

---

**A COMMUNICATIVE EVENT ANALYSIS OF A GREEK FAMILY GATHERING****Ioannis KARRAS**Department of Foreign Language, Translation and Interpreting, Faculty of Humanities / Ionian University,  
Corfu, GreeceEmail: [karrasid@gmail.com](mailto:karrasid@gmail.com)<https://doi.org/10.59009/ijlllc.2024.0055>

---

**ABSTRACT**

This paper focuses on a communicative event, namely that of a Greek family gathering. Hymes's (1974) SPEAKING framework is used as it provides the basis for a systematic analysis and considers the cultural milieu within which the communicative event occurs. To complement this analysis, Hofstede's (1984, 2011) cultural dimensions are used to help understand the cultural drop back against which this event takes place. The overall aim is for the analysis of this communicative event to contribute to a more thorough understanding of language use in a social-cultural context as valuable information on the social-linguistic behavior of people within a specific speech community.

**Keywords:** Communicative Event, Speech Community, Speaking, Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions, Greek Culture.

---

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Ethnography of communication is a field that emerged from the synthesizing of two disciplines: ethnography and linguistics. The main focus of this discipline is on the patterning of communicative behavior and on interactional analysis. Therefore, cultural elements and linguistic elements are no longer observed and studied in isolation, but as an integral part of a whole in a given context. This primary aim of this field is to collect and analyze descriptive data regarding the ways in which meaning is conveyed drawing upon both linguistic and cultural theories. In undertaking an ethnography of communication, one must identify a 'speech community' in a particular locale and then select a communicative event the researcher deems important to analyze. A Speech community, according to Yule (2006), is a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language. For example, a group of lawyers using legal jargon to discuss a case would be considered a speech community. In addition, the concept of 'communicative event' (CE) has become a prominent starting point (Carbaugh, 2007), so it can be seen as the central unit of analysis which goes beyond that of linguistics. Hymes (1974) contends that such analyses aspire to detect patterns of language use employed to help members within an identifiable socio-cultural context to create, as well as reflect, their social world. In other words, the discovery and explication of rules that are necessary for appropriate communicative behavior in a specific socio-cultural context is the main objective.

This article draws on the aforementioned framework and its focal point is the analysis of a chosen CE. As such, the focus is on meaningful communication activity by describing, and analyzing it using a relevant theory set. In order to analyze the chosen CE, a number of steps are followed. More specifically, a theoretical framework and the rationale for engaging it will be provided to create sound scaffolding to base the CE analysis on. During the next step, this theoretical framework will be used to provide insights into the event -both on a macro and

micro social level- and the usefulness of the theory in analyzing and comprehending the event will be explored. The next step aims at giving a short description of the event involving pertinent descriptive information, for instance, who was involved, where it occurred, when it happened, how it unfolded and what was the purpose of the event. After this description, the actual selected conversation transcription excerpt is presented along with comments involving the various exchanges.

## 2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The theoretical framework used herein draws on literature related to communicative events. As this CE took place within a Greek socio-cultural context, it is deemed crucial to first look at the Greek culture on a macro level as it would be useful to raise issues that may help contextualize the CE chosen in connection to family structure. To do this, some elements of Hofstede's (1984, 2011) six-dimensional (6-D) model have been adopted. Moreover, some brief comments about the Greek culture at large are made. More specifically, the dimensions of Power Distance, Individualism-Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance and Short-Long Term Orientation are applied. It should be noted that using Hofstede's model does not imply that stereotypical views of Greek society and its people are endorsed herein. The use of these dimensions merely serves as an indicator of tendencies that may help the reader contextualize the points raised throughout the analysis. Regarding Hofstede's Power Distance Index, which involves the extent to which people of a particular society expect and accept the unequal distribution of power, Greece scores relatively high in this index, as within the Greek culture it is important, among other things, to show respect to the elderly. In relation to the bipolar dimension Individualism-Collectivism, Greece is considered a collectivist society, so people are integrated into strong, cohesive groups. Families tend to be close, and extended family members form close bonds and tend to protect each other. It is important for Greeks to have good and relaxing moments with friends and family and enjoying a long meal with loved ones, for example, is a favorite pastime for many. Greece also scores high on Uncertainty Avoidance which means that generally Greeks are not at all comfortable in ambiguous situations thus, bureaucracy, laws and rules are very important. Greece is considered a slightly long-term oriented culture, which implies that society shows a preference for a future-oriented perspective. Another characteristic of communication among Greeks is that they tend to be very demonstrative people, so emotions are easily shown in their body language and other paralinguistic features (e.g., use of emphatic gestures, change in pitch).

Moving on to the construction of a theoretical framework, it ought to be noted that since the selected CE is that of an informal conversation (a family Sunday lunch), the relevant theories addressed are related to such an event. A plethora of theories have been developed around informal conversations and much scholarly literature has been written on the analysis of this type of conversations, albeit not formally designated as an area of study. Put simply, a communicative event is an occurrence or episode that involves a sequence of related turns of communication, which may involve a professional meeting room, a courtroom hearing or simply a group of friends at a neighborhood café. Through communicative events, information and ideas are shared, and relationships are established and built.

It is generally agreed that a CE is a bounded entity. What becomes important then is recognizing these communicative events to identify them (Saville-Troike, 2003). Changes between events may be manifested through a variety of means which may span from a change in code or topic to nonverbal cues such as a gesture. Identifying these boundaries are commonly easier in more formal situations where the communicative event is governed by clearer

boundaries; whereas, during more informal situations, the shift in events tends to be less predictable and obvious.

In a CE, the message “is carried by both verbal and nonverbal codes simultaneously” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 119). Hence duly attention must be paid to both: what is actually uttered, but also the paralinguistic features and vocalizations (e.g., raising of pitch, sighs, laughs, etc.) as well as nonverbal elements (e.g., gestures, proxemics, oculistics, etc.) These stimuli connected to the verbal communication are often referred to as ‘metacommunication’. Metacommunication not only considers the literal meaning of the words uttered, but all the paralinguistic and nonverbal features which codetermine meaning. As this communicative event involves interpersonal communication, metacommunication is applied to codify and analyze interaction that occurs between individuals at the relational level (Rogers & Escudero, 2004). In essence it “is communication beneath the surface” (Mateus, 2017, p. 82).

In order to better understand and conceptualize a CE, Hymes’ (1974) framework will be used as it provides the basis for a systematic analysis and takes into account the cultural milieu within which the CE occurs. Hymes does not defy the importance of linguistics, instead he expands its scope. He sees ethnography of communication as the study of “communicative form and function in an integral relation to each other” (Hymes, 1974, p. 5). A CE analysis is not confined to the strict boundaries of linguistic analysis (syntax and lexicon) but something which is influenced by the cultural context grounded in the social life making it a distinctive cultural activity.

So as to analyze the selected CE in a patterned way, a specimen perspective (the way data is understood as it relates to reality) (Alasuutari, 1995) is adopted while Hymes’ (1974) proposed model ‘SPEAKING’ is the preferred method deployed herein as this comprehensive model accounts for both the forms and contents of speech as well as the cultural elements that impact it. The acronym SPEAKING stands for Situation, Participants, Ends, Acts, Key, Instrumentality, Norms, Genre. The SPEAKING model draws upon the notion of discourse which in turn is viewed as a string of speech acts or components of CE which takes place in both a situational and cultural context. The use of SPEAKING aids the deconstructing and understanding of the special qualities of specific communication practices that emerge. Below follows a more detailed account of what SPEAKING entails.

#### Situation

The scene and the setting comprise the ‘Situation’ and according to Saville-Troike (2003), the ‘Situation’ would be considered the extra-personal context of the CE. Physical circumstances like place and time of the CE are elements that relate to the setting. According to Hymes (1974), however, scene does not refer to the physical arrangement but is the “psychological setting” or “cultural definition” of a scene. In describing the scene, the researcher should notice the participants’ sense of what is happening during the CE. Overall, the situation offers sound grounding as it provides the specific context of social life.

#### Participants

Details regarding the participants’ sex, age, ethnicity, or other relevant-to-the-analysis categories are provided under this heading. Moreover, the relationship among the interactants is described as it may dictate the type of communication the participants engage in. Finally, any other people present during the CE should be accounted for.

#### Ends

The term ‘Ends’ refers to the purpose and/or function of the event as well as its identifiable objectives and outcomes.

### Act Sequence

'Act Sequence' refers to the components of act sequence and rules for interaction. In other words, turn taking or instances of interruption are analyzed under this component. Saville-Troike (2003, p. 122) uses the same component and states that this is "information about the ordering of the communicative acts in an event".

### Key

Under the component 'Key', many variables may come into play. Hymes (1972, p. 62) uses 'Key' to "provide for the tone, manner or spirit in which the act is done". Any observations of nonverbal communication or paralinguistic features as well as language varieties or regional dialects fall under this component.

### Instrumentality

This component explicitly addresses the message form and content.

### Norms

'Norms' refers to the rules of interaction. Here, it is necessary to explain which speech rules have been used. Norms can be looked at through the lens of what is customarily done and what is the appropriate way to do things. Interruption and/or turn-taking allocation are among the phenomena observed and analyzed under this component.

### Genre

The last component –'Genre'– has to do with the category of communication (e.g., a lecture, interview, storytelling, etc.). The properties that constitute this genre may in themselves become relevant to the analysis at hand.

Whenever applicable, references to Saville-Troike's compiled list of components of communication will also be made to complement and further enhance Hyme's model. It should be highlighted that certain components may generate more information than others so they become a matter of reflection and negotiation for the researcher who will decide on what to focus. Moreover, any given analyses of a CE are bounded by the cultural context in which it takes place, as noted earlier. In some cultures, for instance, turn-taking in both formal and informal settings may be dictated by certain social rules or norms that are shared among all participants and interruption might be frowned upon and thus completely discouraged (Dingemanse & Floyd, 2014; Stivers et al. 2009). Consequently, the local cultural patterns and norms (macro culture), but also the culture of, for example, a particular family (micro culture) must be taken into account and understood if analysis and subsequent interpretation of the CE are to be fully carried out.

## 3. METHOD

The CE analyzed herein is that of an informal family lunch gathering on a Sunday afternoon. It is important to note that this interaction was naturally occurring and not contrived by the researcher so that the analysis produced more closely reflects a natural occurrence. The members of the family readily consented to the recording. The recording device was not visible or obtrusive in any way, so the participants quickly forgot about its existence, as they themselves claimed during a brief interview after the recording. In addition, the CE was videotaped to capture elements of nonverbal communication, but the apparatus was placed at a distance so as not to become obtrusive.

This situation was chosen as a CE in line with Saville-Troike (2003, p. 110) advice regarding novices at CE analyses. Her suggestions include using “brief self-contained sequences which have readily identifiable beginnings and endings. [They] should recur in similar form and with some frequency, so that regular patterns will be more easily discernible”. Moreover, it was thought that analyzing an informal CE would be inherently interesting as it is marked by informal, unstructured, and spontaneous conversation, which potentially lacks clear boundaries and thus renders the analysis to be more challenging instead of facilitating it. However, due to the researcher’s close relationship to the participants and their frequent interaction with each other, he was in an advantageous position to comprehend, interpret and offer deeper insight into this CE, in which he acted as participant-observer. Another point to be made is that the ‘unmotivated looking’ approach was adopted (Psathas, 1990) in the observation. Psathas states that unmotivated looking involves the researcher being open to what is going on rather than searching for a pre-identified phenomenon to occur. Finally, it should also be noted that the participants taking place in this CE constitute a ‘community of practice’ (CofP). Wegner (1998) sees the CofP as a group of people who over time have a common set of social practices with a common purpose. The CofP chosen was a group of family members (researcher’s mother, brother, sister-in-law, niece, and nephew) who regularly get together on Sundays and have lunch at the mother’s house –something quite common in the Greek culture.

Following the recording, brief notes were taken regarding some observations of the event. After listening to the recording, choices were made about the sections that would be used to transcribe and subsequently analyze. The selected transcripts were then translated from Greek into English. In order to ensure quality in translation, the transcript was backtranslated by a bilingual colleague (backtranslation involves translating the translated version back into the source language, which is an important step to ensure quality and accuracy (Son, 2018)) and any discrepancies were addressed duly. It should also be noted that the various analyses are made directly after the selected utterances as the close approximation of the actual utterance and comments assist the reader.

**Setting:** Casual lunchtime conversation

**Recorded:** 03/12/24, 13:45 p.m.

**Approximate length of conversation recorded:** 31’54”

**Approximate length of conversation of Chosen Segment for transcription:** 2’

**Description of setting:**

**Participants:** Yiannis (Y)- researcher; Tasia (T)- mother/grandmother; Stavros (S)- son/brother/husband; Ioanna (I)- (S’s) wife/daughter-in-law/sister-in-law. It should be noted that the focus of this CE was on the adult participants who acted as both addressers (performers/emitters) and addressees (receivers).

**Codes used:** All utterances are bold. **Underlying** a word shows it is stressed. Comments are put in **brackets**. Instances of overlapping are put in **square brackets**. ↑ is used for rising pitch and ↓ for falling. : is used for an elongated sound. A **number in brackets** shows length of pause (in tenths of a second).

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Community event Analysis

To begin with, after some initial utterances of passing the food around and arranging the drinks and after a few seconds of pausing, Yiannis (Y) introduced a new topic by relaying a personal experience, (it relates to his experience with his shopping at a store that morning, where his

cousin's Georgos' (G) fiancé, Maria (M), is employed as a sales clerk). Yiannis's statement immediately grabs the attention of the other participants.

1 Y: (2.0) **Maria assisted me. She's 42, 43 somewhere around there**

The stress on Maria serves as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1992) and helps move the conversation onto another topic (but in line with the overall conversation theme which was gossiping about various family members). It could also be viewed as ratifying the cessation of the previous topic (again talking about family members) to move on to the next one.

2 S: mm

3 I: mm

The use of 'mm' implies that they are ready to hear what Yiannis has to say. These non-lexical conversation sounds or interjections may serve as a non-lexical backchannel as it has little or no referential meaning but still verbalizes the listener's attention and acknowledges his/her interest.

4 I: **we saw her this morning on our [way to...**

5 S: [mm

In the Greek culture, interrupting is quite common (Chalari, 2012), but not necessarily appreciated. Lines 4 and 5 show that the rules for interaction influence the act sequence, which then governs the turn taking that occurs. In line 5, Stavro's 'mm' implies that he reconfirms Ioanna's statement.

6 I: **Going ↓do:wn↓ [towards (0,5)**

7 S: [(unclear utterance)

In turn 6, there is an instance of overlap that falls under certain characteristics of turn taking. Bokova (2004, p. 4) states, that [Ioanna's] "noncompleteness of [her] utterance as well as her slowing of tempo, vowel elongation, falling intonation in the final tone group of an utterance followed by a pause", and finally a change of her gaze direction (looks at the one of her children) provides the interlocutor (Stavros) with the opportunity to briefly take the floor. However, Yiannis quickly resumes with what he was saying, without resorting to overlapping.

8 Y: **because we were saying something about Georgos (my cousin and Maria's fiancé) and she said "how old are you?" Georgos (other customer and friend) was saying that he is 43 cause you are a bit older than Stavros... were you (referring to Stavros) in the same grade with Thanos (Georgo's brother) no you were in the same grade with Georgos**

9 S: Yes

10 Y: mm

In line 8, it is noted that Yiannis chooses to use instances of direct speech "how old are you?", rather than shift to reported speech, in relaying his account, as this makes for a more empathic statement. The interjection 'mm' (line 10), in immediate sequential confirmation, show Y's agreement and continued involvement in the event. It may also be an effort to sustain conversational involvement.

11 T: **Which Georgos?**

12 Y: **Komianos (surname)**

13 T: **Oh, yes [I think Georgos.. I think ...**

14 Y: **[I also received my compliments from Maria (0,5) she said how old are you? 52 I thought 40-42 and then I said "I love you more"**

15 I: [(laughs) **Yeah, were just born!**

One could argue that the rules of turn taking are either breeched or simply more overlapping occurs as the participants get more involved in the conversation. In line 14 there is another instance of overlapping. Nonetheless, Yiannis is too enthusiastic to report the compliment he received (stresses the ages) to let Tasia take the turn. Yiannis's point is made by projecting the thrust of his original turn (Schegloff, 2000). In lines 13-14, an instance of 'overlap resolution device' Schegloff (2000) occurs as Tasia tries to find a slot in Yiannis's utterance, but Yiannis does not acknowledge this and provides no room for Tasia to add something, thus showing persistence to complete his utterances without any acknowledgement of the overlap or any recognizable consequences. An 'overlap resolution device' refers to a set of practices/techniques that help deal with overlapping and assist its user in regulating turn taking. In this case, the features associated with overlapping talk and the strategies that the participants use to deal with overlap situations are quite common. In line 15, Ioanna's laugh may be interpreted as a sarcastic reaction to Yiannis's comment, however, it could also be perceived as playful.

Overall, the exchanges insofar show that one aspect of this kind of informal CE is producing spontaneous contributions to the conversation and that there seems to be no consistent act sequence. Another speech feature that becomes apparent due to this informal conversational style is that of overlap (Schegloff, 2000).

16 **S: Maria is a bit chubby**

Stavro's comment perhaps demonstrates his attempt to elicit more comments from the other participants.

17 **Y: uh** (facial expression showing surprise)

18. **S: although at the wedding she seemed slimmer** (referring to a wedding of a relative)

19 **Y: ↓mm, ok↓**

In line 19, Yiannis's drop in pitch can be interpreted in this context as a lack of agreement with Stavro's earlier utterance and implicitly claims that Stavros's statement is exaggerated.

20 **S: slim (0,5) mm, ok**

Stavro's short pause (line 20) indicates that he is rethinking and trying to repair his original statement as he realizes he may have been exaggerating.

21 **T: she's ok**

22 **Y: she's nice** (referring to her character)

By not commenting on Maria's physique, but rather her character, Yiannis elucidates the fact that weight is not important, but it is the nature of the person that matters. Yiannis almost becomes defensive of Maria as a reaction towards his brother and mother's earlier statements.

23 **T: who Maria (0,5) why did you say Maria is 42...43...she's more like over 45**

24 **I: (laughs)**

25 **S: they have a two-year difference, right?**

In line 23 Tasia is quick to comment about Maria's age. There is a playful overtone here.

26 **I: how old is Georgos?**

27 **T: Nelly (another cousin) says that she is 2-3 years older (0,5) I don't know (0.5) don't say anything**

28 **S: ugh:**

Lines 26 and 27 are examples of an adjacency pair (question-answer) a structural feature which function as building blocks of conversation (Renkema, 2004). In particular, this is a pair of adjacent utterances produced by two different speakers. Once the first utterance is produced, a response is required. As such, Tasia's utterance in line 27 shows reluctance and

hesitation as she feels she may be revealing something that is not known (Maria is older than Georgos) and perhaps does not want to sound critical. Her words “don’t say anything” refer to the fact that this information should not be shared with others. Tasia’s body language (slightly raising of hands and a widening of the eyes) perhaps show that she is serious about not sharing this information with others. In line 28, this elongated negative token/interjection shows that Stavros is disapproving of Tasia’s over-concern with what people may think.

- 29 I: **What’s the age difference between [Georgos and Roula (his sister)?**  
 30 S: **[↑so what↑, Ma (mother)**  
 31 T: **[big difference**  
 32 I: **Big, eh**

In line 29, Ioanna asks a question again which is quite consistent with her less dominant role throughout this excerpt. Stavros’s rising pitch (line 30) and stern glance at his mother shows he is disapproving of his mother’s (Tasia) comment. This would be a clear example of how paralinguistic features contribute more to the meaning conveyed than the actual words. Ioanna’s confirmation of ‘big’ shows surprise, but may also be the result of an expected/invited response posed by Tasia, as she turns her gaze towards Ioanna.

- 33 S: **Georgos is younger than me. I’m 43**  
 34 T: **Georgos is young**  
 35 S: **Georgos is [41**  
 36 T: **[Georgos has to be 41**  
 37 S: (talking about Maria) **43 well 2 years difference**  
 38 T: **well, if that’s his age, yes**  
 39 S: **why do we care?**  
 40 Y: **why do we care?**  
 41 T: **Yes**

This instance of overlapping (lines 35-36) shows immediate agreement between S and T. The exchanges of lines 39-40 are uttered in immediate sequence showing both the brothers’ intolerance of such comments from their mother. Also S’s criticism may be implying his defensiveness as he too is a bit younger than his wife, I. In line 41, T agrees perhaps to mitigate her previous statement and to show that her feelings are in line with those of her sons or also that she realizes that her son too is in a similar situation.

- 42 I: **What is it my love? (refers to one of her children)**  
 43. Y: **(4.0) and Andreas and Vaso (Georgos’ parents and the researcher’s uncle and aunt) have an age difference I mean the entire family...and Rosa and Vasios (a married couple, cousins of the family)**  
 44 S: **oh she’s ↑older↑**  
 45 Y: **well, he being fat**  
 46 T: **and Sotiris and Irene (relatives)**

After a lengthy pause (line 43), Yiannis resumes the conversation by remaining on topic, but moves on to other family members. Yiannis provides other examples of couples in the family where the husband is younger than the wife perhaps to show that this is not so unusual after all in the family. In line 44, Stavros’s rising intonation shows surprise. Immediately after (line 45), Yiannis is quick to explain that Vasios might actually look older than his wife due to being overweight. In line 46, Tasia’s stressed utterance implies that she is quick to remind the family that there are several cases of married couples where the wife is older than the husband (in the Greek culture, this is somewhat of a taboo with older generations as the husband had to customarily be older than the wife).



#### 4.2 Applying the SPEAKING Framework

Having described the communicative event at hand, application of each of Hymes' (1974) components on this particular CE will be applied.

**The Situation:** The communicative event is set in a private home on a Sunday afternoon in a mid-size urban setting in Greece. The scene could be described as informal and relaxed.

**The Participants:** The researcher, the host of the lunch, a married couple and their two children. All participants are close family. The analysis focuses on the adult interactants.

**Ends:** The purpose of this CE was to share news and talk about various family issues.

**Act Sequence:** The topic is introduced by the researcher as the result of his morning shopping. The ordering of the event thereafter is quite collaborative and casual and one topic is followed by another, but they are all closely connected and the theme is common (gossiping about other family members). An informal conversation such as the one analyzed in this excerpt necessitates the contribution of the participants to the conversation and this is due mainly to the fact that there is a certain amount of shared knowledge among all the participants about the topic of conversation.

It could be argued that throughout the event there is no explicit or implicit order that governs turn taking or how the sequence of interaction is generated. This is possibly the main reason for observing instances of turn-taking overlap. These overlaps, however, do not result in breakdown in communication. There are also instances of "cooperative overlapping" (Wardraugh, 2002, p. 298) as is the case in lines 35-36. This type of overlapping is common in unemotional speech where a listener's overlapping speech takes place during the segments of a speaker's speech, which involves a certain amount of shared information. Moreover, regarding the type of speech act, it becomes obvious that no implicit rules apply as every participant contributes to the CE (through confirmations, asking questions, comprehension checks, statements, etc.). This lack of implicit rules is expected, as informal rules of interaction apply in events such as an informal family gathering.

It is noted, nonetheless, that the frequency and length of the contributing exchanges ranges from one participant to the next. For instance, Yiannis has 11 turns; Tasia has 12; Ioanna has 9 (including non-lexical conversation sounds/interjections and laughter); and finally, Stavros has 14 turns (again, including non-lexical conversation sounds/interjections). It has been observed that most of the longer turns are instigated by Yiannis, who also introduces the topic of the analyzed excerpt and perhaps proves to be the most dominant speaker. The least dominant speaker is Ioanna as not only are her turns less in frequency, but each turn is laconic and the aim is either to ask a question (e.g., lines 26, 29) or to do a comprehension check (e.g., line 32). Her less dominant participation could be attributed to the fact that Ioanna was preoccupied with her children at times during certain instances, but also was more reserved as the in-law in the group, not wanting to make comments about her spouse's side of the family out of respect and courtesy. This may tie in with the collectivist aspect of the Greek society and thus tight family bonds and harmony are crucial. In addition, what may also be an important contextual piece of this analysis is the fact that Ioanna is also two years older than Stavros (her husband) and thus frames her collective response to this topic.

**Key:** The tone and spirit are quite positive, happy and there is contentment. At times, the tone is nonchalant and even humorous and playful. No use of higher-level word choice is evident and some use of slang and sarcasm are noted (e.g., in line 8 "were you in the same grade at school" is a loose translation of an informal Greek phrase).

**Instrumentality:** In this case, the communication mode is oral. Inevitably, there are instances of nonverbal communication (gestures) and other paralinguistic features (e.g., rising pitch) that contribute to the interaction.

**Norms:** There are no strictly predefined cultural rules regarding turn-taking or interruptions at such an informal event vis a vis a formal meeting. Therefore, everyone is at liberty to introduce a topic, or interrupt when he/she feels it is appropriate, again typical of the Greek culture.

**Genre:** This communicative event can be characterized by its extemporaneous speech production; hence, the genre is that of informal speaking or casual family lunchtime conversation, it could even be claimed that the genre is that of gossip.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Through this ethnography of communication, the large range of resources speakers employed to produce and interpret language as well as the specific features that may be found in a CE that took place during an informal conversation within a Greek context were identified. The article used SPEAKING –complemented by Hofstede’s cultural dimensions– as a theoretical framework as a comprehensive and practical model with direct applications to speech event analysis. Analyses of this sort contribute to a more thorough understanding of language use in a social-cultural context as valuable information on the social-linguistic behavior of people within a specific speech community may arise.

## REFERENCES

- Alasuutari, P. (1995). *Researching Culture. Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*. London: Sage.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language Style as Audience Design. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook* (pp. 145-204). New York: St Martin’s Press Inc.
- Bokova, V. (2004). Turn keeping and turn over signals in a communicative event of accusation and indictment. *California Linguistic Notes*. XXIX (1), 1-7.
- Carbaugh, D. (2007). Ethnography of Communication. In D. Wolfgang (Ed.). *The Blackwell International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp.245-252). New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chalari, A. (2012). *Why Greeks Interrupt Each Other? The Phenomenon of 'Overlaps' in Everyday Greek Conversations*. Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1992). Interviewing in intercultural situations. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 302-307). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2 (1), 2307-2319.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture’s consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hymes, D. H. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mateus, S. (2017). Metacommunication as Second Order Communication. *KOME*. 5(1), 80-90.

- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The Ethnography of Communication*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Psathas, G. (1990). (Ed.). *Interactional Competence*. Washington: University Press of America.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. New York: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Rogers, L. E., & Escudero, V. (2004). *Relational Communication: An Interactional Perspective to the Study of Process and Form*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29, 1-63.
- Son, J. (2018). Back translation as a documentation tool. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 10(2), 89-100.
- Stiver, T. Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T. Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., Peter de Ruiter, J., Yoon, K-U., Levinson, S. C. (2009) Universals and Cultural Variation in Turn-Taking in Conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26), 10587-10592
- Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. 2006. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.