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Abstract

This study investigates the use of the item *thing* in L1 and L2 speaker discourse in the context of Australian employment interviews. Two main aspects are explored, the relationship of *thing* with the notion of vagueness and its relationship with implicature construction.

Given that most research on *thing* has been conducted in the area of vague language (e.g. Channell, 1994; Cheng and Warren, 2001; Drave, 2002; Jucker, Smith, and Lüdge, 2003; Cutting, 2007), the notion of vagueness is first discussed. From a review of recent semantic and pragmatic literature on vagueness a definition and framework is developed. This definition and framework is then used in a comparative analysis of the vagueness of *thing* in L1 and L2 speaker discourse. The relationship of *thing* with vagueness is, therefore, explored in two speaker groups.

Since the analysis only finds few instances of vagueness when *thing* is used, *thing* is also discussed with respect to the cultural context of Australia and the speech event of employment interviews. In particular, the study explores the effects that speakers can generate by using *thing* in discourse, and, thus, its relationship with implicatures is discussed. Based on previous research in the framework of Relevance Theory (e.g. Sperber and Wilson, 1986/1995; Escandell-Vidal, 1998; Jary, 1998a, 1998b), a model is developed in order to discuss the construction of implicatures in the context where the use of *thing* was observed. From the analysis, it is proposed that the L1 and L2 speakers of English differ in the effects that their use of *thing* generates in the employment interviews recorded.

Possible reasons for differences in the L1 and L2 speaker use of *thing* with respect to the notion of vagueness and regarding implicature construction are explored, and implications of the different uses identified are discussed.
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