceries and staff and there is only one person who controls like 4 (.) 5 different registers where people go. And then one gets broken and the vendors start shouting at the customers: it is your fault, how stupid can you be, and like this. Only in France would that happen.

AV: Hmmmmmm

SE: Blame it on the customer.

MOD: Would you (.) as a side question for you have just been saying then say that before you first arrived in France that the image that you had, or the expectations that you had were actually corresponding to what you experienced?

SE: Hmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm

MOD: Every can also think about some example where people went was it more of a hoax or did it somehow actually correspond to what you later experienced?

AV: Well I think that maybe at first if you have not been in a country at all you have quite high expectations (.) lets say that you go to Paris for the first time (.) You here all this from

the media or where ever, all this talk of how amazing it is and how romantic. And you get all this images and when you go there, and then it is a bit different and you see that there is (talk piu ??) and that people are maybe not always so nice to you. So I think it might sometimes be like a bit too much

ALL: Hmmm

MI: Like (INAUDIBLE) in Paris (.) or something

ALL: (Mild laughter)

AV: Gold Unclear Female in Paris.(INAUDIBLE)

MOD: (INAUDIBLE) in Paris

MI: (laughs) It is there, you go round and

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MI: It is there. I am not saying that it is not in Helsinki, but

MOD: pure gold.

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

AV: but I also had the contrary, because everybody expects people in Paris to be very rude and then some of my friends have had really positive experience, like: they are not that rude, they help you .

NO: Yeah, of course they do.

AV: So, when I went to France, I mean I had this expectation that: ok, they are pretty rude and then all the bureaucracy and it kind of was what I experienced .

SE: I think that of course you have a stereotype or you have some expectations or some pre notions of some countries and of some people, some what ever . And then you go there, of course you are like (.) for example you think that French people are arrogant and rude (.) you go into a restaurant and there is a rude waiter or waitress and then you are: oh, yes, yes they are French . But if they are nice you are like (.) you do not even think about it, it is

NO: This is like it is supposed to be

SE: yes (.) you like feed your own personal thoughts and opinions and stereotypes

MOD: You only notice what .

SE: Exactly, what you want to notice, what you expect.

OL: Stereotypes are really interesting, it gives you a lot when you travel, because you can compare your observations and experiences with what you expected. But it is dangerous if you do not go open minded and give opportunities. Of course you have (.) for example you mentioned Paris (.) you have expectations before going based on whose books you have read or seen, but when you go there you have to be open minded or have to be prepared to get

some kind of disappointments. The reality is different.

Unclear Females: Yeah

MOD: Good, I think that we have pretty much everything on the list; I think this can be enough. I would be happy to have your papers

OL: Are you satisfied?

MOD: I think we can have a little post chat (.) it is always nice to

MI: MOD, can I (.) I am in a rush .

MOD: Yes, yes . Our friend here has some other things

MI: I am already late, but it is One time in my whole time that I live in Jyväskylä

OL: Your relaxation vanished . (INAUDIBLE)

[LAUGHTER]

MI: It happens always, you book one night in a whole year and it is double booked

ALL: Bye, bye, auf Wiedersehen

MOD: First of all, how was it for you (.) did any one feel uncomfortable?

AV laughing: Oh yes, very much (.) I got so very scared.

OL: No .

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: What I really found, I mean I cannot look into your head, I cannot know how spontaneously you actually answered but If I compare with yesterdays group, there is a few things I could not even list that came in exactly the same form yesterday. One of them is underlining the similarity of Germans and the Finns which I have never heard before also yesterday they said that

OL: You have been here for a while, what do you think?

MOD: Well in my opinion it was quite different at least in the beginning and one thing was actually that I thought but found quite comfortable that the talk goes much slower on (.) but it is much more focused. I did not asked about the way of communicating (.) like in what way do you communicate differently, because you were building this; oh yes we are also similar but in my opinion for example Germans talk much more and there is like much going around. The thing I have never seen here is what we call "Streitkultur" in Germany. The love for very intense, even fiendish discussion about a topic that you can in Germany if you want you pick politics you pick re cycling and you can really get into a real fight with an other German. Afterwards it is sometimes ok, sometimes you never want to see each other again but that is something I have never come over here. Here people just not want to have a discussion like that

SE: We are not passionate in that sense

NO: Or if we are we do not want to show our emotions

AV: Or we do not want to make the other person angry (.) we do not like to take it too far

OL: We want to take care of our relationships

Unclear Females: yéah

NO: Or if we think of something really bad, we keep it to ourselves just to maintain some I do not know the word

MOD: Some harmony

NO: Yes I think so

AV: We are like Americans (INAUDIBLE)

OL: Oh, we are like Americans (INAUDIBLE)

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: Sorry

[LAUGHTER]:

OL: Yes fake, if we are building up some kind of harmony it is a fake

NO: and avoid conflicts I would say

ALL: Yaeh, hmm

MOD: So that was one thing and another thing that is totally side note because maybe this is just an university thing but here in Finland I have never felt judged, in Germany I felt judged all the time: be what I say, by the cloths I wear by the stands I take. It is really just a feeling that you have in your back head that if you talk to people and somehow by their looks they are talking one thing but they are also looking (.) and here everybody was I thought pretty open to just at first see what kind of guy is this, we are just going to chat first and this led to a quite different sense of niceness. And also something that many people do not understand that I say that Finnish people are open because normally you say that people in Spain are open (.) or what ever (.) but the people never pre judge at all.

AV: It is just university, it is Jyväskylä a big city where they are used to different I come from a smaller town where there are lots of pre judgements and the smaller the place you go (.) but I think it is everywhere in the world

NO: Yes it is

AV: So, in bigger cities you see different people from different background and opinions

MOD: For example when I was in the Finnish army I was also greeted with the Hiltler greet quite a lot and of course we cannot deny that even if this Nazi allegory had come into somebody's mind you would not have said that because of my nationality anyway. But also

this happened once in a while but then many people have said that on the other hand we have also been collaborating. So there is not this very strong Nazi allegory that other people may have. In Portugal it happened pretty often that the first thing that came up was Hitler or some
AV: It is so stupid because the war was so long time ago

OL: I have seen that in everyday life in Middle Europe when Germans are going to speak to people from other countries (.) the very first thing the ALL are expecting is the Germans have to apologise

MOD: Apologise?

OL: Yeah, they are like a little bit judging Germans before getting to know them better

MOD: do you think that down there it is more common to still rely on this old historical stuff?

OL: Maybe just a little bit. We are a new generation, we are not taking to that too much but I saw that a little

MOD: Yesterday actually the whole conversation started that we were talking about Lidl (.) I do not know why (.) and do you know how they told that Lidl is called in Finland?

ALL: No

AV: Natzi Marketti.

NO laughing: Is it really, no way.

OL: I did not know that.

AV: I have heard it.

NO: Who said that?

AV: The father of my friend: Yes I am going to go to Natzi Market to buy some staff

OL: It is not evil, it is just .

SE: Oh my goodness.

OL: I think it is a bit funny, not mean

MOD: I did not say anything about mean .

NO laughing: But, but hey come on

OL: it is a little bit rude

AV: I think it is funny

OL: It is meant to be funny,

AV laughing: Yeah.

MOD: But on the other hand if you think about how people normally picture a normal German, you know, how does a normal German look, what is he wearing (.) do I have to ask you?

NO: Lederhosen

MOD: Yeah (.) and what does he eat and what does he drink

NO: Bratwurst

MOD: Yes this picture comes together. This still exists somehow. And if you are honest and sometime if you hear German and see Germans this picture just pops up and you .

SE: Of course it does, and Hitler also . Well I mean it is such a (.) you cannot avoid it

MOD: Yeah, but you just but of course Hitler and Nazis is something else but many people see this picture of this Bavarian guy pretty humorously but most people know that not everybody in Germany is wearing that stuff and people are using this picture quite ironically anyway

AV: Maybe the same way like the picture of the drunken super silent fin who is living somewhere in the North of Finland

MOD: Oh, you do not need to go the North of Finland to find him

[LAUGHTER] .

AV: or somewhere in the woods of Jyväskylä

MOD: No, no you do not need to go to the woods

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: They are right here at this table

[LAUGHTER]

MOD: You know what really was interesting and is going to be interesting for what I write (.) I do not know why exactly I still have to think about that (.) but the overall things that were said about Germany were mostly quite positive or also pretty vague . Yesterday I performed the same change to America and exactly the same thing as today happened that people wrote stuff down

SE: I was wondering when I was writing that why is it so much easier to describe Americans or French (.) maybe it is because I am more aware of the culture or I know more about the American culture

AV: They make a bigger deal about themselves. Germans are kind of (.) they keep it low and (.) they do not give strong images or opinions about themselves

SE: Do you think that it is still like (.) not that the Germans are ashamed (.) but that they are kind of apologetic, that they do not want to be too noisy or .

AV: I mean, remember how this guy explained that actually the first time that you could say that you are proud of being German and wave the German flag was the football

NO: Yeah

MOD: 2006

AV: because before that you could not be like “ hey Germany” without sounding really patriotic

MOD: The biggest deal about that (.) it can all be broken down to one symbol (.) the flag. If you have a flag in your garden in Germany (.) people will think that you are a Nazi, if you have anything flag related you are a Nazi. And what was so intriguing was that suddenly when the world Championship came up suddenly everybody showed the flag. This shows, hey you were on the one hand judging people but on the other hand it seemed that you wanted to have a flag yourself and now you suddenly found an excuse to show the flag and, and people were like: Yeah..

OL: I think it was (INAUDIBLE) for many people

MOD: It is kind controversial and. (INAUDIBLE) to say, if you have a normal situation and you have a flag you are a nazi and then suddenly the world championship comes and you say, ok I am going to put 8 flags on my car because it is so big . It was kind of weird thing.

OL: Maybe it was (.) how can I say this, people were waiting 5 years, 10 years waiting for the moment, they wanted to do it but they just

AV: Have the guts or. Yeah

OL: Yeah

MOD: Actually we have got back to status quo now. It was not like that when the weird Unclear Female won the Eurovision Song contest (.) no one was waving flags

AV: Ohhh. (Laughs)

MOD: it happens only after championships (.) but otherwise it does not

OL: Can I ask you one question?

MOD: Hum .

OL: What do you think, would our German list would have been different if you would not been here, if it was someone else moderating?

MOD: Probably yes

OL: I think it can influence it, I mean we know your background and we

MOD: No, I am pretty sure about it actually .

OL: that is influencing a lot

MOD: Yes, that is why I said right at the beginning that I do not know what you would have said otherwise

OL: I know I can say straight anything to you I know it does not harm you and you do not feel bad (.) but still it is influencing how I act in the group. If I say something about Germans I say something about you and other people

MOD: Yes, that is why I decided to have at least one other example or in this case we have two which will change the dynamics in quite many different ways, because no one of the present people is from that culture. Because of course what you can always do when you write a thesis about this stuff you just have to list the possible restrictions of your data. You say, hi it is like this, I can not help it. I mean I cannot pay a moderator to recruit and do this stuff for me. And I somehow started this project that I always start with Germany and then I try to look behind this stuff, what experiences and stories people tell but then two days ago I decided that if it goes kind of slow I am going to move to the next one. Yesterday we talked a lot and the discussion of the German part was actually more open and easier yesterday so the American part like five minutes. Today it was a little bit slower so that I said, okay we are going to take time for two more examples. It has shown that it also depends on the person himself who is talking how much he is influenced by it. Someone told me yesterday if he would not have known me he would probably have said nicer things. So it is pretty individual and you can only list what possible reasons there are why he is not saying this and not that. Basically it is just what people say and you can use it.

SE: Did you start with Germany yesterday also?

MOD: Yes, I am going to keep the structure the same

SE: Because I was like the first thing (.) I was not easy to come up with (.) like now I would have a lot more to say about Germany, now that I

MOD: But now you could have too much thinking time

ALL: Yes hummm

GROUP 3

MOD: We can come to the place afterwards but now the people

Noises of pens scratching (.) cookies being eaten (.) giggles

MOD: Don't push it (.) you don't have to write a poem.

[WRITING]

MOD: I think 4 to 5 things are enough (.) everybody satisfied so far

HAN: do you want this back because I have written everything in Finnish so it

MOD: I will take them but I have good friends

HAN: I can write in English if you want

MOD: Yes you can but you won't (.) that is not what you have to do at the moment just write it in Finnish and

SUS: is it ok if I write in English, because I wrote in English everything

MOD: yes, yes

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: what I have said is that if you feel at some point that you do not come up with a word or it is more fluent you can write in Italian or Arabic (.) then I am going to have a problem (.) but

HAN: the question was in Finnish so I automatically start to write in Finnish

MOD: no, that is good (.) I mean, have a cookie

HAN: I have worked all day so will take cookies

MOD: And please do so because the last 2 days I had cookies and everybody was like: yes I will take one and then I came back home and had these cookies and thought I should not be eating that

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: and I finished them, yes, yes!

EL: so we save you!

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: Save me from severe obesity

ANNE: Finnish people are too polite, oh something is free (.)ohm, maybe I can take one

ALL: (laughter)

MOD: Finnish people are too polite (.) is that so?

HAN: shy

UNCLEAR: yeah

MOD: that is not the same, either too shy to take y cookie or to polite to take a cookie. (.)

Now please, have one. I will not point with my finger on anyone so does others want to read one of the first ones she has written down (.) otherwise I will point

SUS: one question (.) do you think it is not a problem that my dad is German, because I probably have a different feeling about this (.) I think I told it to you

MOD: I don't , where is the problem

SUS: It is just because maybe I see Germany differently than

MOD: In my opinion it is not a problem that is a frame (INAUDIBLE)

SUS: Ok, good (.) you do not want me to write it down that one of them is

MOD: I do not want to have . Now you said it, it is on my data

SUS: good

MOD: no, I do not want to have 6 robots that are all exactly the same (.) that would be quite boring, so that does not really have any influence in that sense but would anyone like to say something (.)otherwise I will .

HAN: well I can start, first thing that came to my mind was football I think German people like football and they are very enthusiastic about football compared with Finnish people for example

MOD: How is it here in Finland

HAN: Not so much (.) maybe in Helsinki there are occasionally some bigger games but ice hockey is

MOD: The way that people care about football might be the same in Finland for ice hockey

HAN: yes maybe

MOD: Football is interesting, not so many people came up with it, but actually quite many do, and I thought (.) ok, you have so many countries that like football (.) ok, football what else

EL: I thought people are very social and open they like talking

SUS: I have the same one that they are talkative

MOD: social, outgoing and talkative, ok have you experienced German people being like this, or is this just a general notion

AN: I think they are happy and laid back and outgoing (.) I think so

SUS: they want to have a good time

UNCLEAR: yeah

EL: I have a German friend and I saw that they are very social

AN: You know that they throw a party I think (laughs)

SUS: I think that they have always a reason to party

AN laughing: yeah (.) or they make it up if they don't have

MOD: ok, so open social outgoing that's nice (.) what else

EL: they are very active, I think they have a lot of hobbies (.) and they have a good school system

MOD: The school system?

EL: kind of (.) I think, ohm, yeah

MOD: If I think about Pisa (.) why do you think that they have a good school system? (.) Just out of interest .

EL: No, not the system (.) yeah, the system is worse than the systems I know (.) (laughs) but I don't know . Explains in Finnish) kuitenkin sillain, että kaikki kouluttaa itsensä

AN: se on vaikeeta sanoa.: they get a good education

HAN: the people are well educated (.) ne on hyvin koulutettuja

EL: yes!

AN: I have something similar because I think that they are quite strict managing the tasks, if they say: I will do it, they will do it! They don't leave things half way done, they do it

MOD: Then that is something else that is not educated

AN: what?

MOD: That is something else that they are very

AN: Yes maybe .

MOD: Hard working?

AN: maybe, yeah

MOD: good, well educated and (.) anyone else

EL: Aha, tunnollinen (.) We are thinking about the word .

AN: onks se saksaksi jotain pünktlich?

EL: Ei sekään ole ihan sama

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

EL: Well if they have a task and they feel that they have to do it they aren't lazy (.) they don't make up a reason that: I can't do that. They think that when I have promised I have to do that

ANNE: It is an inner feeling of a person that I am going to do this because I promised and you want to do it, it is just a

EL: Exactly

SUS: And they do it 100 %, like I am doing it and I'm doing it good

MOD: what interest me is that if you say that they want to get things done when they start, have you (.) do you think that it's actually true and why do you think so, have you any reason to believe that they are like this

ALL: (laughter)

ANNE: Well

EL: When I was in Germany for a week and I went to school for 3 days I got to know some people so I made this observation about those people (.) only those people

MOD: Yes and then you thought that it was kind of like this. (.) What more

SUS: I think that family and traditions are very important

MOD: In what sense

SUS: Like Christmas and like Halloween too that they celebrate and like I said they always have reason to party or invite neighbors or friends in their house and socialize together

MOD: Ok, and these traditions, how is it here in Finland

AN: We have some traditions

EL: We have strong traditions

MOD: because others said Christmas

EL: Yes, but it is because they have some traditions that are only in some towns or some area (.) there are lots of them

UNCLEAR: Yeah

AN: And I think it's (.) well I have met some German people last summer and from what I know from them and they gave themselves a reason, they gave a permission to party (.) and in Finland it is like: oh it's Christmas, we can party and relax but they are: Oh, it is Wednesday (.) I'm going to party, because I can, I want to", something like that. We Finns are like

SUS: we need a reason

AN: Yes exactly

SUS: Maybe because here everything is more expensive, like

AN: Like booze (laughing)

SUS: yes food and drinks are cheaper, so it is not a big deal when they because usually a part of socializing with other people is eating and drinking

UNCLEAR: yeah

SUS: Maybe for us it's a party but for them just normal life (.) not that a big deal. Maybe we should not see it as party just normal life

MOD: I have heard from some people that it is exactly the other way round (.) pretty often actually

UNCLEAR: oh!

MOD: so it is quite interesting that you say that, because I heard exactly the opposite thing from some people who were talking about Finland. So, it is nice that you respect each other's ways of going to party in that sense (Laughs) (.) Anything else, something more general

ANNE: To go back to the traditions and families importance I think German people are more conservative about family values and gender roles than in Finland (.) it's different in the cities but in the countryside it's still very, very common that the women stay at home to raise the

children and in Finland everybody goes working (.) it's not that common for a woman to stay at home and in Germany if you go working in the country side it's like: whau are you not going to raise your children (.) Like that I think they are more conservative. I have another point here that says (.) totally different (.) from a different point of view (.) but in the family values and gender roles Germans are more conservative than Finnish people

MOD: Ok, then what do you have from a different point o view?

ANNE: I think German people are much more open about (.) like alternative treatment for illnesses and stuff like that, they have lot of Homeopathie (.) and Osteopathie (.) I don't know what that's in English (.) osteopaatti (.) it's also a treatment not with medication. And in Finland we always have like: you have to take your pill, you have to take your antibiotics and in Germany they are much more like: if you don't need a shot (INAUDIBLE) don't take it (.) and oh, antibiotics you should not take too much of them. In that sense they are more open and not so conservative than in the family value point they are much more conservative

MOD: Ok, so how the family is seen as a system they are more conservative than here in Finland (.) I don't know how it is in Finland, I cannot say

SUS: I think it is hard because then again in Germany they are much more open about gay marriage for example than in Finland. But for a woman how it is we are much more accepted as an equal gender than in Germany (.) or I don't know how much more it is but that is what I felt about my relatives there

MOD: (INAUDIBLE)

UNCLEAR: But they are older they are not the new generation

MOD: who has not said something yet would like to

ANNE: I would like to continue about they are conservative because I think they are religious they are conservative because there are many Catholics and they go to church every Sunday, okay there are other countries where people go to church too but I think that in Germany they go more

MOD: Do you think that in Germany they are in general catholic

ANNE: well I know that not everybody is catholic there are a lot of protestants (.) but still like there are a lot of Catholics and they go to church

MOD: And they go to church every Sunday

ANNE: well not everybody but

HAN: In Finland there are many people who belong to the church but never go to the church (.) or they are in the church because you should be and they don't really believe or care. I also have the feeling that in Germany religion is much more important than in Finland (.) and that

it has bigger influence in the society also (.) I think that the family values it comes also from the religion

ANNE: I know some German people and German families who are catholic and before every meal they pray

MOD: where have you been?

ANNE: In Salzbergen, Niedersachsen

MOD: Ok, that intrigues me personally but is even more interesting to hear that I have never heard that

ANNE: There I know families that at least they do that (.) and then it is important to them to sit together with the family and eat

UNCLEAR: Yeah

MOD: ok, we close the circle of family values (.) would you think that what you said about the family values is somehow connected with this religious thing You are nodding

HAN: Yes, religion has a huge impact in the society (.) or had, that is why it still has (.) but hm

MOD: Ok, we don't want to squeeze that out, do others have anything else. I mean you have written quite a lot, maybe something more general or more like (.) they were quite elaborate which is quite interesting

ANNE: I think German men are much more open to (.) what is "tehdä aloite" to initiates, exactly (.) like in a bar men were coming to me to talk with me all the time and I didn't really have to go to men to talk to them (.) and that never happens in Finland. I think that is also about that they are more open than Finnish people and I think it is especially with the men

MOD: ok,

ANNE: it is a bigger difference that with women

AN: And I think in other things too, the German men are more open (.) you know in Finland they wear like black and blue (.) even the cloths are (.) the Germans are more open to wear what they like (.) yes more open, like the gay marriage and that kind of thing, I think they are more open

MOD: I would like (.) because your writing is actually pretty detailed (.) I would like you to go into you for a moment and then I would like you to think about what Finnish people in general think about the German people. Is there a difference or do they all think what you have written there. People who do not have such knowledge about it. Can you think about something that is common to think

Silence:

SUS: Bear and sausage of course and Oktoberfest (.) but that is the stereotype you hear from everybody

EL: I also noticed the stereotype that people are very punctual and tidy they like to clean up

UNCLEAR: yeah, yeah

MOD: Ok, what do you think about that

ANNE: Well I wrote here that German people are punctual but that punctual as Finns,

Because when I was in Germany I was annoyed that the bus was two minutes late and the

Spanish people were like: oh my god so punctual” and I: it’s 2 minutes late, it’s not punctual

(.) so they didn’t understand me because

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: When it comes to that do you think that Finnish people are more punctual than German people

UNCLEAR: Yeah

ANNE: I think we are quite the same, it depends on (.) everything depends on the person, but

I think it is quite the same

AN: I also think that Finns and Germans have something in common (.) I don’t know if it’s

the humor or (.) I think that we are people that can laugh at ourselves (.) also

ANNE: like we have a connection

AN: yes (.) yeah

MOD: So think that Germans and Finns are kind of similar

ANNE: Yes!

MOD: OK (.) why

AN: Well, we just talked about the punctuality

MOD: Both are punctual same sort of humor like

ANNE: I think we have a . Like something dark (.) Finns have something dark in them and I

think German people also have (.) we are a bit gloomy and German people are more social

than Finnish people but German people think of themselves that they are not at all social (.) I

think we both have some kind of sadness in our soul (laughs out loud) (.) oh my god (.) we are

so deep

SUS: I don’t know about that

MOD: anti(.)social, they are all kind of anti(.)social

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

EL: I have to disagree; I do not think we are so similar. Maybe it might be something mental,

some humor (.) but I don't know, it's more like (.) no! We are not the same

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

SUS: That's good!

MOD: Would you like to just say or try to say in what way you disagree?

EL: Uhm well I think it's this (1.0) uh attitude of life or some kind of way of thinking and behaving (1.3) and maybe the sociality is the big (laughs) question too

MOD: Because who is uh how is the sociality different?

EL: Uh well Finns are not so social and (.) I I thought it's a big (.) contrast between Finland and Germany

MOD: Ok so you think that maybe the way they communicate is different?

EL: Yes

AN: Well I think it's the well I (inaudible) you know we talked about we are so polite we don't take cookies. But you know German would be like OH MY GOD, CAN I GET, CAN I get and that maybe they are more arrogant than Finnish and sometimes maybe that [mh

EL: [Yes [AN: Yah] we kind of shame of ourselves you know [and they .

AN: [And the Germans they are open and there and [you know

EL: [Yes, [this is me and I am here

SU: [They are like proud of them[selves

AN: [Yeah yeah [exactly

EL: [Yes that's the way (.) we are always like sorry sorry

HAN: And maybe they do more what they want to do than Finns that I think that Finnish people think o:h I would like to that but I'm not gonna do that [because

ALL: [Yeah yeah

SU: [We think too much what other think about us

AN: Ye[ah exactly]

EL: [Yes exactly]

MOD: yeah, ok (.) I think what we can do now we can get back to exactly the same thing I read out in Finnish and repeat the same with somebody else (.) with another national culture and talk a little bit about that because we did it yesterday and the day before and it was kind of nice. So I would like to do the same that you just write down your immediate impression of the people of the United States of America, please

UNCLEAR: Huge (.) Oh my God!

AN: this is so hard, you know

MOD: I am not forcing you

AN: (laughs) (.) ok,

MOD: if you find it hard, then it is hard

Writing in silence

AN: I don't want to talk! (.) laughs

MOD: ok, do you want to say something

SUS: To be honest the first thing that came to my mind was their obesity because it is a huge problem there and people just eat a lot of fast food and a lot of people don't really care about their health and about exercising and stuff like that

SU: I have to disagree because (.) I've been in California and there (.) well ok there's the fat people and then there's the super skinny people. Because I think especially there they care about their health because it's like

MOD: Especially where?

SU: In California because there is warm and there is the beach and people want to look good so they exercise there a lot and in schools the uh (.) the sports system is very uhm important and then they take it very seriously because after the school the (0.8) this practices [MOD: mh] Everyday and I I think they exercise a lot but then there's the other and which are the obesy [obese people

SUS: [I've also (.) uhm heard that in California and Los Angeles and Hollywood especially it's really important to be really skinny and really beautiful and stuff like that but I don't know I think that well probably where the movie industry and things like that are very big maybe there it's more superficial and people duff more care about their image and looks and whatever but I don't know maybe in some (.) u::h smaller places or like in the mid country or where's not that I don't know if like in those places people maybe (.) don't really pay so much attention

AN: In my opinion there is like u::h exactly it's the two far ends it's the obesity and then the uh very health living and I don't think they have like mmh (.)

SUS: [There's not the

AN: [Well my image of a normal (0.6) normal person (.) they don't have they don't have that (.) in the middle, and they should have it and they should look like that (.) but (laughs) you know

MOD: What else?

SUS: I think they are very curious they want to know when they see a new person they ask them like I was in exchange there and people were asking me questions all the time: Oh, do you have this in Finland, do you have computers in Finland

ALL: (Laughter)

SUS: They ask everything

MOD: What did they ask?

AN: (Laughs)

SUS: If we have computers (.) or internet here, and then they asked me “Finland, is it that town in Russia?” They know about their country but they don’t know about other countries

UNCLEAR: Yeah

AN: Europe is like (INAUDIBLE) to Americans

SUS.: Yes, they know Paris and Rome and that is it (.) they don’t know anything else

SUS: Yeah, it is like Europe is a country the countries in it are like

[SUS: the states

UNCLEAR: Yeah

EL: It is unbelievable that they don’t know this stuff (.) they don’t learn it at school .

ANNE: [Yea:h

SUS: [Their school system sucks (.) it’s really [bad

HAN: [I heard it, [too

SUS: [And the it’s like they’re they’re very strict there like if you’re late (.) that’s very big thing and like the (.) you (.) they have this like dress code in the school, too [EL: Mh yeah] that (0.5) if you (.) are wearing something that your shoulders show then they then you get this uhm like a punishment or something (0.5) and they have these ru::les and regulations and (1.0) that’s too much because I thought first before I went to the United States that everything is there very uhm (.) like it’s liberal and li:ke free and uhm [you can do what]ever you want(.

HAN: [That’s not true]

SUS: But that’s not [true]

[No::] (.) no I think

ANNE: That’s I I wrote here (laughs) (0.8) uh I ↑wrote here the paradox of liberal and conservative [HAN: Yeah] because they are (.) really liberal (.) but extremely conservative at the same time So it is like rules and laws (.) a lot of stupid laws (.) and just like they have all kind of different porn but you cannot show boobs in the TV and you can show people getting beheaded in TV but you cannot show nudity and it’s like such a huge difference between

what's wrong and right that's

MOD: ok, yeah I understand, something more?

EL: To be honest I think that my image of the American people is that they are arrogant and they care about their nation and their stuff but they don't know anything about other people and they have these traditions that they always sing their flag (.) the song .

UNCLEAR: Yes I don't remember

UNCLEAR: the pledge of allegiance

EL: Yes, something like that

MOD: You don't remember how that went

EL: No, not right now

MOD: Well no one here is interested in hearing it

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

SUS: They sing it often in school and they stand up and say it and the American flag is everywhere

SUS: Huge pride of yourself, your country and everything

EL: It is kind of always about them, their stuff and

AN: I wrote they are smiling because it's you know I have some friends in Texas and I don't know where it was but anyway even the FB profile of them is like they smile and look beautiful in every single picture. If they have a home coming dance the dress is shining like a kilometer of (.) It's like Oh my God (.) everything is big and American (.) it's always like (.) the image of them is: everything is good, they are smiling and they have everything and you know

EL : Everything is always good, nothing is wrong

AN: I don't think they show

HAN: And then they like, I don't know how to explain but like if you go to an American home like they have the big TV and pool and big cars and they eat good and they buy a lot of things and .

EL: It's like showing to other people that you are doing good

UNCLEAR: yeah, yeah

HAN: They are (.) they care about their status and what other people think about them and you want to make everyone think that oh that person is so rich and they have so much money and they are so cool

SUS: And that they are so happy

HAN: yeah

MOD: yeah, ok

ANNE: That is really interesting because there are really just rich and very poor people and not really normal people in between like they are obese and anorectic people not normal people in(.)between

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

ANNE: They just have adipositas(INAUDIBLE) a lot

AN: And also I think religion is a very big thing there (.) it's huge

UNCLEAR: Hm, it's important

MOD: Something else?

[PAUSE]

EL: Oh yes, this is uuuh something what I heard about an exchange student that they always are like ↓how are you ↓I'm fine ↓I'm good [AN: Yes] and it's always the same (1.0) way it goes but it doesn't mean anything it's just [ANN;AN: Yeah] a way it happens that (0.7)

(laughs) [communication is the

AN: [Yeah you don't have to answer [EL: Yes] like when you go to a store there are always the uh uh myyjä says like

EL: Cashier

AN: yeah like ↓How are youuuu? and [SUS: Yeah]

EL: Yes that is different in Finland because we expect to hear some details about how are you really

AN: the truth

EL: (Laughs) yeah the truth maybe actually I don't know if people there tell it to strangers or even friends that they (.) I don't know if they are doing that

MOD: And you yourself you would tell to strangers if they ask how are you just like

EL: well I

AN: well I'd like to say we don't ask how are you

ALL: (Laughter) yeah

SUS: that is a different seeing of respect we respect people be not asking and they respect people be asking (.) even though they don't want to hear (.) we ask we want to hear

SUS: like they need to be talking the whole time and because I'm from Finland and I'm not so talkative and outgoing and I was just sitting there and looking down then they were asking me oh are you angry are you sad [ALL: (LAUGHTER)] what is the problem or (.) I'm just like I don't have to talk the whole time I can be quiet and

EL: yes and you are not sad when you are quiet

SUS: yeah I just feel they need to socialize the whole time and we are all so strangers and they cannot be quiet

MOD: hm, ok (.) hm, then maybe as a little intersection (.) what do you imagine what do other people think about the Finnish people

[PAUSE]

AN: shy, silent

ANNE: depressed

Giggles

ANNE: suicide

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

AN: (Laughs) oh my God

HAN: they drink a lot

EL: yes

HAN: but also kind

EL: (.) and hard working

UNCLEAR: polite

EL: well educated

UNCLEAR: yeah

MOD: and what do you think there is to these things that they say is that like is it stupid or

UNCLEAR: true

ANNE: (LAUGHTER)

AN: well you know you were asking how people think about Finland and we went like “depressed

Loud (LAUGHTER)

AN: so we think so (.) why shouldn't other people think so too?

ANNE: it's true like it's not in that extent that people think like German people are not that full of bureaucracy and not that punctual as people think but still they are (.) always every stereotype has a reason behind it it's not a just a thought just like that

MOD: hm ok, one last round now I have to think about a country now

ALL: (Laughter)

MOD continues: because I haven't been planning anything at all actually (.) is it ok if you do that once again?

UNCLEAR: hmm

MOD: hm then But let us try the same thing a bit closer (.) let's try the same thing with

Russians

UNCLEAR: ok

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: please

ALL: (Laughter)

ANNE: Russian people, not the society

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: did I say something

ANNE: huge difference!

[PAUSE]

SUS: I don't know

MOD: it does not matter

AN: it's so

MOD: as I said I didn't plan this

AN: the whole thought of Russia it's a, it's so big and you know

SUS: I don't know about the people I just in my mind there comes things about the country

AN: yeah exactly

SUS: I haven't been in touch with people from Russia

AN: yeah me neither

SUS: well I know definitely that the women they care a lot about their looks and always want to look really good and have lots of accessoire and makeup and I read some article ones that Russian women think that Finnish women are ugly because Finnish women in general don't always wear so much makeup and high heels and curls an staff like that

HAN: maybe it is the same with like Estonian women like we think that Estonian and Russian women are prostitutes when they walk around because for us a prostitute dresses like that and wear so much makeup because we don't (.) for us it is so weird

UNCLEAR: yeah

MOD: ok, more

SUS: also I worked as (.) in customers service and I met a lot of Russians in that field and they always (.) they don't know English much so they always they start talking in Russian they expect to get their service in Russian and it's very difficult because sometimes you don't (.) I mean I don't know Russian at all so if there is no one else in there who knows it and the customer don't know there are misunderstandings because they don't know any other language than Russian

EL: I also wrote down bad language education I haven't seen a Russian that could any kind of good English or any other language they always know only Russian

SUS: that is funny because I think in the USA it's the same that all people of course they speak English but they really don't speak any other languages

HAN: are they are lazy

MOD: lazy

AN: I think in the as a thing we see a certain image of the Russians we see the Russians that have that can afford a holiday in Finland or come here and they are rich and they are proud of themselves and only speak Russian because Russia is the (.) I don't know what they think (.) but they don't know anything else and I think there is a contradiction because they have a lot of poorness also

MOD: sorry a lot of?

AN: poorness, so we don't get the whole image be living in Finland we should go there and see but(.) you know as a perfect detail I can tell you that my father said that you know you'll never go in exchange to Russia and I said why and he: it's not safe (.) and that's it (.) like it's the image we get of Russia (.) it's like (.) it's right there but still so far away

MOD: and why did he say it's not safe, can you imagine that

AN: yes, it was my father and I was like you know I don't really so that (.) it, it's history (.) but

ANNE : but it really isn't that safe so (.) my cousin was living in Russia a couple of years and one of her friends got murdered there (.) just like that (.) like at one point he just vanished and they found him in the forest and that happens to foreign people and he could speak perfect Russian and you couldn't even see that he is a foreigner (.) he was gay (.) and if you (.) my cousin wasn't scared there the whole time but if you have money and you have money if you are Finnish and you go there, if you live in a better house then the house look a ruin from outside so that nobody would like that burglars wouldn't come it has to look poor (.) of course it is in some cities and some city parts (.) there are better parts but in general like near Finland Russia is really not that safe

AN: yeah, yeah (.) so

ANNE: and because there is corruption and you cannot trust the police and

UNCLEAR: yeah, that's true

ANNE: I think it is a huge difference what Russians with money look to us and what Russians without money look to us (.) and in Finland we only see (.) like you said (.) Russians that have money and want to own everything and think they deserve anything

AN: yeah

ANNE: because I have met really, really nice persons that aren't at all like that

AN: yeah, yeah

ANNE: and they are really hospitable if you go to Russia they always give you vodka they always give you food they always

AN: I wrote there vodka

ANNE: yes vodka ok (.)if you get to know Russian people they are really hospitable but if you don't know them we as Finnish people see them as the people who treated us badly in the war

UNCLEAR: yeah

HAN: (INAUDIBLE) I think that was good what you said that it is so close but it's so far away (.) like I don't have any connection to Russians or anything but I like (.) because of the war and the history and that children when they are small they learn that Russia is some kind of a negative (.) like they get this negative feeling about them because like the my grandfather who was in the war and talked about "ryssä"

UNCLEAR: yeah

HAN: and then (.) we learn to have this like negative feeling

EL: it's kind of weird because we have this kind of neutral school education books and so

AN : they are never neutral I think

EL: I also have this kind of more negative image of Russia than positive (.) but it's not like right because I don't know any Russian people really (.) or I haven't been there

AN: and you know .

SUS: I don't have any reason to dislike them or anything

EL: but I still have this negative image

AN: and you know Sweden has conquered us also and still we are like we want to win them in everything but still we are like (.) well they are Swedish, ok that is nice

MOD: they are Swedish that is nice?

UNCLEAR: they are ok because they are Swedish they have done a lot (UNCLEAR) of we hate and love them

AN: we win them in ice hockey they are fine

(LAUGHTER):

ALL: UNCLEAR: that is the deal!

MOD: so you hate and love them

AN: yes, I think so

ANNE: because if we lose against Russia in ice hockey it's like: whatever, but when we lose against Sweden it is the biggest thing in the year that has happened

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

AN: it's maybe like brother like sisterhood

ANNE: we are like big brother and little sister and Sweden is like and we are always jealous

EL: it's also because they have similar system like we have in Finland (.) they seem more similar and like we know them (.) but Russians are it's like a different world

UNCLEAR: yeah

ANNE: maybe because it is so big(.) twenty different worlds in one country

MOD: if you pass Russia you are in China

UNCLEAR: yeah, exactly (LAUGHTER)

AN: even if you think of Russian people everyone has a certain image but if you think of Russia you can see like really Asian people if you think about it and then you can see like similar to us like Fin(.)looking pale or you know blue eyes and it is very versatile

SUS: for us Russian people are like European (.) Russian like the continent Europe (.) those Russian people .

HAN: and we don't really see what is behind Ural (.) so

AN: exactly

HAN: even if it would be totally different (.) Siberia is definitely totally different, we just see Putin and St. Petersburg and

EL: yes

MOD: ok, we can as you said, because you said far and close at the same time (.) I have decided to do this now one last time

ANNE: (Laughs) ok

MOD: ok, let us see what happens. I would like you to write down the same thing about the manne

UNCLEAR: ahem, so "romanit"

AN: (laughs)

MOD: ok (.) I think, I also don't want to keep you here for ever

UNCLEAR: oh

MOD: No, no I actually (INAUDIBLE)

AN: We (INAUDIBLE) scream

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: I just said that to be charming

AN: (Laughs) oh ok

MOD: ok, what do we have?

AN: older people give a very of them a very bad image, I can say from myself that the first thing I can recall (.) how do you say it in English? (.)

UNCLEAR: Romanians

AN: Romanians, ok, Romanians (.) the first image I got is that my uncle went with a gun to get the Romanians out of our yard so that they couldn't steal anything from us. So that is the first image for me (.) it's like really bad because (.) you know (.) that's not true maybe But still if you are a child and you see something like that it stays with you

EL: and it's the most common stereotype of those people of course I think and it's also true because there are a lot of rumors that they steal stuff and (.) real stuff (.) and I know (.) because my dad is a policeman I know that they are really involved in a lot of those drug stuff and stealing and it's sad that we have this image but it's also kind of true

UNCLEAR: ahmmm

AN: It's (.) we have this image but for example I had to make a school project about them and after that it was different. I realized that they have (.) the family values are very important

ANNE: yes

AN: it's so much more (.) if you are part of Romanian family you get allowed (INAUDIBLE) and you get accepted as you are and everything like that and they give you the choice you know, you want to wear the big costume thing or not and what do you want to do with your life. But also it gives it's the problem because they are so (.) hmmm (.) they keep to themselves (.) so us Finns we don't know about them, they don't come to you and tell like "you know, I haven't stolen anything I love my family, I love my traditions. We don't know that side of them, it's the bad image that we have

MOD: you said "dresses"

AN: yeah, they have the (.)

EL: traditional

AN: yes (.) the traditional dress (.)

MOD: ok

AN: when you are 15 you have to choose if you wear it or not and if you wear it, you wear it always

MOD: ok (.) good, what else?

ANNE: (INAUDIBLE) family values, also like family as a bigger than your close family like relatives, family honor is really important (.) so it's a (.) I have a friend who is from (.) who is

half Romanian and her uncle I think once I think killed others from another family and
hmmmm

MOD: killed others?

ANNE: yeah, II it wasn't I think it was an accident or something like that but because it was
from another family (INAUDIBLE) they really have a huge problem with that family of
course because it's family honor (.) and nobody in the family is really safe

EL: I know this story too (.) they have some kind of (.) clans

UNCLEAR: yeah,

EL: yes and if others do something bad to the other clan they will hate the other family for
100 years (.) for 200 years it's (.) it's like they do not forgive those stuff

ANNE: and it's not necessarily safe (.) so some of the family member have been chased away
from the city because the other clan is dominant there (.) so

MOD: good, something else?

EL: well I also had this image that they are happy and they like to sing and they are very loud

UNCLEAR: yeah (.) they are!

AN: that's all true (.) it's like they are secure about themselves, I think so but I also think that
it's if I think the mentality of the people I think because they are minority in Finland (.) but
also in other countries (.) it may be a shield you know to show that we can do things and we
can be loud and we are here because they don't really have a secure place in our society and
that is kind of sad also to consider

MOD: hm (.) ok (.) you have lots of children written?

EL: ahem, well I have seen those families (.) big families

HAN: yeah, maybe because they are a minority they want to have a big family (.) so they
have

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

SUS: I don't know many things about the Romanians but the first image for me that comes to
my mind is also like negative like the crimes and everything else (.) and I don't know that is
just how I learned to see the people I (.) like from my parents (.) like when I go to a store and
I see Romanians there then the first thing that comes to my mind is oh now she is hiding
something under the dress and stealing something

UNCLEAR: hm

SUS: it's kind of sad

MOD: ok (.) something that hasn't come up yet?

HAN: style is really important

ANNE : and showing your (.) like the whole dress is like I want to show how beautiful (.) everything outside your appearance is really important (.) just like everybody has the image of gold jewelry and Mercedes and like cars that they drive and it's (.) that is an important part of SUS: yeah, it's kind of easy when you see them you recognize them maybe not just because of their skin color and their hair and like that but by the clothes they wear (.) even the men (.) because

UNCLEAR: yeah

SUS: they were like Jeans or (INAUDIBLE) or pants or something like that (.) they wear really fancy clothes

UNCLEAR: yeah

MOD: ok (.) yeah, this is the end of that so far

AN: laughing: oh no it's so fine (INAUDIBLE)

MOD: we will have a few closing words I would now because you are the group that I do not know most of you (.) this will be a bit stupid but it will help me to identify you that everybody please just says loudly and clearly just their name so that I know who is who and I will cut that out afterwards but please go

ANNE (.) AN (.) EL (.) SU (.) SUS (.) HAN

MOD: oh my God you sound almost the same and then you are SU and SUS

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

UNCLEAR: we should talk more

MOD: no, no it's ok, I will (.) I do it somehow (.) if I have any problem I will invite you again and they give me another sound sample

(LAUGHTER)

MOD: so yeah (.) a few closing words: how was it (.) did anyone feel awkward

UNCLEAR: no

MOD: I now need (.) this is now off record (.) of topic it's for me that I know for afterwards (.) ahmm did anyone at some point feel like he would have thought or said something but he didn't feel to do it (.) felt like anxious or something like that

[PAUSE]

MOD: Because some things that you might this was a thing that came up in every group when I always started with the Germans and the list (.) actually you were the most extremes in making a list of Germans that was overly positive (.) second (.) so elaborate like yeah culture and I don't know what (.) and I was thinking ok, where is punctual where is organized where is all that stuff and it actually wasn't there so do you have any explaining words (.) anything

that you can contribute so that I know it for later because I have to write it my report (.) did someone feel uncomfortable about that

UNCLEAR: No

ANNE: I know too much about Germany I mean we don't say the normal things because we know you already got them (laughs)

AN: (laughs) oh yeah, oh yeah

MOD: what

ANNE: you already know them everybody else always says it and we don't to think about it any more (.) it's like

MOD: yeah, the only time that I actually the first groups started like this, someone was talking about Lidl and then it came up that Lidl they call it Natzimarketti

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

ANNE: why didn't we say anything about the Nazis!!! In the whole conversation.

SUS: actually I was thinking about that

UNCLEAR: I didn't even think about it really

EL: me neither

ANNE: well I did write here that German people are really, really guilty the whole time about being at all proud about anything. But it's here if you want to.

MOD: but it can be that someone was thinking it but it just didn't come up (.) because of course something that restricts my data and I have to openly say: yes I cannot guarantee that this wouldn't have come up in other circumstances (.) that is why I am asking. And the second thing is the reason why I only asked you about the Romani (.) I only asked you it really came spontaneously because I thought how would it be to ask the people about a group that is actually present in your own environment (.) so that is why I asked (.) to see what comes up. What was really interesting at least what I heard was that pretty often people were saying "I have been uncomfortable about it because I actually think that it is not like that but I still have the it. And then this was actually: yeah I think but probably not so much so this came pretty often which I can understand (.) but at least you said it so I am thankful for that (.) you didn't just swallow it down and in that sense I think I do have quite a lot. Probably when I have written it down I kind of just realize how much different stuff I have actually. So I think it was really good also I'm happy that it's over now

ALL: (LAUGHTER)

MOD: and that I can keep on going to anything so to other things so I hope that no one felt under pressure or something like that and in this sense take the last cookies and then you are

dismissed and free go.

UNCLEAR: thank you

MOD: thank you a lot

EL: this was interesting

UNCLEAR: yeah

MOD: oh could you please write your names so that I know
