# Establishing a pattern of dual-receptive language alternation

## Insights from a series of successive haircuts

## Tim Greer

**ABSTRACT**: *This study uses longitudinal Conversation Analysis to track bilingual interaction between a Japanese hairdresser and his Bolivian client. By the end of the first appointment they had enacted an unstated policy of dual-receptive language alternation in which the hairdresser primarily spoke Japanese and the client used English as a lingua franca. In the later sessions the participants mixed other-medium lexical items within their turns in ways that were less marked, adapting the way they formulated their turns by simplifying and modifying them according to the notions of recipient design that they held about each other. The analysis also highlights two of the interactional practices that helped establish this pattern of language use.*

## Introduction

When two people from different language backgrounds meet for the first time, one of the most basic issues they need to negotiate is language choice. Typically a careful assessment of each other's language proficiency and preference helps shape the eventual pattern of communication that is established.[1] In a globalising world, negotiating language preference is particularly frequent in service encounters, where customer and server initially conduct their business as relative strangers.

This study uses longitudinal Conversation Analysis to track the bilingual interaction that occurred between a Bolivian university student and a Japanese hairdresser across a series of successive haircuts, starting with the first time

Tim Greer, School of Languages and Communication, Kobe University, Kobe, Japan.

the two met. By the end of the first appointment they had established a tacit policy of dual-receptive language alternation in which the hairdresser primarily spoke Japanese and the client responded in English, his second language. In other words, the interaction took place in two languages, with each participant mainly speaking one or the other.

The analysis compares the participants' orientations to other-medium second-pair parts in the first session with those in later sessions. It was found that the hairdresser avoided actively using English as a lingua franca in the first session while still making his passive understanding of it apparent to the client through the sequential details of the talk. Once they had successfully conveyed their language preferences, in the later sessions the participants mixed other-medium lexical items within their turns in ways that were less marked. Both speakers adapted the way they formulated their turns by simplifying and modifying them according to the notions of recipient design that they held about each other. The second-pair parts of routinised adjacency pairs were delivered smoothly in other-medium; however, more extended sequences of talk occasionally necessitated the use of same-medium to deal with interactional trouble. It is argued that a progressive familiarity with the procedural routines involved in the haircut also helped foster the pattern of language use.

The analysis contributes to the CA literature on bilingual interaction in first-contact contexts (Torras, 1998) as well as a growing number of studies that use CA to document changes in interactional practices across episodes (Ishida, 2011; Lee, Park, & Sohn, 2011; Nguyen, 2008, 2011a, 2011b, 2012). Such studies are typically interested in how novice second-language speakers expand their access to various interactional resources, such as responses and recipiency tokens. However, the current study is not concerned with categorising one speaker as native and the other as non-native, but instead seeks to track how the participants avoid that issue altogether by acknowledging both Japanese and lingua franca English as valid communication tools.

Firth (1996) found that, even though lingua franca interactions display 'linguistic infelicities and abnormalities, the parties nevertheless do interactional work to imbue talk with orderly and "normal" characteristics' (p. 256). In the current study, the participants additionally orient to Japanese and lingua franca English, what Rehbein, ten Thije, and Verschik (2012) define as *lingua receptiva*; 'a mode of multilingual communication in which interactants employ a language and/or a

language variety different from their partner's and still understand each other without the help of any additional lingua franca' (p. 248). An example of 'pure' lingua receptiva would be when a Portuguese speaker and a Spanish speaker can make themselves understood by speaking their own language without resorting to another common language, such as English. However, in the data to be examined in this article, one of the speakers is using English as his second language and it therefore becomes a lingua franca for both of the participants at various moments. At the same time, the other speaker mainly uses Japanese, which is comprehensible to the other participant. In short, the speakers access a diverse range of linguistic repertoires, including both lingua franca and lingua receptiva and they both work to treat this as normative behaviour.

So far, little consideration has been paid to the micro-interactional details of natural interaction in relation to how this dual-receptive approach to communication is established and reinforced in first-time encounters between strangers. To document this development, the current study will examine its progressive use over time. The analysis, however, focuses more on the way that receptive bilingualism is co-accomplished and interactionally perpetuated within and across episodes of talk, and on the interactional practices that are used to establish this pattern of language choice as normative within this context. This provides insight into the participants' acquired understandings about each other, as evidenced by changes in the way they formulate and recipient-design their turns. In addition, one of the study's broader interests is documenting how people establish and maintain rapport within and across episodes of talk, particularly when they have to do so in a second or third language. Of course, in one sense this gets to the very root of sociality. It is also a very real problem for international students who need to negotiate conversations outside the relatively safe interactional environment of the university.

## Background to the data

The data analysed in this paper were collected on four different occasions over a period of five months. They consist of unscripted conversations that took place while one of the participants cut the other's hair. The initial recording in April was the first time the client had ever been into the salon, and so the study tracked the participants longitudinally as they progressed from total strangers to a friendly customer–client relationship.

The client, Emil, was a 27-year-old graduate student from Bolivia. A native speaker of Spanish and a proficient speaker of English, at the time of the recording he had lived in Japan for about a year and his Japanese was still at a basic level, since the classes that he took were all in English. He primarily used Japanese only outside the university environment in service encounters, such as at the hairdresser. The hairdressers, Yoh and Yumi, were a husband and wife team who owned and managed a small salon in western Japan. Yoh was the chief stylist and Yumi was his assistant. When there was only one customer in the salon, as was the case in the data to be examined, Yoh was in charge of the cut and therefore also tended to speak to the client more than Yumi.

As outlined above, the pattern of communication that emerged between Emil and Yoh is one of dual-receptive language alternation, with Yoh producing a first-pair part in Japanese and Emil responding in English. In other words, each speaker understood the other's turn, but responded in his preferred language. To reply in another language is generally a dispreferred mode of communication (Auer, 1984), and initially Yoh and Emil treated it this way, too. However, over the series of haircuts, they began to treat it as normative behaviour. The analysis will start by examining some opening greeting sequences—those moments when Emil first walked into the salon—since those were the sequences where language choice patterns became most relevant. It will then go on to explore some particular interactional practices that are used to establish and maintain this dual-receptive bilingual interaction, namely other-medium repetition and the use of a post-positioned Japanese copula. For transcription and translation conventions, see this issue's Transcription Key (p. 119).

## Analysis

The analysis will begin from the first moment Emil walks into the salon. Although he starts the conversation in Japanese, he soon makes a bid to shift it to English by asking about Yoh's English proficiency. However, Yoh politely but firmly makes it clear that he prefers to speak in Japanese and makes little attempt to switch to English.

*Extract 1 (T1 Greetings (April 21))*

```
01. Yoh:   Irasshai[mase:.
           Welcome-HON
02. Emil:         [(h)a- kon[nichiwa:
                  [   CoS Hello
03. Yoh:                    [nichiwa::
```

```
                        'llo
04.        (0.4)
05. Yoh:   Hai. e:to
           DM      HM
06.        onimostu  o  (.)  oatsukarishima::s
           HON-bag   ACC    take-HON
           Right, um, I'll take your bag.
07. Emil:  [ (dohzo)
           [   Here you are.
08. Yoh:   [Hai.
            RT
09.        ((Yoh takes Emil's backpack, 6 sec))
10. Yoh:   ((iconic gesture: removing coat))
11.        [uwagi wa-] hai
           [coat  TOP  yes
            And your coat?
12. Emil:  [(       )]
13. Emil:→ Eigo  wa?
           English    TOP
           (Can you speak) English?
14. Yoh:   Eigo   wa   amari  hanasenai  des.
           English TOP little speak-POT-NEG    COP-POL
           Not really.
15.        heh heh heh ha
16. Yumi:  Konnichiwa ha [ha ha
           Hello
17. Emil:               [Konnichiwa.
                        [Hello
18. Yoh:   Konnichiwa. ((takes Emil's coat))
           Hello.
19.        Hai. ((passes coat to Yumi))
           DM
20.        Dewa kochira    ni dozo.
           DM   here-POL   to please
           Okay, right this way.
21. Yumi:  °(onegaishima:s)°
             Wish-HON
22.        ((Emil walks in and sits in chair: 3.5 sec))
23. Yoh:   Onegaishi[ma:(s).
           Wish-HON
           I look forward to serving you.²
24. Emil:          [Watashi  wa   nihongo
                   [ me      TOP  Japanese
25.        ((iconic gesture with two fingers: "little"))
26.        [amari (hanas-)
           [Not really (speak)
            I can't really speak Japanese.
27. Yoh:   [skoshi         des ne.  Hai.  Daijobu  des  yo.
           [a little       COP IP   yes  okay     COP  IP
            Only a little, yes, that's okay.
28.        (.)
29. Yumi:  He(h)h
30. Yoh:   etto::. Onamae    to:,
           HM      HON-name  and
31.        (.)
32. Emil:  ((nodding))  °mmhm°
```

```
33. Yoh:   gojusho      o      kaku  no  to
           HON-address  OBJ    write NOM and
34.        ato (seinengappi)   o    onegaishimas:. <=baasdei
           also date-of-birth OBJ please          birthday
           Um, can I have your name and address and  also your date of birth please, your birthday?
35. Emil:  a- oh.
36. Yoh:   Hai. ((walks away))
           DM
```

Yoh adopts an active role in Japanese from the start, welcoming Emil in line 01 and offering to take his bag in line 06. Emil initiates his first significant sequence-initiating action (FPP) in line 13 and he uses it to ask about Yoh's English proficiency. When Yoh responds with a claim that he does not speak English, one implication for Emil is that he should continue to speak Japanese. As a result, Japanese is the main language for the initial part of the conversation as Yoh and Yumi greet Emil and guide him to the styling chair.

Once seated, Emil continues to topicalise language preference by giving a my-side telling in Japanese—'*watashi wa nihongo amari*'. This designedly incomplete TCU is projectable as 'I can't really speak Japanese', although Yoh produces a co-completion in overlap in line 27 that reworks the initial part of Emil's turn into a more positive assessment—that is, that Emil can speak a little. Yoh then goes on to give Emil a simple form to fill out in Japanese, reifying that language as an appropriate written medium as well. In lines 33 and 34, Yoh points out the key information that Emil needs to fill in, reformulating the potentially problematic Japanese word for 'date of birth' into the English word 'birthday'. This gives Emil his first sample of Yoh's English and, despite Yoh's earlier claim that he lacks English proficiency (line 14), the potential is at least there for English to become a possible medium for the ongoing conversation.

A significant amount of language and identity negotiation is accomplished during the remainder of that first visit, but suffice to say at this stage that Emil begins to recognise that Yoh understands some English and gradually moves toward more English usage throughout the conversation. The analysis will return to some of those episodes later; however, at this point the objective is to compare that first conversation with the opening sequence of Emil's second haircut six weeks later. Again, Yoh uses mainly Japanese, but this time Emil responds in English, albeit in a way that is somewhat marked.

*Extract 2 (T2 Greeting (June 16) Sinkcam (0:56.2–1:17.4))*

```
01. Yoh:    Dohzo
            This way.
02.         ((Emil stands and walks to chair))
03. Emil:   Hisashi buri.
            It's been a while.
04. Yoh:    Ohisashi buri des.
            It's been a while.
05. Emil:   How are you today?
06. Yoh: →  h(h)ai
            yes
07.         (2.0)
08. Yoh:    genki deshita      ka.
            well  COP-POL-PST INT
            Have you been well?
09. Emil:   A:::h ye- (.) yes, yes.
10.         [Ge- genki (des).
            [    well   COP-POL
                I'm well.
11. Yoh:    [uh-heh heh [ha ha
12. Yumi:               [heh ha
13. Emil:   uh ha
14.         (0.9)
15. Emil:   And, (0.6) and you?
16. Yoh:    Hai. Itsumo genki des yo.
            yes  always well  COP IP
            Yes, I'm always well.
17. Emil:   heh-ha
18. Yoh:    Hai.
            Yes.
```

In line 04, Yoh responds to a standard Japanese greeting in Japanese. However, when Emil produces the subsequent first-pair part in English in line 05, Yoh responds in Japanese and produces a counter question in Japanese. Emil responds to this in a fairly delayed manner in line 09 with some turn initial perturbations and then a mid-turn switch back to Japanese, which seems to acknowledge the normative preference for same-medium communication (see Li Wei, 1998). When Emil initiates the next paired sequence in line 15 in English, Yoh responds quickly and confidently in Japanese, demonstrating that he understood the question but that he would rather formulate his response in other-medium. This is a very different opening sequence from the first one, since it is clear that Emil knows that Yoh understands English, even if he does not speak it.

By the third visit, dual-receptive bilingual interaction has become firmly established as the medium of communication, although Yoh does produce more English responses during the greeting sequence, particularly as post-positioned other-medium repetitions.

**Establishing a pattern of dual-receptive language alternation...**

*Extract 3 (T3 Greetings (July 21))*

```
01. Emil:   [Kon[nichiwa:]
02. Yumi:   [Kon[nichiwa:]
03. Yoh:        [nichiwa:]
04. Emil:   hello↑
05          (.)
06. Yumi:   hello heh ha ha
07. Emil:   Nice to see you.
08.         (.)
09. Yumi:   heh
10. Yoh:    Come in.
11. Emil:   Thank you.
12.         (1.0)
13. Emil:   How are you today.=
14. Yoh:    =Hai. ja,  Genki  des  yo.
            Yes   okay- fine   COP  IP
            Okay- Yes, I'm fine.
15.         (.)
16. Emil:   ((laugh))
17. Yoh: →  Bery good.o
18. Yumi    (    )
19. Yoh:    ((laughs))
20. Emil:   ojamashima::s
            Pardon me
21. Yoh:    Hai.
            Yes
22.         ((Emil sits, exhales deeply))
23. Emil:   It's very hot.
24. Yoh:    Ah-hah ha, soh     des ne.
                       That way COP IP
25.         (.)
26. Emil:   so (   ) ((Shakes head))
27. Yoh:    mo::h (0.3) kore kara:, motto atsuku narimas yo:
            IP          this from   more  hot    become  IP
            And it's going to get hotter from now on.
28. Emil:   ((smiles looks upwards))°oh god°
29.         ((laugh))
30. Yoh:    demo, (.) natsu wa:,
            but       summer TOP
31.         (0.3) / ((establishes eye contact in mirror))
32.         kaeru   n   des ka? Bolivia.
            return  NOM COP INT
            But, are you going to home to Bolivia in the summer?
33. Emil:   ((shakes head)) no::
34. Yoh:    ah kaeranai   n   ya.
            CoS return-NEG NOM IP
            Oh, you're not.
```

In lines 01–03, the participants greet each other almost simultaneously in Japanese. However, Emil then repeats *konnichiwa* in English (by saying hello), leaving the medium of communication ambiguous. This most basic of English greetings is understandable by just about any Japanese person and to not respond in English would be clearly making

an effort to reject it as an ongoing medium. It also provides a slot in which Yoh initiates a paired sequence in English (the invitation in line 06), which Emil responds to in same-medium. This is quite different from the sort of language preference work he did in the initial stages of their first and second meetings. Although such English turns from Yoh are brief, they do indicate his tacit knowledge of Emil's preferred language and provide an implied ratification of English as a possible medium for talk between these participants and in this context.

The opening sequence is a vital part of establishing rapport, and it can be seen that Yoh's choice to reciprocate by producing second-pair parts in same-medium at this point helps to establish the mood as a friendly one, even if later the interactants return to dual-receptive interaction due to their limited productive proficiency. Yoh gradually shifts back to Japanese via a process of self-repetition in other-medium. He translates his second-pair part in line 14 *genki des yo* to English in line 17 'Very good' and then produces his next response in Japanese only as the talk becomes less and less formulaic. By the time he initiates his next first-pair part, he does so in Japanese in line 30, and the dual-receptive language pattern is again occasioned, with Emil responding in English in line 13.

In the fourth and final haircut (not shown here), the dual-receptive pattern happens from the very first greeting, indicating that, over time, the participants have become familiar with each other's language preferences and are able to design their turns based on their knowledge of their interlocutor's perceived proficiency.

## Interactional practices that help establish dual-receptive bilingual interaction

In the above analysis, a close examination of how the medium of communication developed and changed over time has been based in particular on sequence and recipient design. However, it is also worth taking into account some of the interactional practices that helped facilitate this dual-receptive medium. To this end, this section will look at two specific mechanisms that the participants used to arrive at dual-receptive bilingual interaction as their principal medium of communication; (1) the use of other-medium repetition, and (2) a post-positioned Japanese copula.

The analysis will begin by considering other-medium repetition. There were two main kinds of repetition—next-turn other-repetition and same-turn self-repetition. In next-turn other-repetition a self-selected speaker repeats what the other person said in prior turn, providing a targeted receipt of certain specific information (Greer, Bussinguer,

Butterfield, & Mischinger, 2009; Svennevig, 2004). This receipt-through-repetition can be formulated in the same language or in another one. For example, at one point during the haircut, Emil said, 'It takes two days,' and Yoh receipted it by saying *futsuka des ne* ('Two days').³

In the longitudinal data I examined, next-turn other-medium other-repetition seems to be one of the key interactional environments that the participants used to establish and perpetuate the talk as dual-receptive bilingual interaction. In Extract 4, Emil is telling Yoh how much hair he wants cut off.

*Extract 4 (Receipt through other-medium next-turn repetition)*

```
01. Emil:  So:, just a liddle.
02.        (0.5)
03.        [Like-
04. Yoh: → [Skoshi  dake.
            [a little only
             Just a little.
05. Emil:  Yes.
06. Yoh:   Hai.
            Yes.
            Okay.
```

In line 01 Emil produces a request that includes the English 'Just a little' and after a brief gap of silence, in line 04 Yoh signals his understanding by repeating it in Japanese. This is a critical phase of the haircut and it is important for the hairdresser to understand the client's instructions, so receipt through repetition makes it clear just what Yoh has understood. It also indicates that any turn at talk is formulated for the speaker as well as the recipient. It could be that repeating Emil's turn in Japanese aids Yoh in processing its meaning.

### English FPP plus post-positioned copula

When Yoh had to produce a first-pair part in English he often chose to give it a Japanese feel by tacking the Japanese copula *des ne* on to the end of what would otherwise be a complete TCU in English. For example, in Extract 5, Yoh tells Emil that they are the same age.

*Extract 5 (Post-positioned copula)*

```
01. Yoh:   Emil san wa ni-juu-nana
                AT TOP twenty-seven
02.        sai   des ka::?
           years COP INT
           Emil, are you 27?
```

```
03.        (0.5)
04. Emil:  Yes:[:. ((nods))
05. Yoh:       [Ohn.
06.        (.)
07.      → Same des.
               COP
08.        (0.3)
09. Emil: [Really?]
10. Yoh: → [ O n a ]i doshi des.
          [ same    age  COP
          (We are) the same age.
```

Yoh is looking at a simple profile that Emil has just filled out and notices that Emil is 27 years old. He checks by asking, 'Emil, are you 27?' and when Emil confirms that he is, Yoh says 'same *des*', following it up in line 10 with a self-repetition in Japanese, *onai doshi des*. Notice that the Japanese copula here helps carries more syntactic weight than the content word *same*, since it enables *the* definite article the and the subject of the sentence to be elided and it is ambiguous whether he is saying *we are the same* or *I am the same*. Although it is not clearly stated, both speakers understand Yoh to be talking about himself at this point, as evidenced in next-turn by Emil's news-receipted uptake. If Yoh had intended the elided subject to be in English ('I'), due to syntactic constraints of English he would have had to include an English copula ('am') before the word *same*. Coming as it does at the end of the sentence, the Japanese copula enables Yoh to finish his TCU in Japanese and therefore transition to a self-repetition in that medium.

In other words, although Yoh does codeswitch to English, he regularly does so by mapping single lexical items onto Japanese base grammar through the use of a post-positioned Japanese copula. At times, this practice also involves longer sequences of English grammar, but the incremental positioning of the Japanese copula still enables Yoh to signal his preference for Japanese, as he does in line 50 of the following Extract.

## *Extract 6 (Other-medium self-repetition with post-positioned copula)*

```
45. Yoh:   Emil san wa,(0.5) doko  no  shusshin des ka.
              AT  TOP       where GEN  descent  COP INT
           Where are you from, Emil?
46. Emil:  Ah- eh *Doko  kara, [to omoimasu ka
              Where from  QT think   INT
           Ah, eh, where do you think?
47.            ((*Yoh places cape around Emil))
48. Yoh:                   [Hai.
                            Yes
49. Emil:  heh heh ha
50. Yoh: → E:::h (1.2) eh where're you from. des ne.
                                        COP IP
```

```
51. Emil:   (uhum,)
52.         (0.3)
53. Yoh:    Doko  des ka
            Where COP INT
            Where (are you from)?
```

In line 45, Yoh asks Emil where he is from and Emil attempts to produce a counter-question, 'Where do you think I'm from?' However, Yoh receipts Emil's turn at a point where it is incomplete (line 48) and therefore probably hears it as a repair initiation. He repeats his original question in English in line 50, and finishes it by adding the Japanese increment *des ne* to the end of the turn. If this were to be translated, it would be something like '*It is* where're you from', so the *des ne* serves little syntactic function. Instead, what it achieves is a return to Yoh's preferred medium of Japanese. Since *desu* is also a polite form of the Japanese copula, Yoh's switch may also help accomplish certain aspects of polite distance that are not available through the English alone.

During their initial meeting, the practice of other-medium repetition played a role in occasioning a critical incident that led to Yoh and Emil's use of dual-receptive bilingual interaction. As outlined above in Extract 1, Emil asked Yoh about his English as soon as they met and Yoh claimed that his proficiency was low. In the talk that followed, Emil endeavoured to speak Japanese, but eight minutes later he had begun to use more English. On several occasions, Yoh indicated his comprehension by repeating Emil's turns in Japanese, leading to the critical incident in Extract 7, in which Emil overtly notices Yoh's receptive English skills.

*Extract 7 (A critical incident T1 (08:31))*

```
135. Emil:   °It's° (0.5) very beaudiful.
136. Yoh:    Ah.
137.         (.)
138. Emil:   an' (.) white.
139.         (0.4)
140. Yoh:    Ah soh des ne. Masshiro   des ne.
             RT that COP IP pure-white COP IP
             That's right. It's so white, isn't it?
141.         (0.7)
142. Yoh:    ne:(g)::h.
             IP
143. Emil:→  U:m, (.) You can- understand very good English.
144.         >heh heh ha<
145. Yoh:    Aha ha [ha ha ha.
146. Yumi:          [ha ha ha ha.
147. Yoh:    Heh ha.
148.         (0.4)
```

```
149. Yoh:    .hh A:::ah¿
150. Emil:   >°skoshi?°<
             A little
151. Yoh:    Skoshi   dake des kedo ne.
             A little only COP but  IP
             Just a little bit though.
152.         (0.4)
```

Yoh and Emil had been talking about a salt-flat lake in Bolivia, with Emil producing the assessment 'It's very beautiful and white' (lines 135 and 138). In line 140, Yoh does an agreement through other-medium repetition, making public his comprehension of the just-prior English version. This leads to Emil's noticing of Yoh's English in line 143, and, while he downgrades his assessment (from *very good* in line 143 to *a little* in line 150), Yoh acknowledges in line 151 that he can in fact understand English. This does not imply that he will go on to speak it, but, from that point in their relationship, Emil begins to use more English (and less Japanese), ratifying dual-receptive bilingual interaction as a legitimate medium.

## Concluding comments

This longitudinal examination of the micro-details of bilingual talk has demonstrated that the participants co-established a dual-receptive medium of communication through a variety of interactional practices. This did not necessarily happen in a neat linear fashion, but rather through a progressive series of gradual recognitions. At the start, Emil began the interaction in Japanese but made some explicit bids to move it to English. Yoh continued to use Japanese but also gave sufficient samples of his English along with indications of his comprehension of the English that Emil used. This led to a critical incident in which Emil commented on Yoh's English, which was the point at which Emil started to move toward dual-receptive bilingual interaction as a medium of communication. Other-medium repetition and post-positioned copulas were two of the interactional practices that helped perpetuate this dual-receptive approach, and, by the final recording, the other-medium responses happened in an unmarked way.

Although Yoh resisted using English at first, he also demonstrated a passive understanding of it, which eventually allowed Emil to shift to that language. Both speakers adapted the way they formulated their turns by simplifying and modifying them according to the evolving notions of recipient design that they held about each other. It was interesting to note also that the pattern of language use was smoother as Emil became more familiar with the routines of getting

his hair cut—the greeting sequence, the haircut brief, the small talk, and so on. This feature of the talk both co-accomplishes rapport and indicates the participants' comfort with each other over time. Indeed, the participants' growing acceptance of the dual-receptive language alternation pattern in itself constitutes a form of rapport, as they work to treat an other-medium response as normative, even though in most bilingual interactional contexts it is often taken as a mark of dispreference (Auer, 1984).

Ultimately, the message is that communication takes place despite the interactants' mutual linguistic limitations because they both work to make it happen. The fact that they are also engaged in a service encounter that routinely involves extended conversation between the client and the server promotes such talk and helps establish a rapport that can lead to subsequent business transactions. In this situation, issues of native and non-native are rendered moot as the participants treat each other's preferred language as equally acceptable, highlighting the fundamental difference between language and talk.

## Acknowledgements

## Notes
1. Undoubtedly, visually available aspects of the other person's perceived identity, such as ethnicity and 'race', also play a part in determining an interlocutor's presumed language preference; however, participants do not usually orient to these explicitly in the initial moments of first encounters.
2. There is no concise English translation for this polite phrase, but it is an affiliative display of an impending cooperative relationship. Literally it means 'I wish', but the implied meaning here is 'I trust we will get along well together'.
3. A current speaker could also use other-medium self-repetition to accomplish a sort of pre-emptive clarification in same-turn by translating some part of the TCU in progress, for example, when Emil said, 'Where- *doko* did you study?'

## References
Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis, *Journal of Pragmatics 26*(2), 237–59.

Greer, T., Bussinguer, A., Butterfield, J., & Mischinger, A. (2009). Receipt through repetition. *JALT Journal, 31*(01), 1–30.

Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Palotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i Press.

Lee, S. H., Park, J. E., & Sohn, S. O. (2011). Expanded resources of English-speaking Korean heritage speakers during oral interviews. In G. Palotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i Press.

Li Wei (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational codeswitching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity* (pp. 156–176). London, England: Routledge.

Nguyen, H. (2008). Sequential organization as local and longitudinal achievement. *Text and Talk*, *28*(4), 501–528.

Nguyen, H. (2011a). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Palotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i Press.

Nguyen, H. (2011b). Achieving recipient-design longitudinally: Evidence from a pharmacy intern in patient consultations. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek (Eds.), *L2 Interactional competence and development* (pp. 173–205). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Nguyen, H. (2012). Social interaction and competence development: Learning the structural development of a communicative practice. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, *1*, 127–142.

Rehbein, J., ten Thije, J., & Verschik, A. (2012). Lingua receptiva (LaRa): Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 248–264.

Svennevig, J. (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies, 6,* 489–516.

Torras, M.-C. (1998). Catalan, Castilian or both? Code negotiation in bilingual service encounters. *Working Paper Series*, Working paper no. 26. Retrieved 4 July, 2013, from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pubs/clsl/clsl96.pdf