'Ways of Speaking' on Norwegian Radio 1935-1980

A Study of Text Norm Evolution

WENCHE VAGLE

Within research on media discourse, the interest in the historical dimension has been growing over the last decade or so. There is an awareness that mass media genres change over time. However, empirical research on historical shifts in meaning patterns in mass media discourse is just beginning to emerge. A minute part of this fresh ground will be covered in this article, which reports from an on-going research project on *text conventions* in radio discourse. More precisely, the issue to be addressed is the unfolding of 'ways of speaking' on Norwegian public service radio in the period 1935–1980, which roughly covers the era of The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation's (NRK) broadcasting monopoly in Norway. What was referred to as *text conventions* above can be rendered more technically as *text norms*, which form a subgroup of *social norms*. More informally, they can be given as 'ways of meaning'. They constitute *registers* and *genres*. An important subset of the radio's 'ways of meaning' is its 'ways of speaking', and it is these that are inspected in my study.[1]

My claim is that revealing facets of the radio medium's cultural impact can be uncovered via an examination of its *text norms* as they shine through in the succession of radio texts that have been produced and transmitted up through the decades. The radio's text norms is an indirect route to the social settings and functions that this medium has fostered, and ultimately to its cultural significance. If genres are 'the drive belts from the history of society to the history of language' (Bakhin, quoted from Fairclough 1992:126), then the history of a society can be surveyed through the evolution of its genre system, as it is articulated by shifts in communicative patterns.

This article will present the over-all scope of a project with the working title 'Diachronic Shifts in Radio Discourse. Linguistic Interaction and Time-Space Transformations in Norwegian Radio 1935-1980'. Given the mid-way status of the project, priority will be given to theoretical framework, problem area and investigation techniques. Nevertheless, there is also room for preliminary findings and illustrating excerpts from Norwegian radio texts (included in a separate appendix). Finally, the following question is raised: What does it mean when meaning patterns on the radio change? Answers are sought in the technological and socio-historical context of the radio medium – more specifically:

in the communicative tasks and responsibilities that radio broadcasting has taken on in Norway.

Previous Research on Present-Day Radio Talk

My interest in the historical growth of speaking patterns on the radio springs from a small-scaled survey of Norwegian radio magazine talk in the mid-1980s (Vagle 1990a, 1990b, 1991 & 1992). That study disclosed a heterogeneous picture of different radio situations expressed through more or less distinct linguistic registers. It turned out that these registers could be located along a somewhat disordered continuum from basically written registers (in all but the oral reading delivery) via different mixtures of spoken and written language to basically spoken registers (with some preplanning of topical structure). The scale materialised when the different text types in the corpus, identified on the basis of situational criteria, were ranked by frequency counts of 'spoken and written' parameters. In passing, it can be noted that these results are in agreement with other observations on radio language as a blend of speaking and writing (cp Tannen 1989: 150ff, Lindblad 1985, Jonsson 1982, Nordberg 1991, Lomheim 1987, Berge 1990: 53). The spoken-written continuum that was roughed out in my former study can be seen as an outer face of secondary orality, which is a displaced and hybrid orality, marked by planned spontaneity (Silverstone 1991:148f). In Walter Ong's wording:

This new orality has striking resemblances to the old in its participatory mystique, its fostering of a communal sense, its concentration on the present moment, and even in its use of formulas. But it is essentially a more deliberate and self-conscious orality, based permanently on the use of writing and print, *which are essential for the manufacture and operation of the equipment and for its use as well* (Ong 1990:136).

Starting from the conclusion of my prior research on radio discourse, that broadcasting has given rise to its own text strategies so that it is no longer relevant to treat the language of the air as a parallel to the printed word, the present study sets about to trace the genesis of linguistic radio registers. This endavour will outline some phases in secondary orality: namely those that are voiced by Norwegian radio in the period 1935 till 1980.

Wider Implications of Object of Study

I have stated that renewals in the radio's text norm repertoire represent a revealing object of study because they furnish an indirect path to the social situations and functions that this medium has brought about, and thereby also to its cultural import. In order to substantiate this claim, I need to sketch a couple of theoretical arguments from communication theory, sociosemiotics and action theory. Some of the theoretical points will come to a fuller view in page 186 on theoretical framework.

Radio Situations

Let me start with the gist of Joshua Meyrowitz' (1985) and Anthony Giddens' (1990) observation on mass media and modernity: The influence of modern media on social behaviour and society stems from the new spatio-temporal configurations of the communicating parties that have been brought to earth by the media industry's application of modern communication technology. With this insight as a point of departure, the radio situation can be cha-

racterised and distinguished from other communication situations on the basis of two factors: 1) the special set-ups of the communicative coordinates of time, space and participants that have been facilitated by the appliance of radio technology for broadcasting purposes, and 2) the types of social, i.e. communicative, functions that integrate such situations. Let us put these two factors under scrutiny in order to identify the mechanisms through which they influence the radio's 'ways of meaning'. This will also bring us to the issue of the radio's cultural impact.

Communication and Mediation

This is the slot in my argument where I need to make a detour to communication theoretical deliberations. According to the phenomenological framework that I am working with, communication involves one party who presents a states of affairs, an intentional object tied to her consciousness, to another party by way of a medium (or more media). It is a necessary condition for communication to occure that the other party provides an uptake, i.e. that she apprehends the states of affairs in question on the basis of the mediated presentation that was made by addressor (cp Lundsten forthcoming). Being a mental phenomenon, a communicative act needs to be carried by a physical medium in order to be perceivable. Mediation in itself is not particular to communicative acts: All action is mediated. What is specific to communicative acts, stemming from their mental nature, is the complexity of their mediation. It consists, not only of physical and perceptual layers (sound or light waves and perceptual qualities connected to the human perceptual-cognitive apparatus), but also of normatively based semiotic ones: sign systems (such as *language* and *traffic*

lights) and norms established by convention for situated use of sign systems in communication (such as *text norms*). Advanced sign systems that include both a lexicon and a grammar (or their equivalents), of which human language is the prototypical one, command yet another semiotic resource: the ability to fuse instantiations of single signs into complex wholes, i.e. *texts*, and thereby generate an infinite array of novel, agglomorated meanings (cp Lundsten forthcoming). In addition, technological and technical layers might be involved – both technology for reproducing, storing, and transmitting semiotically coded information (such as *writing, Morse* and *notes*), as well as secondary technology that opens up to further transgression of spatio-temporal boundaries (such as *print media* and *electronic media*). These diverse mediation strata interconnect so that physical, perceptual, and technical properties impose certain limits that need to be respected in the formation of semiotic medium phenomena. Apart from this ontological binding, it is the social functions – the communicative tasks, purposes and intended effects for the undertaking of which actors employ semiotic systems and conventions – that 'determine' the genesis of semiotic resources.

Text Norms Mediate
Social Situations and Functions

The point that I want to make by way of this excursion to the composite nature of communication mediation, is the fact that among all the tiers of mediation involved, it is the conventional norms for communicative use of sign systems, notably *text norms*, that respond the most directly to social situation and function. (Sign systems themselves, for example natural languages, also adapt to the jobs and settings that they

are taken into use to convey, but that is a much slower process.) Hence, it is on the semiotic level of *text norms* that one will find the imprints left by the radio situations' origos of time, space and participants. And it is here that the characteristic social functions of Norwegian (public service) radio are manifested. As is the case for social norms generally, text norms are ways of acting established by convention as means for carrying out specific tasks which spring from particular sociohistorical contexts. From the evolution of 'ways of meaning' on the radio, one can therefore deduct what social relations radio texts have been (and are) used to mark, and what communicative missions this medium has been (and is) ascribed. Consequently, to anatomise the unfolding of text norms on Norwegian public service radio will yield glimpses of the transition from its traditional obligations and functions such as 'information', 'education' and 'diffusion of (national) culture' towards missions that are often summed up as 'social integration', 'reinforcement of personal identity', 'entertainment', 'participatory adventure', and 'consumer service'.[2] It is against this backdrop that 'ways of speaking' stand out as an interesting object of study. (However, a description of text norm metamorphoses will not tell what the medium has actually been used for. Reception research will have to be mobilised in order to look into such matters.)

Text Norms Mediate Culture

I need to strengthen my theoretical platform, building on ideas from sociosemiotics (Halliday 1990, Ventola 1987) and action theory (Giddens 1990a:38), in order to explicate in what sense 'ways of meaning' express social situations and culture in general. The theoretical edifice to be raised

will also lay bare in what way the radio's 'ways of speaking' realise the specific social settings engendered by this broadcasting medium and thereby manifest its cultural meaning. In condensed form, the argument runs as follows: A culture, i.e. a 'way of life', is constituted by its situational types, which in their turn are realised by the set of 'ways of doing things' commanded by its members. These activity types are created, maintained, transformed and annihilated in actual actions. In proverbial form, a culture *is* what its members *do*. Within communication, actions are communicative, which implies that 'ways of doing' amount to 'ways of meaning' is this field. So, it is through the realisation circle holding between 'text mediated communicative actions – situations – culture' that text norms – as uttered by finer or coarser textual patterns, couched in text mosaics – contribute to the creation of a culture's specificity and thereby serve to locate the culture in question on the sociohistorical dimension in relation to other cultures.[3]

Theoretical Framework and Object of Study

Theoretically, this study is grounded in the sociosemiotic 'school' in linguistics, associated first and foremost with M.A.K. Halliday's name. The main achievement of this theory is that it explicitly appreciates language as a medium for social actions in social contexts. It sees language as 'a set of socially-contextualized resources of behaviour, a "meaning potential" that is related to situations of use' (Halliday 1990:34). 'Language is the ability to "mean" in the situation types, or social contexts, that are generated by the culture' (loc cit).[4] In addition to this theoretical tradition, I draw on a more explicitly formulated theory of text norm constitution and change (Berge

1990, 1991, 1992 & 1993), influenced by Mukarovsky and Voloshinov.

What Is Discourse?

My object of study in broad terms is 'diachronic shifts in Norwegian radio discourse from 1935 to approximately 1980' (cf project title given initially). Let me examine this object in order to bring out its constitutive parts and pin down the specific point of interest within the object, namely *text norm evolution*. In addition, such an analysis of the object's constitution will lay out a bridge to my operationalised research questions and analytical tools. The specifying parts of this object, 'Norwegian radio' and 'from 1935 to approximately 1980', are more or less self-explanatory delimitations that need no further comment. The part 'diachronic shifts' will be dealt with on page 192. First, I will concentrate on the key term *discourse*. According to the sociosemiotic definition that I am working with, *discourse* as a social process consists of *text* and *context*.[5]

A text is a medium for social action (Berge 1990, Ventola 1987:16, Lundsten forthcoming). In the sociosemiotic perspective it has been somewhat informally defined as 'language that is doing some job in some context' (Halliday & Hasan 1990: 10), more formally as language that 'functions as a unity with respect to its environment' (Halliday & Hasan 1992:2). The Halliday tradition is first and foremost concerned with verbal texts. This does not mean that *text* is considered a linguistic phenomenon only. Many texts – notably mass media texts such as radio programmes, films and cartoons – draw on other semiotic systems in addition to the linguistic one. Others rely solely on non-verbal semiotic systems, for instance musical and iconic ones.

What Is the Link between Text and Context?

Now, what is the link between *text* and *context* that enables us to say that they form an integrated whole, named *discourse*? Let me turn to sociology and sociolinguistics in order to venture an answer to that question. Empirical studies in sociolinguistics over the last three og four decades have documented that language use correlates systematically with situation type.[6] On a less abstract level this implies that people vary their linguistic practices according to what they are doing – according to the nature of their activity and the social context in which they are using language to perform some job. This must mean that language users do not chose arbitrarily or 'freely' from their linguistic resources when they speak or write. Rather, their linguistic actions are informed by some norms of conduct. Members of society learn how to mean in social settings. Through experience, they develop a sensibility to cultural, situational and verbal contexts that enables them as speakers to select (and as hearers to predict) the systematic norms governing the particulars of a text. In Dell Hymes' well-known wording, this sensibility is known as 'communicative competence' (cp Halliday 1990:32).

Linguistic action is, of course, but a sub-type of human action in general. Therefore, sociology – more precisely – action theory, is an obvious place to search for a hypothesis on what motivates linguistic actions. All varieties of action theories, including precursors such as voluntarism and utilitarianism, set out to explain human behaviour. They often start from the observation that there seems to be some consistency, some recurring patterns, in human behaviour, and try to explain how this can be. Answers vary across the continuum be-

tween the limiting boundaries of the human condition: biology (heredity), physical environment, and culture as a normative symbolic system (Parsons 1968, VII:432).

In action theory 'proper' (Émile Durkheim, Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, Alfred Schutz, Anthony Giddens ...) social norms are regarded as the regulator of human actions. Still, there are divergent understandings of the nature of social norms and the processes through which their regulatory function is achieved. In brief, a movement has taken place in action theory towards explicitly semiotic conceptions of social norms. Max Weber points to the meaningful aspect of social norms and the way they form cultural meaning systems (Parsons 1968, VII:433). The conception of social norms as semiotic constructs is even clearer in phenomenological ethnomethodology with its qualification of common-sense reality as – in Schutz' wording – 'sedimentation of meaning' (Natanson 1968). Yet, the semiotic structure of social norms is not brought to the fore in sociological thought. Rather, it is my interpretation, buttressed by ideas from sociosemiotics and text norm theory.

By this excursion to action theory, it is made plausible that what mediates between communicative actions carried by texts and their contexts (or communicative situations), is a normative component. This normative component is the integrating device that moulds the constitutive parts *text* and *context* into the functional whole *discourse*. The normative constituent is often labelled *code* in semiotic models of communication such as the famous one by Roman Jakobson (1960). It holds semiotic resources of two kinds: 1) sign systems 'proper' (i.e. *language* and *music*) and 2) norms for situated use of sign systems (i.e. *text norms*) (page 185).

The Semiotic World of Language and Society

Because it is the normative component that integrates *text* and *context*, it stands out as a promising point to spotlight in a study of discouse. Yet, before empirical investigation of such an object can be embarked upon, its ontological status needs to be considered in order to find methodical approaches through which to grasp it. The internal structure of the object must also be brought out in order to encircle the specific point to concentrate on within the normative component itself.

Since a clarification of these two matters presupposes an understanding of what a semiotic normative component is, a few lines will be spent on that issue first. In semiotics, it will be recalled, an 'object' is not said to be a sign on the basis of some fixed ontological criterium. Rather, a sign is everything that can be taken as significantly substituting for something else (Eco 1979:7). A sign is something which stands 'to somebody in some respect or capacity' (Pierce, cited from Eco 1979:15). It is the functional relationship, established by social convention, between 'the something' that stands for 'something else' which is the defining criterium of the sign (cp Eco 1979:7&16, Nöth 1990:15&42). In Hjelmslev's formulation, there is a relation of solidarity between *expression* ('something') and *content* ('something else'): a sign function holding between the two functives (*expression* and *content*) of the sign (Nöth 1990:70). Within both functives, Hjelmslev distinguishes between *form* and *substance*. By this procedure, he dissolves the indeterminacy as to whether the sign vehicle (expression) is to be understood as 'a particular physical event or object' (Morris 1946:96, 367, cited from Nöth 1990:80) or as a mental object

– as in Saussure's conception of the signifier as a 'psychological imprint' or 'acoustic image'. What Hjelmslev's differentiation achieves, is to assign the physical and physiological *expression-substance* to the realm of physics and psychology, and to give priority within semiotic inquiry to the *expression-form,* which is said to be the abstract conceptual structure of the expression (Nöth 1990:80).[7]

Let me demonstrate this sign concept by explicating the sign function of human language. Language as a semiotic system is constituted by lexico-grammatical forms (the expression side of the sign) which realise semantic meaning (the content side of the sign). The standard way to illustrate the arbitrary and conventional nature of the relation between expression and content, is to compare lexical items from different languages. The expression-forms *fløte* (Norwegian), *grädde* (Swedish) and *rjómi* (Icelandic) all have the same semantic content – a content that in English is carried by the expression-form *cream.* (This exposition applies to what André Martinet labelled the 'first articulation' of language – its meaningful forms. What is special to language as a semiotic system, is the fact that these meaningful forms in their turn are realised by the 'second articulation' of language – the meaning differentiating sound system, the phonemes, of language.)

Loaded with this semiotic weaponry, let me now dismember the complexity of the normative component that mediates between *text* and *context* in order to zoom in on the part to be scrutinized in my study, namely *text norms*. An object can be broken down in different ways, depending on theoretical perspective and research interests. A sociosemiotic analysis brings out the following constituents within the normative component: *language*, *text norms* and *situation*. This break-down is motivated by the function that the tripartite norm structure is set to fulfil, namely to mediate between texts and contexts. The hinge of sociosemiotic thought is an understanding of both *language* and *situation*, as well as their linkage through *text norms*, as based on semiotic social norms. In epitome, the normative component holding between *text* and *context* can be described as three interrelated norms in the following way: It consists of the semiotic repertoire of society (i.e. *situation types*), which is connected to the semiotic repertoire of language (i.e. the *linguistic system*) through a third norm: the repertoire of linguistic actions (i.e. *text norms*).[8]

The qualification of *situation* as a semiotic construct is not as mysterious as it might seem at first eyesight. The fundamental idea can be traced in various social sciences, such as sociology, anthropology and ethnography. A pertinent example is the 'microsociology-of-knowlegde'-school as it is presented by Berger and Luckmann (1991 [1966]). In this tradition *social reality* or *society* (which equals *culture* in ethnographic terms) is defined as socially constituted knowledge or meaning (Hudson 1980:74, cp Halliday 1990:81, 126&169). What is captured by such a semiotic definition of situation, is the typeness of any given instance of context. The indeterminacy that pertains to the concept *context* in many frameworks between basically material interpretations and more sociocognitive ones, is resolved in the sociosemiotic perspective through its apprehension of extralinguistic reality as a semiotic edifice: Physical reality is regarded as the expression of semiotic content.[9]

It is less controversial to regard *language* as a semiotic system, as it is the prototypical one. The situated evolution of human language has resulted in a naturally designed communication system construed

around three basic metafunctions: the *ideational*, the *interpersonal* and the *textual*. People do more things simultaneously when they act communicatively. For one thing, they present 'states of affaires' – experiences with the 'inner' and 'outer' world, as well as experiences that are already formulated in signs. In doing this, actors employ the communicative function which is called *ideational* in sociosemiotic terms.[10] It is sometimes referred to as the *observer function*. It is the function which infuses texts with 'content' – to use the dichotomous 'form content'-terminology which is widespread in textual studies. However, there are also other aspects to communicative actions – aspects which are often lumped together under the cover heading 'form' in the binary conceptualisation mentioned, and often considered to be ancillary to the 'content'-function. In the sociosemiotic perspective, this remainder category is further decomposed so as to spell out the nature of the other functions residing in communicative actions. When allowed to come out in their own right, these functions take on important roles that are not merely subservient to the 'content' one. In sociosemiotic theory, these other two or three metafunctions are labelled the *interpersonal function*, which embraces the *expressive function*, and the *textual function*. They are fairly different in nature. The interpersonal function enable participants to parttake in social relationships, and to mark them on the dimensions of social hierarchy and solidarity, whereas the expressive function provides actors with means for expressing their subjectivity and social identity. The last function mentioned, the textual function, allows participants to combine the different aspects of their communicative actions into composite wholes that constitute or form parts of coherent texts. Last, but not least, it is this enabling textual function that makes it possible to anchor text-borne messages in their non-textual context. The interpersonal function is also known as the *intruder* function; the textual as the *relevance* function (Halliday 1990:48 &112f).

The lexicogrammatical and semantic norms of the world's linguistic systems constitute different languages – such as English and Norwegian. In comparison, *text norms* do not form different languages, but rather different *registers* and *genres*, that can be transferred across language barriers. Compare the way journalistic text norms travel across various kinds of boundaries (between different linguistic communities, different media, different [sub-]genres ...).

Social Norms and Text Norms

Time has come to offer definitions both of *social norms* in general and of the sub-group *text norms*. *Social norms* are socially established semiotic constructs that generate human action, judgement, evaluation, perception, affection and cognition when instantiated in specific situations (Berge 1990:30; Williams 1968:204ff). In so doing, they found human rationality. As a considerable amount of human activity is symbolic and takes place through texts, quite a few of our social norms are text norms. *Text norms* can be defined as conventional expectations concerning textual behaviour and guide lines for such behaviour (Berge 1990:51).

Routes to Text Norms

Now that radio *text norms* have been picked out as the point within radio discourse to focus on in my inquiry, and then given a fuller definition – both as an isolated concept and in terms its position within the integrated whole of discourse, it is time to

consider methodical issues. How does one set about to examine *text norms*? The first requirement to be met in an empirical investigation, is to *localise* the object of study. Where are *text norms* situated? What is their ontological status? The only place to look for something, is in material reality. In a first approach, one can therefore lay down as a bridging hypothesis that *text norms* – defined as 'the conventional expectations and guide lines for textual behaviour' – will be manifested in textual behaviour. My explicit interpretation of social norms as semiotic constructs takes us a bit further in encircling what part of the norm which is exhibited in human activity, namely its expression. As norms are signs, there is a sign function at work: an expression side related to a content side (cf page 188). The conventional meaning of norms (their content) is expressed in (typical) human behaviour. From this it follows that the contents of *text norms* are embodied in (typical) symbolic actions fused in texts.

The questions is, then, what tools there are for studying the typeness of text-borne linguistic behaviour. Stated in blanket terms, humanistic science has produced two approaches (and an accelerating number of methods) for researching social norms. One basic methodology is to use the actual behaviour itself as data, and search for regularities in the activities themselves. This research scheme is more complicated than it sounds in that it involves defining description categories and procedures, as well as criteria for delimiting empirical data. Applied to my problem area, this approach can roughly be given as destilling text norms governing linguistic behaviour on Norwegian radio from 1935 onwards on the basis of radio texts from the relevant period. With reference to the semiotic norm conception presented above, the procedure is to search for con-

sistencies in textual patterns, which can be regarded as empirical evidence (or observable consequences) of an underlying norm (cp Berge 1990:42f, 54 & 67; Bhatia 1993: 22ff). This is the primary approach in my study. It will be fleshed out in more detail on page 196ff.

The other basic way to conduct research on human behaviour and its normative foundation is to bring out the actors' own judgements on what they are doing with the aid of various investigation techniques. In the case of journalistic ideals and professional standards for programme production and textual presentation in a broadcasting corporation, such methods include sitting in on editorial discussions, looking into sources like internal publications (Annual Reports and Accounts, policy documents, internal magazines, handbooks and guidelines in journalistic production) and educational material (textbooks, courses etc in broadcasting journalism), as well as interviewing journalists, programme producers and other staff on their likes and dislikes in professional matters. Imprints of the operating norms will be found in the selection of matters discussed, in explicit and implicit assessments (both negative and positive), in pieces of advice, in sanctions etc. With reference to the bridging hypothesis mentioned above, participants' evaluations as carried by such vehicles can be regarded as outer projections of an underlying norm (cp Berge 1990:42&43 Bhatia 1993:22ff). In my study, this approach will not be deployed in its own right. Rather, information gathered through such sources have guided my selection of texts to include in the corpus, my formulation of research questions, and the range of linguistic aspects to put under scrutiny. In addition, these sources might function as a background against which to interpret text-analytical findings.[11]

What Is Evolution?

There is a part of my study object that I, as yet, have not touched upon, which is rendered as *diachronic shifts*, alternatively as *evolution*. As a preliminary – pragmatic and pre-theoretical – qualification, let us say that 'text norm evolution' refers to changes in 'ways of meaning' that take place over time.

Let me start charging the concept *evolution* with more content by recapitulating what was stated in section 3.5 on the existence mode of semiotic systems: They exist in actual use. Sociosemiotics is a context-relational model of meaning (cp Lemke 1993:248). It underlines the way in which language and its derived connotative semiotic systems (registers and genres) are created, maintained and changed in constant exchange with their environment. When these systems are employed (instantiated) in actual use, the instantiations have a retroactive potential to change the systems themselves. As it is put in Mukarovsky's formulation:

> *Every norm changes by nature of the fact that it is constantly applied, and it must adjust itself to new circumstances which arise as a result of these new applications* (1970:31, cited from Berge 1990:56).

As Halliday points out, complex semiotic systems are unstable; they persist only through change; their state of being is becoming (Halliday & Martin 1993:110).[12]

The evolution of any complex semiotic system has a mixed background in both 'internal forces', ie the instability and variability of the system itself (cp Halliday 1993:109, Berge 1990:59), and 'external forces', ie medium-specific properties and the social functions that the system is set to fulfil (Halliday 1993:110). The external socio-technological driving forces, rooted in specific socio-historical situations, are the spurs of text norm evolution. They are what it takes for text norm innovations to occure. For the time being, they are left out of the picture. (Such matters will be touched upon on page 201f.) The present section concentrates on the 'internal forces' or conditions – i.e. what it is in the nature of text norms as semiotic systems that facilitate evolution.

As mentioned, the condition for text norm renewal is the built-in instability and variability of the norm system itself. This synchronic variation opens up to diachronic shifts. In opposition to de Saussure's abstract and static conception of language, thinkers in the counterstream of European semiotic thought argue that language is not a stable system of identical forms. Rather, it exists by virtue of containing conflicting norm systems, which refers to conflicts in society (Voloshinov 1986; Berge 1990:57).

Now, what is it in the nature of semiotic systems that caters for this internal variation? The answer rings as one contemplates the ontological status of such systems: the sign function itself (the relation between expression and content planes) and the existence mode of signs (their 'life' in actors' situated communicative acts). In other words, the answer lies in the process of interpretation – in the never-ending semiosis, in Pierce's formulation. As mentioned, the fundamental insight of semiotics concerns the arbitrary nature of the relation between the content and expression planes of the sign. Since this relation is conventional, founded on norms, it means – in the case of language and its derived connotative systems – that the relations between lexiocogrammar (expression), semantics (denotative content) and text norms (connotative content, i.e. registers and genres) are not fixed, but open to

constant renegotiation as the systems are applied in situated use. Addressors and addressees employ their incorporated norms – their linguistic and communicative competence – in order to produce and interpret messages, i.e.: to establish connections between the situation of the communicative event, the semantic content of the communicative acts, and the observable lexicogrammatical forms which are used to carry this content in this situation. As there is hardly ever full agreement between the addressor's and addressee's competence, various (mis)understandings are liable to occur. In turn, this might give rise to norm ajustments (Berge 1990: 60ff).[13]

When shifting focus from the actors to their semiotic resources, such conflicts within or among actors on what normative standards to go by in situated behaviour, linguistic or otherwise, come across as *conflicting, colliding* or *heterogeneous norm systems* – in the somewhat 'metaphysical' semiotic jargon.

When contradictory norm systems unfold in texts, they might collide and produce new systems (Berge 1990:58). The process through which such synchronic presence of variation and conflicting norms opens up to diachronic shifts over time has been labelled *individuation* (cp Lemke 1993:257).

It is individuation that is the root of evolution. The concept itself is taken from biology, where it mediates between two types of biological change: the development of the individual and the evolution of the species. An individual only recapitulates its species (its type) in general. In many specific ways it is unique. This means that the individual's developmental trajectory can deviate from the type-trajectory in a way that might be passed on to future individuals. By this individuation, the deve-

lopmental trajectory of the type evolves. Evolution occurs when individuation leads to a novel dynamic stage by the new trajectory being recapitulated in a significant number of successor individuals (Lemke 1993:257, cp Berge 1990:116).

The process of individuation takes place, not only in biological systems, but also in semiotic ones as individual texts never reproduce their underlying semiotic norm systems in full and identical form. Rather, texts are unique interpretations of a norm. As such, they represent a dynamic potential for change (cp Berge 1990:62) through the same kind of individuating process which has just been described for biological systems. The early history of NRK can be used for illustration. It holds many examples of strong, independent radio journalists who found their own 'ways of meaning' in the pioneer days and passed them on to coming generations of radio reporters so that new radio text norms were established (cp Dahl 1991:113ff).

Delimitation of Problem Area

As mentioned earlier text norms are manifested as regularities in actual textual behaviour. If textual patterns are to be seized in an empirical study, they must be given operationalised definitions. For practical as well as theoretical reasons, there is also a need to single out the most relevant subset of text norms to put under scrutiny. Let me first identify the textual level on which regularities indicative of norms can be searched out. *Text* has been defined as a medium for social action, which is to say that a text is a pragmatic-semantic unit. It consists of communicative act(s) sustained by semantic meanings. Its meanings (i.e. content) are expressed through lexicogrammatical forms – i.e. words and struc-

tures. This is to say that consistencies in text-conveyed social actions can be found by surveying lexicogrammatical structures in texts (cp Halliday & Hasan 1990:10).

Now, language is a multifarious semiotic system, and verbal texts carry different kinds of meanings (page 188f). As discussed at some length in previous section, I am primarily interested in text norms, not in semantic meaning as realised by lexicogrammatical forms *per se*. However, text norms appear in texts as specific configurations of meanings, associated with specific situation types (cp Halliday & Hasan 1990:38f). Thus, they are indirectly expressed by lexicogrammatical forms too. In sociosemiotics, this 'double use' of lexicogrammatical forms is sometimes given as a 'realisation circle' between language and text norms (cp Ventola 1987:63). Language as a semiotic system has its own means of organising expression, namely phonology (op cit:57), whereas text norms constitute a second-order semiotic system – a connotative one – with no articulation in its own right. Rather, it uses language for its realisation (Ventola 1987:57, Barthes 1967:30).

Text norms pertain to the whole spectrum of higher-order textual patterns associated with typical social situations. Therefore, the scope of inquiry in an empirical study of text norms must be narrowed down. My actual delimitation has been informed by three factors: 1) a central hypothesis in sociosemiotic theory on the relationship between semantic meanings and contextual aspects known as the 'metafunctional hook-up hypothesis' (cp Ventola 1987:38); 2) the specificity of radio contexts, namely their special spatio-temporal arrangement of participants (cp page 184f and also page 195 below); and 3) my own listening to taped radio programmes up through the decades. In epitome, all these

factors suggest that it is not so much the 'content' of media messages as it is their 'form' that is medium-sensitive and liable to be affected by the specificity of mass media contexts. Therefore, the searchlight is directed at text norms concerning 'presentational forms'. They fall in two groups: 1) those that are means through which radio performers' and listeners' identities, as well as the participants' role relationships, are constructed (style, tone, level of formality, forms of mention and address, turn-taking rights ...) and 2) those that are means through which radio texts are realised as wholes and anchored in context via various cohesive bonds (including deictic expressions), montage techniques, formats generally, and verbal formats especially – such as monologue, dialogue, interview, debate, and other multi-voice speech exchange systems. In sociosemiotic terminology, text norms of the first type are realised via *interpersonal* and *expressive meanings*, whereas type two text norms are expressed by *textual meanings*.

These two lines of 'presentational form' converge on the spoken-written dimension. For reasons to be dwelt with on page 197, it is this dimension that is marked out for a closer inspection in my study. Steered by my listening in NRK's archives, I have chosen to give special emphasis to the following three impact points on the spoken-written dimension:

1) the handling of the speech situation coordinates (time, space and participants).

2) methods for textual production – i.e. pre-planning strategies (scripting and rehearsal) and post-processing techniques (editing), and

3) interactional characteristics (monologue versus dialogue formats).

The Double Doubleness
of Radio Context

[The broadcasting] puts the listener in direct connection with the speaker. And the public is able to hear just as well as if they had been present. This is much more valuable than to read a lecture, for instance in a paper. The direct connection between the performer and his auditorium is the most essential aspect of broadcasting. The other essential aspect is that one does not need to be present. Hereby, the auditorium of the speaker becomes infinitely much bigger. It grows from a few hundreds or thousands to ten thousands, to hundred thousands. A speaker can directly address a million people, a whole population.[14]
(Statement by director Nickelsen, The Norwegian Board of Telegraphy, in his inauguration speech on the opening of the first Norwegian broadcasting company in December 1924; cited from Dahl 1991:28.)

An appreciation of radio contexts and their influence on text norm formation in radio discourse needs to start from the spatio-temporal specificity of the radio situation, which is rooted in the application of radio technology for broadcasting purposes. Radio talk is situated in a communication situation that is minimally double in at least one dimension: space. In most cases there is not only a disjunction of place, but also of time, between communicator and audience (cp Bell 1991:85). There are three consequences of this spatio-temporal distantiation that invite further comment.

First, when the participants in the communicative event are not connected through the situatedness of place (Giddens 1991:16) – as is the case in face-to-face communication – this brings about certain problems of time-space coordination. When the dimension of space is liberated from concrete places and the dimension of time is no longer bound to natural rhythms, it means that physical nature no longer provides spatio-temporal connections that safeguard a comprehensible, coherent world, and that this work needs to be taken over by social processes. According to Anthony Giddens, this is the source of modernity's dynamism (1990:17).

The most urgent problem that needed to be solved when language is put to use in mediated communicative events, stems from the fact that language as a semiotic system is situated in nature, owing to its evolution in fixed spatio-temporal contexts (Benveniste 1971:219, Ducrot 1984, Halliday & Hasan 1990:45). Therefore, utterances contain traces of the actual communicative event(s) which fostered them, in the form of deictic expressions pointing to the participants, time, and space of the engendering context (cp Nöth 1990:332; Benveniste 1971:217-222). Given the manner in which linguistic texts, as a result of this mechanism, encapsulate their context, the crucial problem when communicating through technologically mediated texts is to find ways of producing integrated messages in communication situations that are discontinuous spatially, and ambiguous temporally.

Second, the context of radio talk can be temporally double in more ways: Actual performances are, for the most part, more or less pre-planned, scripted and rehearsed (cp Goffman 1974:53ff).[15] Technological equipment for recording and editing has complicated the temporal dimension further in facilitating extra temporal layer(s) of editing and delayed transmission.

Third, the spatial doubleness of radio contexts imposes definite limits on the type of interaction that can take place through the radio medium. There can be no interaction between the two main parties in the communicative event, the addressor (radio performer[s]) and the addressee (radio listeners). Disparate com-

pensatory strategies have emerged because of this deficit, which is universal to mass communication media. In the case of radio broadcasting, these strategies include postal listener contact, listener activation, and formats with different kinds of listener participation – such as studio shows and phone-ins. Still, this does not alter the fact that the communicative party of the audience as a whole has no means of interactive participation. When a radio reporter addresses her radio audience directly, she is forced to do so through monologue formats. However, the spatial separation of participants makes it opportune to construct complex situations with embedded communicative circuits. Interaction on a certain level can be introduced with the aid of miscellaneous multi-voice formats such as split narration, discussions, interviews and game shows. The communicative interaction between radio performers participating in such formats takes place in an 'inner communicative circuit'. This circuit as a whole occupies the addressor role in the 'outer communicative circuit', in which the radio audience holds the addressee role. The spatial dimension can be further multiplied – for instance by the presence of a live audience in studio-based programmes. The interaction between the studio audience and the 'inner-most situation' of the host and her guests then forms a mediating circuit between the 'inner-most' situation and the 'outer situation'. Thus, the mediating circuit is constituted by the radiation of the 'inner-most' situation as a whole functioning in the addressor role and the studio audience functioning in the addressee role.

Empirical Approaches and Preliminary Findings

According to the semiotic-phenomenological concept of social norms as meaningful constructs residing in human actions (cf page 190f, text norms are manifested in textual regularities. So, what is needed for conducting empirical research on shifts in text norms pertaining to the radio's 'presentational forms', are some scalpels for dissecting radio texts that will make consistencies and inconsistencies in presentational text patterns stand out. For the undertaking of that job I have designed an instrument labelled 'diachronic register analysis'. It consists of more interconnecting parts. Some modules are fully formalised in terms of lexicogrammatical description, whereas others are more supple. What my investigation technique achieves, is to identify a further specified set of recurring textual constellations on different levels of delicacy in actual texts, and make differences come out.

Since this analytical framework is a meticulous grid, details will have to be left aside. This chapter is devoted to the radio text corpus. It deals with a method for exorcising historical shifts in text norms and present crude versions of the model's linguistic parameters. They represent an operationalisation of the spoken-written dimension with the three focal points that were picked out as particularly salient to the evolution of radio presentational forms in section 4: 1) spoken-written qualities in general, 2) time-space transformations, 3) discourse processing techniques, and 4) interactional characteristics. Because quantitative counts and statistical handling of the spoken-written parameters remain to be performed, no results will be be reported from the general screening of spoken-written qualities (cp page 197). For the three pin-pointed domains on the spoken-written dimension, my tentative analytical try-outs have produced some preliminary findings, which confirm the impressions that I have gained from extensive listening

to radio productions in NRK's archives. Nevertheless, what is presented as preliminary findings below, should be regarded as hypotheses in need of further testing.

Data

As already mentioned my primary data consist of radio texts, which have been transcribed, segmented and indexed so as to make them accessible for detailed linguistic analysis. Both linguistic transcription and further data preparation are meticulous and time-consuming procedures. Therefore, a corpus of spoken data for fine-grained linguistic analysis has to be restricted. To a certain extent, my selection of data was governed by the content and organisation of NRK's archives. Three of the most prominent radio journalists in NRK's history are used as 'cases': Arthur Klæbo (texts from 1936, 1956, 1957, 1971 and 1978), Rolf Kirkvaag (texts from 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1956, 1959 and 1970) and Toralv Øksnevad (texts from 1935, 1936, 1938, 1965 and 1971). These three radio reporters are widely acknowledged for their influential and innovative journalistic practice. The corpus also comprise some miscellaneous texts for the illustration of certain points. All in all, there are around 25 text in the corpus (in duration between 4 minutes and 1 1/2 hours each), which sum up to about 14 hours of recordings. The number of running words is around 70 000. Only monologue and dialogue formats have been included, whereas other multi-voice formats are left out.

Capturing Diachronic Change

Before describing my analytical model in terms of linguistic parameters, let me sketch how it is to be used in order to seize the dynamic aspect of text history. In broad wording, my text analytical procedure for identifying the radio's text norms and pinning down their evolution, is to 'sift' radio texts dating 1935 till 1980 through an analytical net that catches certain predefined linguistic patterns, and then make comparisons across texts by way of a contrastive method. The contrastive analyses are partly qualitative (through illustrative examples), partly quantitative (through descriptive statistical measurements of lexicogrammatical parameters). As my database comprises texts from a fairly extended period (1935-1980), diachronic continuities and shifts will stand out fairly clearly. As touched upon in previous section, the total number of texts included in the corpus is low – for practical reasons. This limitation means that the spread of data across the historical period to be covered is fairly thin. Hence, the empirical verifications to be offered in this study merely amount to some examplary dives into the radiophonic ocean of the past.

Capturing Contours of Secondary Orality

The reason why the linguistic description in this study fastens on the spoken-written dimension is simple. In the sections *Wider Implications of Object of Study*, and *The Double Doubleness of Radio Context*, I watched radio discourse from two different vistas: 1) the characteristic communication situation of the radio medium, and 2) the social functions of radio discourse. When shifting the perspective to the semiotic means that mediate between situations and functions, our eyes fall upon the focal point of 'the orality-and-literacy paradigm' – an interdisciplinary humanistic field that covers the complex issue of socio-psychological consequences of orality and literacy. From this angle, the abstraction and explosion of the

time and space dimensions effected by modern technologies for handling information and communication, is seen as 'the technologising of the word' – the transition from speech to writing, and further on to hybrid mixtures which characterise 'secondary orality': 'the orality of telephones, radio, and television, which depends on writing and print for its existence' in Walter Ong's words (1990:3).

The composite circumstances of language production on the radio pave the way for texts reflecting more situations. To a large extent, radio talk consists of basically written language transformed to spoken language. By this productional procedure, both the writing situation of manuscript production and the oral situation of actual speech delivery are liable to be encapsulated in the text itself. Besides, a third situation intervenes through the conscious awareness of the listeners 'out there'. In the case of 'multi-voice' formats, the situational complexity is even greater, and there will be indices in the text of the various embedded communicative circuits. These intertwined productional and situational threads engender texts which are heteroglossic on the spoken-written dimension.

It is this hybrid nature of radio texts that is to be diagnosed through a variety of register analysis, i.e. a quantitative registration of selected 'spoken-written' parameters. The specific selection of linguistic parameters for such an analysis has been guided by the aboundant findings from the "the spoken and written discourse approach". In particular, studies by Wallace Chafe (Chafe & Danielewicz 1987, Chafe & Tannen 1987) and Douglas Biber (Biber 1991, Biber & Finegan (eds) 1994, Biber & Hared 1992), as well as a Norwegian study on spoken syntax (Hanssen et al 1978), have been exploited.

As indicated in a former section, the three aspects of 'presentational form' that were identified as loci for text norm transition on the radio – 1) time-space configurations and participants' role relationships, 2) text processing techniques, and 3) interactional characteristics – are all related to the spoken-written dimension. They represent close-up pictures of specific dominions within the dimension.

Capturing Time-Spaces

The first close-up picture brings to light the different solutions to the coordination problems created by the time-space configurations of the radio medium. The investigation technique is to analyse patterns in the use of deictic expressions of time, space and participants. Such expressions perform textual jobs in the discourse. They serve to anchor the subject matters discussed ('the topical plane' of discourse, to use the terminology of enunciation theory) in the actual context ('the discourse plane') (Benveniste 1959 & 1971, Ducrot 1984, Larsen 1989:12).

The purpose of this part of the analysis is to track the historically-specific means that radio discourse has come up with in order to overcome (?) the insurmountable time-space barrier between senders and receivers. My preliminary findings on this part of the project suggest that various text strategies have evolved – strategies that define the relationship between the participants in different ways. I have coined some metaphorical captions through which to grasp the essence of the different semiotic construals of radio context. In a rough chronological order, there are strategies of suppression, miracle, exclusion, and simulated interaction.[16] The suppression strategy is the solution that has evolved in

writing as a means for liberating the text from its immediate non-textual context. In its purest variety, it generates texts that are not anchored neither in time, place or participants, but rather rest in themselves. The miracle strategy is a contrary solution. It makes the most of the participants's spatial separation, while emphasising their temporal unity in a text strategy that underlines the miracle of the new medium. The exclusion strategy excludes the listeners from the communicative event by referring to them in third person – *the listener(s)*. The latest solution, simulated interaction, employs direct address in second person (*you*) – thereby simulating the counterpart's presence.[17]

Capturing Text Production Processes

As touched upon, the time-space distantiation of radio discourse opens up to various text processing techniques which are not available in face-to-face communication. Some of them are more or less specific to the radio medium. My next close-up photograph is meant to catch changes in text productional processes such as preplanning and post-processing techniques. However, it is not a straight-forward task to devise analytical tools for this purpose. Evidently, the best way to study textual productional methods such as scripting and editing in existing productions, would have been to compare final texts with documentation on the textual production process (working notes, manuscripts, running schedules, unedited recordings, preliminary productions). Unfortunately, this is not feasible as notes, manuscripts and raw recordings are – for the most part – unrecoverable. So, the second-best solution is opted for, namely to go by various prosodic, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic 'speech management cues' (cp Allwood et

al 1990) in the texts themselves. To a trained ear, these yield a fairly good picture of the degree to which a text passage is preplanned. In order to 'freeze' the impressions that are thus gained, they have been written down in the transcripts with the aid of some notational conventions for describing speech management phenomena and paralinguistic features in general. Next, they are both inspected by eye in order to assess the alternation in pre-planning degree, and surveyed by machine for quantitative measurements. Then, main tendencies are extracted. However, there are obvious pitfalls to this approach. One of them is the competence skilled reporters have in concealing discourse pre-planning on delivery in order to produce an impression of 'fresh talk'.

As for the tentative outcome of this examination of text productional techniques, the main trend is that full scripting – in either monologue or dialogue format – is gradually replaced by text processing strategies that combine pre-planned global coherence with local spontaneity (whether rehearsed or fresh). Post-editing as a means for altering a text's over-all structure enters the scene fairly late.

Capturing Interaction

My third close-up shot focuses on interactional characteristics in dialogue formats. In designing a not fully formalised method for analysing such aspects, I take the turn-taking system of ordinary conversation as a point of departure, and regard this as a base-line system from which all other speech exchange systems derive. Radio speech exchange systems can then be described in terms of how they deviate from the turn-taking system of ordinary conversation (cf Heritage, Clayman & Zimmermann 1988). Turn-taking mechanisms in

ordinary conversation have been thoroughly researched in the Anglo-American conversation analysis (CA) tradition (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; Greatbatch 1986, 1988, 1991; Clayman 1991; Greatbatch & Heritage 1991). On the basis of CA-findings, an inventory of speech exchange mechanisms in ordinary conversation can be established. The model of ordinary conversation that is thus created, is then used for scrutinising texts in my database by way of a norm-and-deviance approach. What emerges from this undertaking, is the shapes of different radio speech exchange systems – and their evolution.

Since this part of my textual exploration is still under way, what can be reported at this stage are merely some rudimentary results. In crude terms, what my analysis in embryo tracks, is an evolution from formats with no exchange (monologues, such as lectures and recitals) to formats with interactional characteristics and more or less orientation towards normal conversation (interviews, panel debates, phone-ins ...).

Let me add some historical details to this point, in concentrating on the early formation of broadcasting genres. When broadcasting entered the social scene in the 1920s, its text norms were transferred from situations that in certain respects ressembled the radio situation. The genres in question all have two properties in common: 1) Physically, their messages are carried by sound waves, and 2) Participants are asymmetrically arranged, often in a 'one-to-many' set-up, with no interaction between addressor and addressee. Apart from weather forecasts and fishery information, radio broadcasting in the early days was entirely made up of elements from other media and art forms: concerts, theater performances, records, lectures, reading of unedited news telegrammes from the Norwegian news agency NTB, reading of stock exchange information, and recitation of literature – including drama (Dahl 1991:30ff). All these genres are thoroughly prepared through writing and rehearsal, and they are predominantly monologue ones.[18] Gradually, multi-voice formats with interactional characteristics, more or less imitative of ordinary turn-taking, were introduced. The innovation center seems to have been programmes directed at children and youth, in addition to entertainment programmes.

So, there is a both qualitative and quantitative transition from monologue formats towards formats with interaction of various kinds. In combination with the speech processing parameter, the different stages from a monological and written idiom of production and delivery towards interactional speech are tentatively characterised by the following labels:[19]

1) Scripted monologue

2) Scripted dialogue

3) Scripted diamonologue

4) Hybrid talk (monologue and dialogue)

5) Semi-spontanious talk

6) Staged and edited talk

As indicated, these different steps on the evolutionary ladder of radio formats are chronologically ordered. However, two major reservations need to be introduced. First, the evolution of the the radio medium's secondary orality is meandering. It does not necessarily progress in a clearly defined linear direction. Second, the historically older ways of radio text production still belong to the repertoire in later phases, but they are no longer as pervasive as they were in earlier times. Rather, they are deployed for specific purposes in particular radio genres – for instance in news reading, weather forecasts and causeries.

What Does It Mean?

As suggested in previous sections, text norms crystallise in actual situations as means through which to perform socio-historically given communicative tasks. They are also tinted by the perceptual-cognitive and physical-technological layers of mediation involved. With reference to this knowledge on socio-technological pressures in text norm evolution, the unfolding of registers and genres on Norwegian radio can be read as an index to the various social functions and communicative goals that Norwegian radio has taken on up through the 20th century.

Let me start to fill in on this vast subject by casting a glance at the interplay between social functions, communicative goals, and medium-specific properties in the genesis of text norms in early Norwegian radio history. The fact that perceptual-technological characteristics of the medium itself excert determinative influence on the formation of text norms, is clearly demonstrated in the pioneering periods of radio amateurism and technological experimentation. In the amateur period, communicative goals and functions were neither fixed, nor important. What counted to the radio amateurs, was the thrilling magic of radio waves in itself. Activities of transmission and reception were self-motivated, as it were. The objectives of the amateurs were hardly communicative at all as they pertained to the medium itself. Consequently, the question about *what* to transmit, was of little significance. In their search for information on which to perform their hobby, the amateurs freely exploited existing sound-carried genres.[20]

In Norway, this kind of self-sufficient technological goal is even more striking during the period of trial transmissions by the Telegraph Board (1923–1925). The transmissions' principal objective was to facilitate technical measurements, on the basis of which to decide whether broadcasting was possible technologically in Norway. In addition, one wanted to produce a homely expertice in technical broadcasting matters. In searching for material to transmit, Kristiania Broadcasting, which was the name of the experimental transmittor of the Norwegian Telegraph Service, followed in the radio amateurs' tracks: It merely fed on existing sound-based genres (cp Dahl 1991:22-24).

The leap from 'radio' to 'broadcasting' critically involved the qualification of social functions and communicative goals for this new mass medium, as well as settling numerous conflicts among actors, and setting up (institutional) regulations (cp Dahl 1991:15ff). From the perspective of the central actors on the Norwegian arena, the private broadcasting corporations in the 1920s,[21] the most urgent enterprise was to qualify new social functions and communicative goals for the communicative situation serving as their justification: the one constituted by the broadcasting company as addressor, the general public as addressee, and radio texts – produced, transmitted and received through radio technology – as medium.

Is it too much to say that the art of rhetoric will have a renaissance, and that the same will happen to the art of education? Is it too much to say that the art of music will find its way into every home; can one doubt that music is on the threshold of a new era as measured by the amount of people it will be able to reach?

How many benefactive seeds will not be sown in the population by this means. Art and eloquence, news and useful information, broadcasting comprises everything that has spiritual value, and especially those who live far from urban centers, will benefit from it.

From the very first moment, broadcasting will have to focus on enlightenment. It will be able to bring something to everybody, as long as it does not bring boring things. It pervades all society, just as sun and rain fall on all the country. And everybody who want to, can participate, given a small amount of money. And just as rain and sun produce growth on earth, broadcasting will bring growth to the minds of people. (Extract from the speech by the director of the Telegraph Board, Nickelsen, at the opening of the first Norwegian broadcasting company in 1925; cited from Dahl 1991:28.)[22]

In his inauguration speech at the opening of the first Norwegian broadcasting company, the director of the Telegraph Board, Nickelsen, identified the communicative obligation of broadcasting as 'enlightenment for the general public' ('folkeopplysning'). To serve this over-arching cultural objective, he also pinned down an instrumental, more technical, goal – namely to reach people living in far-away places. He merely hints at the general rhetorical strategies to be employed in orienting towards the pin-pointed cultural goal, using words like 'didactic' ('opplæringskunsten'), but 'not boring'. However, he has more to say on which existing genres to draw on: namely rhetorical speeches ('veltalenheten'), music, art, news and useful information ('nyttig stoff'). What this reading of Nickelsen's speech shows, is that Kringkastingsselskapet A/S inherited a supply of text norms from other media, in an attempt to accomodate these text norms to its declared communicative goals and functions. Only in the next round were text norms as means through which to orient towards these newly defined communicative goals moulded by their actual use as communicative strategies.

As radio history moves on, text norm renewals are continuously propelled by technological innovations and redefinitions of communicative functions and objectives, as projected into programming policies. The new obligations taken on by the NRK, after its constituion as a public service broadcaster in 1933, have been characterised as 'contributing in the construction of the Norwegian nation', 'adopting editorial principles summed up in the key words "socially beneficial", "Norwegian" and "independent editing"', 'adapting to listener habits and listener text norms', and 'creating more symmetry and "democracy" in the communication situation' (cp Dahl 1975:258). As is well-known, the programming policy of the NRK has undergone substantial revisions since then. However, space prevents me from pursuing that matter any further. Neither will I venture to draw out in explicit terms the connections between technological progress, alterations in programming policies and text norm innovations.[23]

Summing Up

Let me round off this article by recapitulating my embryonic empirical findings and by proposing, in blanket terms, how to make sense of them on a cultural or societal level. My study departs from the observation that present-day radio talk varies along the spoken-written continuum, and it sets about to disclose the growth in linguistic 'presentational forms' on Norwegian radio (1935-1980). In epitome, the preliminary results indicate that the written-spoken scale of present-day radio registers – streching from distanced, authoritative (not to say authoritarian) registers to involved solidarity registers (cp Vagle 1990a & 1990b; Lomheim 1987:297) – also represent a diachronic movement. Registers with more spokenness are progressively added to the existing writtenlike reg-

isters. To put the cultural implication of this outcome in a nut shell, what is mediated through such a continuous differentiation in 'ways of speaking', is the increasing complexity of modern society. Social changes do not just involve language: To a significant degree, they are constituted by

shifts in language practices – notably in the crystallisation of new text norms (Halliday 1990, Berge 1990:37ff, Fairclough 1992:6). This is why the radio's contribution to human culture can be studied first and foremost through the history of radio genres.

Notes

1. This is to say that my study fastens on the *linguistic* part of radio-messages. Quite a few radio genres also accomodate semantic meanings voiced by silence (!) or other semiotic systems – systems that are thought of as *music, sound effects* and *ambient sounds* in radio journalistic jargon.
2. These characterisations of social functions in public service broadcasting are taken from studies primarily concerned with Nordic *television*. Some reservation is therefore called upon as regards their application to public service *radio*. To my knowledge, there are no probes into the social functions of public service *radio* as a separate entity.
3. Similar ideas also haunt in phenomenologically inclined sociology (i.e. Alfred Schutz and Erving Goffman), in the sociology-of-knowledge school of Berger and Luckmann(1991 [1966]), and in anthropology (Geertz 1973).
4. As there are more conceptualisations of the sign's ontological status within (socio)semiotics, I add that my inclination is towards the position of realist phenomenology – which comes across in my presentation of the central concept *text norms*. The phenomenological apprehension of signs is shared by most researchers in the sociosemiotic 'school'. Conceptions might glide, though, and find various middle positions between realist and idealist formulations.
5. Let me spend a footnote on situating the sociosemiotic terms *discourse*, *text* and *context*

in a landscape that is better known in communication and media studies. In the theoretical frameworks of these diciplines, *discourse* as a whole is generally known by the label *communication situation* (alternatively: *communicative situation*), whereas the part that equals *context* in the sociosemiotic framework, normally is broken down in smaller parts. In the most minimal formulation, it is said to consist of sender/author/addressor and receiver/counterpart/addressee, which yields the ontologically founding parts of the communicative situation as follows: *addressor*, *text/medium* and *addressee* (cp Lundsten forthcoming). (As the terminological superfluity on this point is of no consequence to my inquiry, it will not be discussed.) What materialises is the most basic version of a *communication model*.
6. The segment of sociolinguistic research that I am referring to in this connection, is often labelled studies of 'varieties according to use'. The distinction between 'varieties according to user' (dialects and sociolects) and 'varieties according to use' (registers and genres) is a commonplace in sociolinguistics (cp Hudson 1981:48, Halliday 1990:35, Halliday & Hasan 1990:41, Biber 1994:51 and Romaine 1994:20).
7. Different terms are used in semiotics to denote the two parts of the sign. I use Hjelmslevian ones as these are in consonance with my Hallidayan framework, which is heavily influenced by Hjelmslev. I abstain from taking a standpoint on the meaning theoretical controversy of whether the *referent* (Ogden

& Richards), *object* (Pierce) or *designatum* (Morris) is to be included in the sign concept or not because it is of little relevance from my phenomenological point of view. In this perspective, experiential phenomena, that are intentional in the phenomenological sense and thus bound to human consciousness, would in any case substitute for what is given as objects in the physical world in other philosophies. Because the organisation of experience (or knowledge) in the individual actors' minds is difficult to access, it can be argued to leave it out of a semiotic analysis. As is well-known, positions vary in phenomenological thought on the issue of what status physical reality should be given. Husserl himself worked his way towards an idealist position (Lyons 1968:28), whereas phenomenological sociologists such as Schutz and Goffman include physical reality in their analyses.

8. Within the sociosemiotic perspective, terminology for designating the middle part of this tripartite norm complex, the connection between *language* and *situation*, has changed somewhat during the four decades or so of the theory's existence. I use the term *text norms* (taken from Berge 1990) as a superordinate term for *registers* and *genres*. The distinction between *register* and *genre* is not present in Halliday; it has been introduced by some of his followers (see Ventola 1978, Martin 1992).

9. The question whether physical reality also exists in its own right, as it were, is beside the point. In my philosophy, it does.

10. In other theories, equivalents of the ideational function are known by denominators such as *referential, informational, (re)presentational, descriptive, cognitive, assertive, constative*, and *symbolic*.

11. Agile readers might have noticed that I in this discussion on where to localise norms have not committed myself to any standpoint on the controversial meaning-theoretical issue of where the 'meaning' part of the norm sign is to be found. I have only stated that the expression part – to be more precise: the expression-substance – appears in material reality: in human activity and its offsprings. In philosophical and semiotic thought, the existence mode of signs, both of signs as wholes and of their separate functives (*expression* and *content*), is apprehended in various ways (cp Nöth 1990:80). Do signs have a separate, spiritual or abstract, mode of existence? Do they merely exist as the perceptum in an act of communication? Are they constructs in the human mind – or in society? Or do they only reside in physical reality – in human behaviour and cultural products thereof? The sociosemiotic perspective integrates viewpoints from more meaning theories – notably structuralist, pragmatic and phenomenological ones. Still, it holds that the only place signs live and can be observed is in actual use. In line with Umberto Eco's view, the material expression in social discourse is regarded as the only testable subject matter. In Eco's words: 'What is behind, before or after [...] [is] beyond the semiotic threshold' (1979: 317).

12. This dynamic conception of language and text norms is voiced, not only in sociosemiotic linguistics, but also in other 'schools' belonging to the counterstream in the European semiotic tradition after de Saussure. Central names are Bakhtin (1992), Voloshinov (1986), Mukarovsky (1970 & 1978), and Lotman (1990; Lotman et al 1975).

13. Social actors have achieved competence in social action by way of participating in such action. Because the actors' social backgrounds vary, they will not have access to the same range of social situations. This entails that they incorporate somewhat different norm sets. In other words, knowledge on how to handle various social situations is asymmetrically distributed among actors (cp Berge 1990:61ff). Such norm incongruence might take more forms. For one thing, actors might disagree on what norm to apply in a given situation. To take a familiar example from the institution of the family, parents might have different opinions on what norms to be guided by in a given child-parent conflict. Another form of norm incon-

gruence materialises when actors agree on what norm to apply, but hold different views on what situational choices to make from the system. Such incompatible interpretations of what constitutes 'correct' situated application of the norm, amounts to a conflict between different varieties of the same norm system. Some norms are heavily marked by this kind of built-in contradictions. To a Norwegian, evident examples are the two written standards of Norwegian. They both hold a multitude of orthographic as well as morphological 'free' choices, and interpretations vary both on what choices to make in which situations and on what selections to combine in order to create internal stylistic coherence (Berge 1990:47).

14. In the Norwegian original:

[Kringkastingen] stiller lytteren i direkte rapport med den talende. Og tilhørerne hører like godt som om de var tilstede. Dette blir jo meget værdifuldere end at læse et foredrag, for eksempel i en avis. Den direkte rapport mellom den optrædende og hans auditorium er det ene væsentlige ved kringkastingen. Den anden væsentlige ting ved den er at man ikke behøver at være tilstede. Herved blir det auditorium en taler hænvender sig til, uendelig meget større, det vokser fra nogen faa hundrede eller nogen tusen til titusener, hundretusener, en taler kan henvände sig direkte til millionen, til et helt folk kan han tale.'

15. In present-day radio production the degree of pre-planning appears to be next to zero in certain genres, at least in middle 'slots' in the global text structure. However, on closer inspection it turns out that scripting has been replaced by formulaic utterances in set routines (cp Brand & Scannell 1991:217).

16. Examples are given in the appendix under the heading 'Time-space transformations'. The term *simulated interaction* is taken from Mancini (1988).

17. This strategy is also known as 'para-social interaction' (Horton & Wohl 1976:212), 'simulated co-presence' (Scannell 1991:2), and 'synthetic personalization' (Fairclough 1992: 98).

18. Actually, quite a few of these genres had already been exploited in the pioneer periods of amateur radio and technological experimentation.

19. Text examples are given in the appendix under the heading 'Interactional modes and degrees of pre-planning'.

20. In this connection, it deserves mentioning that the radio amateurs' activities were severely hampered in Norway, as in the rest of Europe, by prohibitive legislation during World War I. In Norway, it was illegal, officially, to listen to the radio until October 1924 (Dahl 1991:19).

21. The most influential one was the one in Oslo, Kringkastingsselskapet A/S (in operation from 1925). Broadcasting companies were also founded in Bergen (1925), Ålesund (1926) and Tromsø (1927) (Dahl 1991:30).

22. In the Norwegian original:

Er det for meget at si, at veltalenheten vil faa en ny epoke, og at det samme vil ske med oplæringskunsten? Er det for meget at si, at tonekunsten vil kunne finne vei til hvert hus og hver hytte, kan man tvile paa at ogsaa musikken staar foran en ny epoke, forsaavidt angaar mængden av mennesker den kan naa?

Hvor meget godt vil der ikke kunne saaes ut til folket paa denne maate. Kunst og veltalenhet, nyheter og nyttig stoff, kringkastingen omfatter alt av aandelig værdi, og særlig de som bor langt borte fra centrene, vil faa glæde av den.

Fra første stund maa kringkastingen lægges an på folkeoplysning. Den skal kunne bringe noget til alle, bare den ikke bringer noget kjedelig. Den gaar ut over det hele samfund akkurat som sol og regn falder over det hele land. Og enhver som vil, kan mot en ringe betaling bli delagtig i den. Og likesom regn og sol faar det til at gro i bakken, vil kringkastingen kunne faa det til at gro i menneskenes sind.

23. There are, of course, also more fundamental goals involved in broadcasting activities – such as 'establishing respectability in the public opinion both for radio as a medium

and for the broadcasting institution itself', which was a central end in the 1920s, and 'safeguarding and enhancing economic income and internal growth of the institution', which seems to be a universal aim for most institutions – at least in capitalist societies. Such basic economic interests are also sought to be met through broadcasting productional output, but they lie far beyond the scope of this study.

Bibliography

Allwood, Jens; Joakim Nivre & Elisabeth Ahlsén. 1990. Speech Management – on the Non-written Life of Speech *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 13:3-48

Bakhtin, M. 1992 [1986]. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (eds Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist; translated by Vern W. McGee) Austin: University of Texas Press

Barthes, Roland. 1967. *Elements of Semiology* (French original: *Éléments de Sémiologie*, 1964). Translated by Jonathan Cape Ltd. London: The Chaucer Press

Bell, Allan. 1991. *The Language of News Media.* Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell

Benveniste, Emile. 1971. The Nature of Pronouns. In *Problems in General Linguistics.* Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press

Berge, Kjell Lars. 1990. *Tekstnormers diakroni. Noen idéer til en sosiotekstologisk teori om tekstnormendring.* MINS 33. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet

Berge, Kjell Lars. 1992. Conflicts and changes in textual norms. In: Ann-Charlotte Lindeberg, Nils Erik Enkvist & Kay Wikberg (eds): *Nordic Research on Text and Discourse.* Nordtext Symposium 1990. Åbo: Åbo Academy Press

Peter L. & Thomas Luckmann. 1991 [1966]. *The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* New York and London: Penguin Books

Bhatia, Yijay K. 1993. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings.* London & New York: Longman

Biber, Douglas. 1991 [1988]. *Variation across Speech and Writing.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

Biber, Douglas & Edward Finegan (eds). 1994. *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register.* New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press

Biber, Douglas & M. Hared. 1992. Dimensions of register variation in Somali. *Language Variation and Change*, Vol. 4:41-75

Brand, Graham & Paddy Scannell. 1991. Talk, identity and performance: The Tony Blackburn Show. In Paddy Scannell (ed). 1991. *Broadcast Talk.* London: Sage

Chafe, Wallace & Jane Danielewicz. 1987. Properties of Spoken and Written Language. *Comprehending Oral and Written Language.* Academic Press

Chafe, Wallace & Deborah Tannen. 1987. The Relation between Written and Spoken Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 16:383-407

Clayman, Steven E. 1991. News interview openings: aspects of sequential organization. In: Paddy Scannell (ed): *Broadcast Talk.* London: Sage

Dahl, Hans Fredrik. 1975. *Hallo – hallo! Kringkastingen i Norge 1920 - 1940.* Oslo: Cappelen

Dahl, Hans Fredrik. 1991. *NRK i fred og krig. Kringkastingen i Norge 1920-1945.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Du Bois, John; Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino & Susanna Cumming. 1991. *Discourse Transcription.* University of California, Santa Barbara. Unpublished manuscript

Du Bois, John W. 1991. Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research. *Pragmatics* 1 (1):71-106

Ducrot, Oswald. 1984. *Le dire et le dit.* Paris: Les éditions de Minuit

Eco, Umberto. 1979 [1976]. *A Theory of Semiotics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge UK: Polity Press

Fashold, Ralph. 1991 [1990]. *Sociolinguistics of Language.* Oxford: Blackwell

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers

Ghadessy, Mohsen (ed.). 1993. *Register Analysis. Theory and Practice*. London & New York: Pinter Publishers

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, Anthony. 1990a [1989]. *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, Anthony. 1990b. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Greatbatch, David. 1986. Aspects of topical organisation in news interviews: the use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society.*, 8:441-55

Greatbatch, David. 1988. A turn taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society*, 17:401-30

Greatbatch, David. 1991. The management of disagreement between news interviewees. In Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Greatbatch, David & John Heritage. 1991. On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews. In Deirdre Boden & Don H. Zimmerman (eds). *Talk and Social Structure. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Oxford: Polity Press

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1990 [1978]. *Language as Social Semiotic.. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1993. Language and the Order of Nature. In: M.A.K. Halliday & J.R. Martin: *Writing Science. Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: The Falmer Press

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1994 2nd edition [1985]. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1990 2nd edition [1985]. *Language, Context and Text; Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1992 [1976]. *Cohesion in English*. London & New York: Longman

Hanssen, Eskil, Ernst Håkon Jahr, Thomas Hoel, Olaug Rekdal & Geirr Wiggen. 1978. *Oslomål. Talemålsundersøkelsen i Oslo (TAUS). Hovedrapport*. Oslo: Novus

Heritage, John; Steven Cayman, & Don H. Zimmerman. 1988. Discourse and Message Ananlysis. The Micro-structure of Mass Media Messages. In: Robert P. Hawkins, John M. Wiemann, & Suzanne Pingree (eds.): *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes*. Newbury Park: Sage

Heritage, John and David Greatbatch. 1991. On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews. In: Deirdre Boden and Don H. Zimmerman (eds.): *Talk and Social Structure*. Oxford: Polity Press

Horton, D & R. Wohl. 1976. Mass Communication and Para-Social Interaction: Observations at Intimacy at a Distance. In: J.E. Combs & M.W. Mansfield (eds): *Drama in Life. The Uses of Communication in Society*. New York: Hastings House

Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Closing statement: linguistics and poetics. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed). *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass. & New York: MIT Press & Wiley

Johansen, Jørgen Dines & Svend Erik Larsen. 1994. *Tegn i brug*. Odense: Amanda

Jonsson, Åke. Den omsorgsfulla ordmålaren: studier i Sven Jerrings radiospråk mot bakgrund av radions allmänna syn på språket under de första decennierna. Umeå *Studies in the Humanities*; No 48. Umeå University

Larsen, Peter. 1989. TV: Historie og/eller diskurs? *Edda* 1989 (1):9-25

Lemke, J.L. 1993. Discourse, Dynamics, and Social Change. *Cultural Dynamics* 6 (1):243-273

Lindblad, Inga-Britt. 1986. *Lokalradiospråk. En studie av tre lokalradiostationers sändningar.*

Umeå studies in the humanities 72. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International

Lomheim, Sylfest. 1987. Språket i radio og fjernsyn. In Egil Børre Johnsen (ed.): *Vårt eget språk*, vol. I. Oslo: Aschehoug

Lotman, Jurij. 1990. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: Tauris

Lotman et al. 1975. Theses on the semiotic study of cultures (as applied to Slavic texts). In: Thomas Sebeok (ed): *The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*. Lisse: de Ridder

Lundsten, Lars. Forthcoming. *Textual Communication as Social Act. A Reinachian Inspired Study*. PhD-dissertation. Helsingfors University

Mancini, Paolo. 1988. Simulated Interaction: How the Television Journalist Speaks. *Euorpean Journal of Communication*, 3 (2)

Meyrowitz, Joshua. 1985. *No Sense of Place. The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press

Mukarovsky, Jan. 1970. *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Fact*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

Mukarovsky, Jan. 1978. *Structure, Sign, and Function*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press

Natanson, Maurice. 1968. Schutz, Alfred. In: Sills, David L (ed.). 1968. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. XIV. The Macmillan Company & the free press

Nordberg, Karin. 1991. Skriftligt och muntligt i radion. *XXI Nordiska Historikermötet: Huvudtema i I Icke skriftliga källor*. Umeå: Umeå universitet

Nöth, Winfried. 1990. *Handbook of Semiotics*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press

Ong, Walter. 1990 [1982]. *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word*. London & New York: Routledge

Parsons, Talcott. 1968 a. Durkheim, Émil. In: David L Sills (ed.): *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. The Macmillan Company & the free press

Parsons, Talcott. 1968 b. Social interaction. In: David L Sills (ed.): *International Encyclopedia of the social sciences*. The Macmillan Company & the free press

Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. *Language in society. An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sacks, Harvey; Emanuel Schegloff, & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50 (4):696-735

Scannell, Paddy (ed). 1991. *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage

Silverstone, Roger. 1991. Television, Rhetoric, and the Return of the Unconscious in Secondary Oral Culture. In: Bruce E. Gronbeck, Thomas J. Farrell & Paul A. Soukup (eds): *Media, Consciousness, and Culture. Explorations of Walter Ong's Thought*. Newbury Park: Sage

Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices. Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Taylor, Talbot J. & Deborah Cameron. 1987. *Analysing conversation. Rules and Units in the Structure of Talk*. Oxford: Pergamon Press

Vagle, Wenche. 1990a. *Radiospråket – talt eller skrevet? Syntaktiske og pragmatiske tilnærminger i semiotisk perspektiv*. Oslo: Novus

Vagle, Wenche. 1990b. Velkomne til P2s morgonsending ... Analyse av radiotekster. *Pressens Årbog* 1989:98-110

Vagle, Wenche. 1991. Radio Language – Spoken or Written? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics.*, 1 (1):118-131

Vagle, Wenche. 1992. Radiospråket – et eksempel på sekundær muntlighet. In: Jan-Erik Lundström & Berit Sahlström (eds): *Talspråk, skriftspråk, bildspråk*. SIC 35. University of Linköping

Ventola, Eija. 1987. *The Structure of Social Interaction. A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters*. London: Pinter Publishers

Volosinov, Valentin M. 1986 [1929]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press

Appendix: Text Examples from Norwegian Radio

Time-space transformations

Suppression strategy

Sigmund Freud was born in 1985, and spent most of his life in Vienna, the capital of Austria. Following Hitler-Germany's annexation of Austria, he flew, in 1938, to London, where he died the following year.

Freud has had an enormous impact, not only on psychiatry and psychology, but also on literature, art and social debate. [---][1] (Einar Kringlen: 'Sigmund Freud og Psykolanalysens stilling i dag', October 23, 1993, NRK P2, published in P2-Akademiet 1994:29)

Exclusion strategy

Now we need to redirect our way of thinking to the world of meteorology. All research shows that in dry country areas there is a correlation between precipitation and vegetation. Many of **the listeners** *will remember how Leif Juster made fun of The Institute of Meteorology in his sketch 'Against normal'.[2]* (Stein W. Bie: 'Sprer verdens ørkener seg?, December 11, 1993, published in P2-Akademiet 1994:104)

Simulated interaction

[---] In experiments at school it is not the pupils who test nature, but rather the experiments that test the pupils. Whether they understand the instruction, whether they master the laboratory equipment, whether they see what they are supposed to see, whether they draw the correct conclusions.

Can **you** *(pl) sense the soreness in what* **I** *am saying? Can* **you** *(pl) sense that* **I** *am saying that things are not what they ought to be? Then* **you** *(pl) have understood* **my** *careful hints.[3]* (Svein Sjøberg: 'Trenger et dannet menneske å vite noe om naturvitenskap?', January 1, 1994 NRK P2, published in P2-Akademiet 1994:164)

One of the most difficult things to do, is exactly to discover something that **one** *has always known. Most people wander about in the world without ever noticing such things. Everthing that* is*, is taken for granted — no fish discovers water.*

You *(sg) have certainly used an elevator. Have* **you** *(sg) noticed that hardly anyone look eachother straight in the face. They might look in the wall, they might watch their watches, they might stare in the air – but they do not meet eachother's eyes. And that is peculiar.[4]* (from Gudmund Hernes: 'Hvordan ser et forskerhode ut på innsiden?', October 2, 1993 NRK P2, published in P2-Akademiet 1994:11)

Miracle strategy
(Example from 1935 radio reportage)

((SOUND: STEAM ENGINE STARTING (7))) <M <SLOW **today** *the microphone with other equipment* **is** *placed* **in the first train travelling the stretch Neslandsvatn - Nelaug on the Southern railway** *SLOW>*

... **we are now having** *a transmission ... by way of short wave transmitter . from the train . to a receiver at Vegårdsheia ... and from there by direct line to the broadcasters*

... (3.3) hopefully . this technical experiment will succeed

. and **we** *will be able to give* **you** *((V-FORM, SG)) impressions . from this solemn occasion . that really* **here** *where* **we are** *<EMP* **is** *EMP> an occasion*

the opening . of the six kilometre long . new rail track . from Neslandsvatn to Nelaug[5] (from Thorstein Diesen: "Sørlandsbanen", NRK 1935)

Interactional modes and degrees of pre-planning:

1) Scripted monologue & 2) Scripted dialogue

IND	INF	TEXT

A1.1   AK   *<M eg skal i kveld |. snakke litt med*
<M I will to night talk a bit to
femog^tjugeårsjubilanten |, på Det norske
the 25th anniversary jubilant at The Norwegian
^teatret |, .. ^skodespelar Edvard ^Drabløs |.
^Theater .. the ^actor Edvard ^Drabløs

A1.2   AK   *.. men då slike folk |, som oftast er ^opptekne |, antan*
.. but as these people usually are ^buzy either at
på !scena eller andre ^stader |, .. så var det
the !stage or other ^places .. consequently there was
inga anna ^råd (/råd/) |, enn å taka med seg mikrofonen
nothing else to ^do but to bring the microphone
opp i Bøndernes ^hus |,
up to The Farmers' ^House

A1.3   AK   *.. det vil seia ^nedi |.*
.. that is to say ^down to

A1.4   AK   *.. for ^skodespelarane |, bur i ^kjellaren |.*
.. because the ^actors live in the ^basement

A1.5   AK   *... eg er no ^komen= |, framom ein tjukk og morsk*
... i have now ^pass=ed a thick and fierce
vakt^mann |;
security ^officer

A1.6   AK   *.. og eg har gått gjennom ein ^la=ng |, ..*
.. and I have passed through a ^lo=ng ..
^undergrunnstunnel |, .. og er no ^endelig i
^underground corridor |, .. and am now ^finally in
labyrinten bak ^scena |.
the labyrinth behind the ^stage

A1.7   AK   *... over ^meg |? .. skal Oskar Braatens store*
... above ^me .. is Oskar Braaten's The Great
^barnedåp |. straks gå av ^stabelen |;
^Baptism (just about to get ^on)

A1.8   AK   *.. og inne i ein ^krok |, ser eg*
.. and in a ^corner see I
femog^tjugeårsjubilanten i ^profil |.
the twentyfive-years-jubilant in ^profile

A1.9   AK   *.. han sit og dreg ein pudder^kvast |, over .. den*
.. he sits and pulls a powder ^puff over .. the

A1.10   AK   *lett |, .. ^raudvorme maska til kyrkjetenar ^Evensen |.*
slightly .. ^redish mask of verger ^Evensen

A1.10   AK   *.. god^kveld Drabløs |,*
.. good ^evening Drabløs

A1.11   AK   *og til lukke med femog^tjueårsjubileet |.*
and happy twentyfifth anni^versary

A2.1   ED   *.. ^takk skal De ^ha |,*
.. ^thank you ((V-FORM))

A2.2   ED   *det ^er ikkje før i ^morgo |.*
.. it ^is not until to^morrow

A3.3   AK   *.. ja men det er no godt å vere tidleg ^ute veit eg (/i/) |,*
.. yes but it is {no} fine to be in good ^time I know

A4.1   ED   *.. ja^ja |.*
.. yes^yes (well^well)

A5.1   AK   *.. men skal ^eg (/i/) først få lov å fortelje lyarane*
.. but shall ^I first be allowed to tell the listeners
litt |, .. korleis det ser ut ^her |?
someting .. about how it looks like ^here

A6.1   ED   *.. ^versågod |?*
.. ^please (go a^head)

A7.1   AK   *.. rommet blir kalla |, .. ^skodespelargarderobe |;*
.. the room is called .. the ^actors' dressing room

[---]

A7.10   AK   *.. eg er komen ^hit |. for høyre korleis det står til*
.. I've come ^here to get to know how (the jubilant
med jubi^lanten |.
is feeling)

A8.1   ED   *.. de=t |, står berre ^bra til med ^meg |.*
.. I= am ^all right

A8.2   ED   *.. men eg må snakke ^fort |,*
.. but I have to talk ^fast

A8.3   ED   *for eg <ACC skal snart opp på ^scena |. ACC>*
because I <ACC am soon to go on ^stage ACC>

A9.1   AK   *.. <ACC åja |,*
.. <ACC oh yes

A9.2   AK   *det skal bli ei ^råd med ^det |. ACC>*
(that we can manage) ACC>

A9.3   AK   *jeg (/jæ/) har alltid ^høyrt at femogtjuge år |, er då*
I have always ^heard that twentyfive years is {då}

inga .. ^tid|, i ^våre ^dagar|.
no .. ^time/ in ^our ^days

A9.4 AK *så det skal alltid .. ^greia seg .. med eit*
so it will allways .. ^do .. with a
kvar^ter til å nå fram til Dykkar fyrste|, ..
^milepål|.
quarter to *reach your ((V-form)) first* .. ^mile-
stone

A9.5 AK *men korleis bar det no=|, .. forresten til at De*
but how did it {no=} .. by the way go
that you ((V-FORM))
vart ^skodespelar|.
became an ^actor

A10.1 ED *.. ^tja (Hx) ha@|.*
.. ^well (Hx) ha@

A10.2 ED *.. korleis bar det til at ^De vart ..*
^radioreporter|?
.. how did it happen that ^you ((V-
FORM)) became .. a ^radioreporter

A11.1 AK *.. det var da ^svært kor|, .. ^vrien De er ^då|?*
.. it was {da} ^awful how .. ^difficult you
((V-FORM)) are {^då}

A11.2 AK *.. men dersom eg (/i/) no var ^jubilant|, så*
ville eg
.. but if I {no} was a ^jubilant then
would I

(/i/) .. nok seie noko slikt som at .. eg (/i/)
alltid .. {nok} say something like that .. I
have always
har kjent meg ^kalla til ^dette
felt a ^call for ^this

A11.1 AK *[o=g --] M>*
[a=nd --]

A12.1 ED *<RS [ja ja] ja .. se ^der|,*
[yes yes] yes .. look ^there

A12.2 ED *.. der kan De ^sjå|,*
.. there can you ((V-FORM)) ^see

A12.3 ED *.. ein kan bli ren- ^vill her i ^verda|.*
.. one can be totally ^lost here in this
^world

A13.4 AK *.. ^å= det er vel ikkje alltid ^det|.*
.. ^oh= it is [vel] not always ^that

A14.1 ED *.. ne=i|,*
.. no=

((CONTINUES))
(from Arthur Klæbo and Edvard Drabløs: *The 25th an-*
niversary of Edvard Drabløs at The Norwegian Theater. Inter-
view with Arthur Klæbo, 1936)

3) Scripted diamonologue

IND INF TEXT

((CLASSICAL MUSIC (15)))

[((CLASSICAL MUSIC CONTINUES))]

H1.1 RK *[<M dette er eventyret om ^Holanlegget/ .*
[<M this is the adventure about the ^Hol
plant/ .

[---] ((INTRODUCTION CONTINUES))

H1.30 RK *. i ^dag/ . er det ingen ^mennesker/ . og ingen*
. to^day/ . there are noe ^people/ . and
no
^boring/ i disse tun^nelene/
^drilling/ in these ^tunnels/

H1.31 RK *. ^vannet/ trenger all ^plassen\ . der det bruser*
. the ^water/ need all the ^space\ .
where it roars
gjennom tun^nelene/ . kilo^meter etter
kilo^meter/ .
through the ^tunnels/ . kilo^meter after
kilo^meter/ .
på vei mot ^kraftstasjonen
on its way to the ^power plant\
... ((THE SOUND OF ROARING WA-
TER (8)))

H1.32 RK *... den ^gangen/ for to og et halvt år ^siden/ .*
... that ^time/ two and a half year a^go/ .

beskrev ^utbyggingssjef/ ingeniør ^Vaumund/ .
described ^construction director/ engi-
neer ^Vaumund/ .
kraftstasjonen fra pa^piret\ M>
the power plant from the ^paper\ M>

H2.1 CLV *... ((START 1946 RECORDING)) <M<*
SLOW ^kraftstasjonen/
... ((START 1946 RECORDING)) <M<
SLOW the ^power plant/
oppføres av ^jernbetong\ . og blir sytti
is built in ^reinforced concrete\ . and
will be seventy
meter ^lang/ og tyve meter ^høy/ over ter^ren-
get
meter ^long/ and twenty meter ^tall/
over the ter^rain\

H2.2 CLV *. men den føres også tyve meter ned ^under*
. but it is also put twenty meter down
^beneath
ter^renget/ . når vi regner med turbin og
the ter^rain/ . when we count also the
turbine and
gene^ratorsjaktene/ som er sprengt ned i ^fjellet
the gene^rator shafts/ that are blasted
into the ^mountain\

H2.3 CLV *. ^sprengnings/ og ^gravningsarbeidet/ er ferdig*
. the ^blasting/ and ^digging opera-
tions/ are

(/færrdi/) ^utført/ . i det tolvtusen kubikkme-ter
^done/ . in that twelve thousand cubic metre

^fjell/ . og femogtyvetusen kubikkmeter ^jord/ .
^stone/ . and twentyfive thousand cubic metre ^soil/ .

er ^fjernet
are re^moved\

H2.4 **CLV** *. som De ^ser/ . er for^skallings/ . og*
. as you ((V-FORM)) ^see/ . is the ^form/ . and

ar^meringsarbeidet/ i full ^sving
rein^forcement work/ in full ^swing\

H2.5 **CLV** *. og ^kraftstasjonen/ . vil være under ^tak/ i løpet*
. and the ^power plant/ . will be under ^roof/ some

.e. . av ^høsten\ SLOW>M> ((END 1946 RECORDING))
time .e. . this ^autumn\ SLOW>M> ((END 1946 RECORDING))

H3.1 **RK** *<M ... og i dag ^er kraftstasjonen under ^tak/*
<M ... and today ^is the power plant under ^roof/

H3.2 **RK** *. og den dominerer hele ^dalen*
. and it dominates the whole ^valley\

H3.3 **RK** *. ikke fordi den er så ^stor/ . men fordi den mo-derne*
. not because it is so ^big/ . but because the modern

^stilen/ bryter med den gamle ^stilen/ . i ^dalen
^style/ breaks away from the old ^style/ . in the ^valley\

H3.4 **RK** *... bygningen ^er/ . <PAR som ^Vaumund sa\ PAR> .*
... the building ^is/ . <PAR as ^Vau-mund said\ PAR> .

sytti meter ^lang/ og femogtjue meter ^bred
seventy metre ^long/ and twenty-five metre in ^width\

H3.5 **RK** *. og den er så ^høy/ som en tolv fjorten etasjes ^gård/*
. and it is as ^tall/ as a twelve-storeyed ^building/

H3.6 **RK** *. men ^halvparten av den/ ligger under ^jorden*
. but ^half of it/ is beneath the ^gound\

H3.7 **RK** *... denne ^gangen/ kan utbygningssjefen beskrive*
... this ^time/ can the construction direc-tor describe

bygningen utfra det ^ferdige/ pro^duktet\ M>
the building from the ^completed/ ^product\ M>
((END STUDIO))

H4.1 **CLV** *((START SOUND FROM WATER PLANT))*
<M? ... som De ^ser/ . så er kraftstasjonsbygningen
<M? ... as you ((V-FORM)) ^see/ . so is the power

for ^så vidt/ . ^ferdig
plant building so to ^speak/ . ^comple-ted\

H4.2 **CLV** *. det som vi driver p- ^på med/ . det er*
. what we are do- ^doing/ . that is

installa^sjonen/ av de . to første ma^skin-gruppene
the ^installation/ of the. two first machi-ne ^groups\

H4.3 **CLV** *. den første maskingruppen ^er/ . ferdig instal^ lert/*
. the first machine group ^is/ . comple-tely in^stalled/

. og for så vidt ^allerede . ^vært i/ . rota^sjon/
. and really ^already . ^been in/ . ro^ta-tion/

H4.4 **CLV** *... og den ^annen/ holder vi . på med . ^selve/ .*
... and the ^other/ we are . doing . the ^actual/ .

monteringen ^av\ M?>
installation ^of\ M?>

H5.1 **RK** *<M? ... .e. det som . slo ^meg/ med en gang jeg kom inn*
<M? ... .e. what . struck ^me/ at once when I came in

her i ^dag/ . det var at .e. det er så kolossalt
here to^day/ . it was that .e. it is so enor-mousley

høyt under ^taket/
high under the ^ceiling/ ((HIGH-CEI-LINGED))

H5.2 **RK** *. altså jeg mener det er --*
. {altså} I mean there is --

H5.3 **RK** *det ser ut som det er så mye ^rom/ ^ledig/ M?>*
there seems to be a lot of ^space/ ^va-cant/ M?>

H6.1 **CLV** *<M? . ja det er nok ikke ^noe/ ledig ^rom*
<M? . yes there isn't {nok} ^any/ vacant ^space\

H6.2 **CLV** *. det ser kanskje sånn ^ut/ . på grunn av at*
. it might perhaps ^look like it/ . because of that

det er så lite som stikker opp over ^gulvet
there is so little that protrudes over the ^floor\

H6.3 **CLV** *. men/ konstruksjonshøyden er nøyaktig . ^gitt/ på*
. but/ the construction height is exactly . ^given/ in

^forhånd/ . i og med . de . ma^skiner/ som skal
^advance/ . in that . the . ma^chines/ that will
installeres ^her
installed ^here\

H6.4 CLV . turbinen ble ^nemlig/ ... ^satt/ ... !under
. the turbine is ^actually/ ... ^put/ ... !under
^undervannet/
the ^under water/

H6.5 CLV ... altså ikke . helt sånn som man .
... that is to say not. totally the way that one .

alminnelighet pleier francistur^biner/ . <X så X> at
normally use to francis tur^bines/ . <X so X> that
man får en ^sugehøyde/ . ^men/ . tvert imot
one gets a ^suction height/ . ^but/ . on the contrary
at man får et ^lite/ . ^mottrykk
that one gets a ^small/ . ^counter pressure\

((CONTINUES))
(from Rolf Kirkvaag: *Electricity from Hol power plant*, 1949/1946)

4) Hybrid dialogue

IND INF TEXT

[---] ((INTRODUCTION))

C1.26 AK <M ... no sit vi i den . koselege ^stova ^hennar_
<M .. now sit we in her . cosy ^living room_

C1.27 AK . og skal få oss ein ^prat om_ . litt av ^kvart\
. and are going to have a ^chat about_. different ^things\

C1.28 AK . er det .e. ein gamal ^handelsstad dette/ .
. is this .e. an old ^trading post this/ .
Abelone ^Møkster/ M>
Abelone ^Møkster/ M>

C2.1 AM <SS. !nei=\
<SS. !no=\

C2.2 AM *han ^er ikkje (/ kje/) ^gamal handelstad/*
it ^isn't ^old trading post/

C2.3 AM *her var nokon som (/ so/) . aller ^fyrst . begynte*
there were some . in the ^beginning . who started
med å selja ^brød som de ^slapp . å løysa
to sell ^bread that they ^didn't have to obtain a
^handelsbrev på
^trading licence for\

C2.4 AM . og ^so_ . var der då ein gamal ^snikkar/
. and ^then_ . there was {då} an old ^carpenter/
som begynte handla som løyste seg handels^brev
who started to trade who obtained a trading ^licence\

C2.5 AM . og etter ^han_ . då begynte ^eg\
. and after ^him_ . then started ^I\

C2.6 AM *for ^han . berre handla litt i eit ^rom han*
because ^he . only traded a bit in a ^room that he

hadde/ oppi ^husene sine\ SS>
had/ in one of his ^houses\ SS>

C2.7 AK <M ... eg såg mange ^naust langs stranda då eg ^kom/
<M ... I saw many ^boathouses along the shore when I ^came/

C2.8 AK og ^båtar låg det/ i kvar einaste ^vik\ M>
and ^boats there were/ in every ^cove\ M>

C2.9 AM <SS !alle (/ adle) har mo^torar/
<SS !all have ^engines/

C2.10 AM . så de har lika mange småmotorar som heiter
. so they have quite as many small engines named
sabbar som der er ^bilar i ^Oslo\ SS>
sabbs that there are ^cars in ^Oslo\ SS>

C2.11 AK <M? . det var ^svært/ M?>
<M? . that is ^someting/ M?>

~C3.1 AM <S . [@] (2) S>

C4.1 AK <M? [ko-] kor mange menneskje ^bor/ her på ^Møkster da M?>
<M? [ho-] how many people ^live/ here in ^Møkster {da} M?>

C5.1 AM <SS . cirka hundreog^tjue per^soner\ SS>
<SS . approximately hundredand^twenty ^people\ SS>

C6.1 AK <S <P det var [<X ikkje X> ^mange_] P> S>
<S <P that was [X not X> ^many_] P> S>

C7.1 AM <S [det] er ^cir=ka/ toogtjue ^hus\ S>
<S [it] is ap^proximately/ twentytwo ^houses\ S>

((CONTINUES))
(from Arthur Klæbo: *Three waste land women* [Tre øydegardskvinner], 1957)

5) Semi-spontanious/spontanious talk

((INTRODUCTION + CONVERSATION WITH FIRST GUEST))

RK   . hva . hva hva sparket De den gangen
     . what . what what did you ((V-FORM)) play that time

JS   . å= .e=m. . skal vi se
     . oh= . e=m . well

JS   ... .e=. De sparka center
     ... .. e=. you ((V-FORM)) played center

JS   og jeg sparka= ... ja centerback eller winghalf tenker jeg
     and I play=ed ... yes center back or wing half I believe

A   [P @= P>]

RK   [...] ja sånn om hverandre altså
     [...] yes at once then

A   [2 @= 2]

JS   [2 . ja= . vi skulle jo 2] helst holde --
     [2 . ye=s . we should {jo} 2] preferably hold --

RK   (0) laga jeg noen mål den gangen
     (0) did I make any goals at that time

A   [3 <P @= P> 3]

JS   [3 ... 3] ja da . stort sett bra
     [3 ... 3] oh yes . pretty good

RK   [4 <P la- @= P> 4]
     [4 <P ma- @_ P> 4]

A   [4 @= 4]

(from Rolf Kirkvaag: *Easy mix from Marienlyst* [Lett blanding fra Marienlyst skoles aula], 1959)

Key to transcription conventions

The general outline of the transcription model is based on Du Bois: 'Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research' (Pragmatics 1:1,71-106, 1991), Du Bois et al. 1991 (Discourse Transcription), Du Bois et al. 1993 and the Nordic macrosyntagm model (Hanssen et al. 1978).

UNITS
Turn	[*speaker identification*]
Macrosyntagm unit (MS unit)	[*carriage return*]
Word	[*space*]
Truncated intonation unit	-- [*two hyphens*]
Truncated word	- [*hyphen*]

SPEAKERS
Speaker identity/turn start	CAPITALS:
Speech overlap	[ ] or [[ ]]
	[ ] or [[ ]]

The left brackets are vertically aligned to indicate where the overlap starts.

SOME PROSODIC FEATURES

Main intonation contour/terminal pitch direction (placed at the end of an intonation contour)
Fall	\
Rise	/
Level	– [*dash*]
Pause	
Long	...
Short	.
Primary accent	^ [*in front of the stressed syllable*]
Emphatic accent	! [*in front of the stressed syllable*]

VOCAL NOISES/NON-VERBAL SOUNDS   ( )
Exhalation	(Hx)
Inhalation	(H)
Laughter	@

PARALINGUISTIC FEATURES
Quality (of voice extending over a stretch of speech)	<Y Y>
Manuscript reading quality	<M M>
Probable manuscript reading	<M? M?>
Rehearsed spontaneity	<RS RS>
Spontaneous speech	<S S>
Pre-planned speech	<PLAN PLAN>
Semi-spontaneous speech	<SS SS>
Forte: increased loudness	<F F>
Piano: decreased loudness	<P P>
Laugh quality	<@ @>
Parenthetical prosody	<PAR PAR>
Multiple quality features	<Y<Z Z>Y>
Tempo	<Y Y>
Fast	<FAST>
Slow	<SLOW>
Accelerando: gradual speeding up	<ACC ACC>
Decelerando: gradual slowing down	<DEC DEC>
Marcato: words distinct/emphasized	<MRC MRC>

TRANSCRIBER'S PERSPECTIVE
Transcriber's/researcher's comment	((CAPITALS))
Uncertain hearing	<X>
Indecipherable stretch of speech	X=
Phonemic transcription	(/ /)

INDEXING
Speech events/texts	alphabetic symbols: A, B, C
Turns	arabic numerals: 1, 2, 3 ...
Macrosyntagm units (within turns)	.1, .2, .3 [*arabic numerals following a dot*]
Backchannel	~

Notes

1. In the Norwegian original:

   Sigmund Freud var født i 1985 og tilbrakte mesteparten av sitt liv i Østerrikes hovedstad Wien. Etter Hitler-Tysklands anneksjon av Østerrike, flyktet han i 1938 til London, hvor han døde året etter.

   Freud har hatt en enorm betydning, ikke bare for psykiatrien og psykologien, men for litteratur, kunst og samfunnsdebatt. [---]

2. In the Norwegian original:

   *Nå må vi flytte tankegangen inn i meteorologens verden. All forskning viser nemlig at i tørr-landsområdene er det stor sammenheng mellom nedbør og plantevekst. Mange av **lytterne** husker sikkert Leif Justers herlige gjøn med Meteorologisk Institutt i sketsjen 'Mot norrmalt'.*

3. In the Norwegian original:

   [---] I skolens eksperimenter er det ikke elevene som tester naturen, men forsøkene som tester elevene. Om de forstår instruksjonene, om de mestrer utstyret, om de ser det de skal se, om de trekker de riktige konklusjonene.

   *Aner **dere** sårheten i det **jeg** sier? Aner **dere** at jeg sier at det ikke burde være slik? Da har **dere** forstått **mine** forsiktige antydninger.*

4. In the Norwegian original:

   *Noe a*v det aller vanskeligste **en** kan gjøre, er nettopp å oppdage det **en** alltid har sett. De aller fleste vander rundt i verden uten noensinde å få øye på den. Alt som er, er selvsagt — ingen fisk oppdager vann.*

   ***Du** har sikkert kjørt med heis. Har **du** lagt merke til at nesten ingen i en heis ser hverandre i øynene. De kan si i veggen, de kan se på klokken, de kan stirre ut i luften — men altså ikke se hverandre i øynene. Og det er jo ganske rart.*

5. In the Norwegian original:

   *((SOUND: STEAM ENGINE START-ING (7))) <M <SLOW mikrofonen . **er . i dag** . med et stort utstyr . plassert **i åpningstoget . på . Sørlandsbanens parsell Neslandsvatn . Nelaug** SLOW>*

   *... **vi har nu** . overføring ... ved hjelp av kort-bølgesender . fra toget . til mottager på Ve-gårdsheia ... og derfra på linje til kringkasterne*

   ... (3,3) forhåpentlig . vil dette ... tekniske eksperiment lykkes

   *. og **vi** skal kunne gi **Dem** . inntrykk . fra denne høytidelige begivenhet . som virkelig **her** nede **vi sitter** <EMP **er** EMP> . en begivenhet*

   åpningen . av den seksti kilometer lange . nye jernbane . fra Neslandsvatn til Nelaug