

Lingua Receptiva (LaRa) - Remarks on the Quintessence of Receptive Multilingualism

Jochen Rehbein, Jan D. ten Thije, Anna Verschik¹

Jochen Rehbein
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education
Inonu Bulvari
TR-06531 Ankara, Turkey
Email: jochen@metu.edu.tr

Jan D. ten Thije (corresponding author)
Departement Nederlands, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics
Universiteit van Utrecht
Trans 10, 3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands
Email: J.D.tenthije@uu.nl
www.jantenthije.eu

Anna Verschik
Institute of Estonian Language and Culture,
Tallinn University,
Narva Road 25
10120 Tallinn,
Estonia
Email: anna-verschik@tlu.ee

Biographical note

Professor Dr. Jochen Rehbein, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, since 2006; in 1971, started teaching general linguistics, sociology of language, German as a foreign language at German universities; co-founder of the Hamburg Research Centre on Multilingualism. Publications, projects: Functional Pragmatics, discourse analysis; grammar and mental processes, multilingualism; intercultural communication; Turkish linguistics; politeness.

¹ Acknowledgements: We thank Daria Bahtina and Ivika Rehbein-Ots for making suggestions regarding English formulations.

Jan D. ten Thije is assistant professor at the Dutch Department / Utrecht institute for Linguistics at Utrecht University. His main fields of research concern institutional discourse in multicultural and international settings, receptive multilingualism, intercultural training, language education and Functional Pragmatics.

Anna Verschik is professor of general linguistics at Tallinn University and docent in Yiddish studies at Helsinki University. Her scholarly interests include Russian-Estonian language contacts, sociolinguistics of the Baltic countries and varieties of Yiddish in the Baltic region.

Running head: lingua receptiva

Abstract

This article introduces and defines the notion *lingua receptiva* (LaRa) as 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. The quintessence of lingua receptiva is discussed from communicative, psycholinguistic and language psychology approaches to multilingualism. Moreover, the occurrence of this mode is documented across various language families throughout time and in various discursive intercultures it creates. Furthermore, three central characteristics are discussed, namely ideological barriers resulting in asymmetry, 'inference-making' mechanisms and function of idiomatic expressions. Finally, lingua receptiva is compared to other multilingual modes, especially with English as lingua franca.

Key words: receptive multilingualism, intercomprehension, semicommunication, intelligibility of closely related languages

1. Defining ‘lingua receptiva’

Receptive multilingualism is 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*. Their mutual understanding is established while both recipients use their ‘passive’ knowledge of the language and/or variety of their interlocutor(s). The field was established already in 1952 when Voegelin and Harris distinguished the intelligibility among dialects due to close genetic relationship, and stated that ‘an informant’s comprehension from another dialect could provide an index of dialect distance...’ (Casad, 1974: 52). In later studies, this phenomenon has been conceptualised as ‘intelligibility of closely related languages’ (Wolff, 1964; Casad, 1974, 2005; Ethnologue (n.y.)), ‘semicommunication’ (Haugen 1981; Zeevaert, 2007), or ‘intercompréhension’ (Grin 2008). This mode has also been described as ‘receptive multilingualism’ (Braunmüller, 2007, ten Thije/Zeevaert, 2007).

In contrast to previous approaches, we will elaborate especially on the *receptive* component, which is crucial in grasping the notions of understanding and misunderstanding. In actual fact, we operationalise these specific receptive mechanisms and in order to do so we introduce a new notion, namely *lingua receptiva* (abbreviated LaRa). By definition, *lingua receptiva* is the ensemble of those *linguistic, mental, interactional* as well as *intercultural competencies* which are *creatively* activated when interlocutors listen to linguistic actions in their ‘passive’ language or variety. The essential point is that speakers apply additional competencies in order to monitor the way hearers activate their ‘passive knowledge’ and thus attempt to control the ongoing process of understanding.

Lingua receptiva has a long-standing tradition not only within multicultural Europe, but throughout the world, yet it has been largely ignored or suppressed as a result of homogenising language policies of European nation-states in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, lingua receptiva communication continues to occur in various multilingual niches. In this article we will, for the first time, systematically relate processes of understanding and misunderstanding to research on multilingual communication across various language families as well as in different socio-cultural settings in Europe and Asia.

First we define the notions of hearer-speaker dichotomy with respect to LaRa. Next, we summarise the quintessence of lingua receptiva from communicative, psycholinguistic and language psychology approaches to multilingualism. Then, we describe the occurrence of this mode across various language families throughout time and the discursive interculturalities it creates. Subsequently, we discuss three features that are crucial to unravelling the notion of lingua receptiva:

ideological barriers resulting in asymmetry, ‘inference-making’ mechanisms and function of idiomatic expressions. Finally, we compare lingua receptiva with other multilingual modes, especially with English as *lingua franca* and comment on unique features of LaRa.

2. Hearer’s LaRa – speaker’s LaRa

In LaRa, we distinguish between hearer's and speaker's components which themselves follow a distinctive system of competencies. The hearer’s component of LaRa consists of all processes that actualise and intensify the hearer's competencies. These linguistic means comprise nonverbal signals that steer the speaker's production, prosodic elements expressing the whole range from agreement to disagreement, formulaic expressions (e.g. ‘I don't understand’, ‘What do you mean?’, ‘What?’), echo questions, and other linguistic elements. On the other hand, the speaker’s LaRa lists strategies such as reformulations, repairs (Rehbein 1984), recapitulations, rephrasings and other types of meta-discourse elements (e.g. Bührig, 1996; Kameyama, 2004). Accommodation processes, in particular, lead to lexical and morphological adaptations towards what speakers imagine hearers would be able to understand better in their recipient language (Braunmüller, 2002). In conclusion, these creative verbal elements within LaRa are often the result of receptive multilingual discourse, which is why their analysis will provide new insights into the emergence of contact varieties (e.g. Matras & Bakker, 2003; Matras, 2009).

All these elements mentioned above occur in communication under normal conditions and can be observed on the surface of communication, both mono- and multilingual. What calls for extra attention, however, is the fact that these elements are used to signal and to mediate processes of intercompréhension in lingua receptiva. It is the mental component of such underlying processes of understanding that is not applied as ‘default elements’ (Zeevaert, 2004) but signals that additional deeper understanding processes are activated in order to anticipate and/or overcome potential non-/misunderstanding. In particular, both speaker and hearer activate the following elements to address various language dimensions:

- additional devices of segmentation and phonological adaptations
- morphological and syntactic meta-knowledge derived from a ‘closely related language’
- syntactic and semantic parsing and re-activation of cognates and other inter-related structures (see section 3)
- illocutionary and pattern knowledge based on overall communicative knowledge (see section 3)

- inference-making processes that draw on constellation-based, contextual, semantic or rather propositional dimensions (see section 6.2).

To summarise, these additional mental and linguistic activities are used on the basis of a ‘passive’ language to enhance processes of reconstructing the speaker's plan in order to establish a hearer’s plan (e.g. Rehbein, 1977; Rehbein & Kameyama, 2003), as it will be explained in the next paragraph. It should be emphasised that inferences can be seen as mental activations in multilingual communication.

3. Understanding / comprehension revisited

The kernel concept of *lingua receptiva* is the process of understanding across languages and varieties. There are two disciplines which deal with this phenomenon: multilingual communication theory and language psychology and psycholinguistics.

Gumperz and his colleagues focused on understanding and especially misunderstanding in intercultural discourse (e.g. Gumperz & Roberts, 1991; Gumperz, 1992; Hinnenkamp, 2000). They observed that many misunderstandings can be detected in discourse so, methodologically speaking, they cannot be identified on the morpho-syntactic or lexical level alone (e.g. Roberts, 1996; Simonot & Broeder, 1996; Allwood & Abelar, 1984, Allwood & Simonot, 1984). Despite the fact that this research tradition stems from interactional socio-linguistics and pragmalinguistics, it could be argued that a similar line of argumentation that favours discourse analysis should be applied to *lingua receptiva*. More recent literature on intercultural discourse focuses on processes of ‘successful’ communication and to what extent linguistic means contribute to intercultural understanding (e.g. Bührig & ten Thije, 2004).

Discourse is the medium in which understanding and misunderstanding emerge. Therefore, reception of speech actions in discourse can be conceived as *stages of understanding*. These stages describe the process of ‘percolation’ as executed by the hearer (e.g. Ehlich & Rehbein, 1986; Rehbein & Kameyama, 2003; ten Thije, 2003a; Kameyama, 2004). These stages have been summarised as follows:

- (I) assessment of the constellation (based on preceding discourse-knowledge)
- (II) formation of the hearer’s expectation
- (III) perception of the linguistic elements of utterance, illocutionary and propositional act (in order to be able to proceed to the active construction and co-construction of the whole speech action)

- (IV) formation of the hearer's plan (reconstruction of action focus, schema formation, plan of received speech action; and further processes)
- (V) adoption of the plan (of the received speech action).

The quintessence of the speaker-hearer plan formation lies in the fact that each interactant is a speaker as well as a hearer in the string of discourse. In receptive multilingual discourse, this alternation is bi-directional since the 'turn-over', or a *production-to-comprehension switch* of LaRa, occurs between *speaking in one language (speaker's role)* and *understanding in the other (hearer's role)*. An experimental investigation by Rehbein (1987) disclosed how non-understanding in L2 blocks speech production in the same language, whereas understanding in L1 facilitates production in L2. It is obvious that *lingua receptiva* does not run this 'blockage' risk since the speakers produce L1 speech actions. Yet, successful understanding presupposes reaching stage (IV): in other words, all interactants must be able to form a hearer plan in their 'passive' language, and adopt it (stage (V)) as a precondition for the follow-up step in discourse.

Beerkens (2010) applied this model in a study on German-Dutch receptive multilingualism. Based on discourse empirical findings, she adapted this model by including the assessment of receptive competencies of both speaker and hearer in stage (I). Consequently, stage (V) was enriched by an additional i.e. whether the adopted plan corresponds with respect of the anticipated receptive competencies.

Another application of this model is discussed in Rehbein & Massakowa (to appear). In a study on multilingual Turkish-Kazakh discourses of exchange students they found that some processes of understanding can be blocked at stage (III), whereas others are percolated to the next stages to attain understanding. In this processing, the hearers (*re-*)*activate language typological knowledge* as well as *knowledge from different discourse and grammatical resources* (see section 6). It is not assumed that average speakers are aware of language typology, yet research has shown that psychotypology or 'perceived language distance' plays a role in multilingual interaction (Kellerman, 1977, 1995; de Angelis, 2007).

Language psychology and psycholinguistics contribute to the conceptualisation of *lingua receptiva* in a number of ways. An established research tradition has shaped the model of understanding as an active mental process of construction (Bühler, 1934; Hörmann, 1976, Carroll & Freedle, 1972; Clark & Haviland, 1977; Freedle, 1977). Furthermore, the model of speech comprehension and speech perception has been developed (Clark, 1996). Another approach conceptualises the active linking of sentence structure to discourse structure through the hearer (van Berkum, Zwitserlood, Hagoort, Brown, 2007). Perception in cross-linguistic settings is considered to be a non-automatic process due to various aspects of parsing that range from phonemes

and morphemes to morpho-syntactic and syntactic categories (van Gompel & Pickering, 2007). The latter is crucial since understanding processes can be blocked at an early stage unless respective knowledge is activated in the construction process of the hearer (c.f. Ingram 2007: 345; for an overview Pisoni & Remez, 2005). Moreover, the speaker's perception of hearer's response influences the construction process of their utterances (e.g. Schober & Brennan, 2003). According to Pickering and Garrod (2004) syntactic structures of comprehension pre-determine syntactic structures of production due to discourse. It would be plausible to assume that this alignment by discourse is also true in situations in which multiple languages are involved as is the case of receptive multilingualism. The turn-over takes place in the comprehension-to-production switch when primed structures, lexical items or morphemes are compared. From this point of view, setting up learner's grammars from a hearer's perspective could be promising, as it was done in 'Rezeptive Grammatik' for learners of German (e.g. Fabricius-Hansen & Heringer, 1988).

In sum, psycholinguistic research demonstrates models of understanding construction that is in line with the speaker/hearer-plan formation as discussed above within the pragmatic approach. To be more precise, both psycholinguistic and pragmatic models encompass the following activities like:

- Developing a deep network of expectations of what will be said (by the speaker) based on (common) presuppositions – see stages (I) (II) (III)
- Creating the reception of components of the utterance, the propositional and the illocutionary act by activating knowledge of various linguistic and interactional repertoires – see stage (IV)
- Co-constructing an interpretation of the utterance in its various components of the whole speech action – see stage (V).

Given the two approaches, it should be mentioned that in addition to the processes mentioned, a whole range of discursive components comes into play: speaker's objectives, genre of discourse, discourse patterns, turn-taking, formulaic expressions, topic-comment-processing etc. All these mental, interactional and linguistic dimensions shape the hearer's actions (e.g. Dascal, 2003; Holtgraves, 2007).

4. Communicative constellations of *linguae receptivae*

The occurrences of *linguae receptivae* appear to be manifold. Globalization in Europe is historically determined by structural mobility that has led to various potentially multilingual conflict constellations. Therefore, *linguae receptivae* occur in *border regions*, in *institutional discourse* (e.g. work place, television, educational settings, health care discourse, sales talk, meetings etc.) and in *cross-generational communication* within and across language families. These distinct communicative constellations are influenced by ideologies, historical beliefs and attitudes on the one hand and language policies on the other.

There are several constellations which are based on contact-and-conflict situations of multilingual communication. With respect to *linguae receptivae* we may refer to the great European language families, such as Romance languages, Germanic languages, Slavic languages, Finno-Ugric languages, Turkic languages, Indo-Iranian and Semitic languages as well as some languages which are in close contact with them (e.g. Basque, Albanian). In previous studies, the concept of language family starting from the Scandinavian and Germanic varieties (Haugen, 1962, 1981; Braunmüller, 2002; Zeevaert, 2004) and Romance languages (e.g. Jensen, 1989; Conti & Grin, 2008), has been regarded relevant for the investigation of successful *intercompréhension*. For instance, it has been claimed that within the family of Romance languages sufficient comprehension could be established in 30 to 50 hours of explicit language training (e.g. Blanche-Benveniste, 2008, Janin, 2008; Grin, 2008: 94). Constellation-specific elements that can have both positive and negative effect on *intercompréhension* are also discussed in Berthele (2007a, 2008). Receptive multilingualism occurring in and mediated by the broadcast media has been researched in the Czech and Slovak context (e.g. Kompasová 1999/2000, Nábělková 2008, Zeman 1997, 2008).

Cross-generational multilingual communication includes settings where members of the elder generation converse in a minority/immigrant language with their children who respond in the majority language (Fishman, 1991, 2004; Spolsky, 2004). In Europe immigrant languages such as Turkish have been affected by language attrition, language loss, contact-induced change, and creative languageing (Schmidt, Köpke, Keijzer & Weilemar, 2004; Yağmur, 1997; Rehbein, 2001, 2007; Rehbein, Herkenrath & Karakoç, 2009). As an example of a study on cross-generational conversations in Turkish as an immigrant language and German as a majority language, we refer to Herkenrath (this volume) (cf. also Afshar, 1998, 2007 for German-Persian intergenerational LaRa). Moreover, cross-generational constellations can also be observed in Turkish as a majority language and Arabic as the language of understanding in Antioch/Southern Turkey and in multilingual Kurdish-Turkish settings in many regions of Turkey.

Further, Turkish and Azerbaijani interactants exercise receptive multilingualism in border regions (Sağın-Şimşek & König, this volume). Constellations of that type often benefit from a mediator, which activates common knowledge between the languages, just like Latin does for European or Persian does for Middle East constellations in historical contexts. Calvet (1996) and Wurm, Mühlhäusler & Tryon (1996) in particular show the worldwide realization of the LaRa potential in various contact constellations. Moreover, several constellations of receptive multilingualism may be linked by ‘*chains*’ of mutually intelligible varieties which spread across vast linguistic areas (e.g. Voegelin and Harris, 1951). As corners of such an ‘intelligibility chain’, Kazakh and Turkish being relatively distant languages are of interest because, contrary to language-typological expectations, receptive multilingualism is still effective (e.g. Rehbein & Massakowa, to appear).

An overview of the diversity of multilingual constellation demonstrates how receptive multilingualism is practiced *across language families*. For instance, university students from different cantons in multilingual [diglossic] Switzerland converse with their French-speaking fellows in German while listening to them speaking French and vice versa (e.g. Werlen, 2007; Serra, 2010). In Finland in municipalities that have a Swedish speaking minority, authorities are required to understand their clients who speak Swedish whereas these clients must follow their interlocutors’ instructions in Finnish (e.g. Rontu, 2010). In Estonia, at least in some parts of the country, there seems to develop an Estonian-Russian LaRa, as is often the case in other post-Soviet states (Verschik, this volume). Multilingual African situations exemplify cross-generational constellations in which typologically distant (both minority and immigrant) languages are spoken within families (e.g. Agoya, to appear). Finally, Wurm, Mühlhäusler & Tryon (1996) discuss multiple bi- and trilingual intercultural constellations in which bi-directional bilingualism across language families takes place.

In conclusion, it is justified to claim that the old criterion of ‘intelligibility of closely related languages’ (Gooskens, 2007; Chaoju & van Heuven, 2009, Schüppert & Gooskens, this volume) is a too restrictive notion. Moreover, ‘intelligibility’ is not a feature inherent to languages but to multilingual (LaRa-)communication as dynamic process. Consequently, receptive multilingualism also includes all those language constellations in which speakers and hearers communicate by alternately employing different languages as vehicles of speaking and of understanding.

5. Discursive Interculture(s) and Cultural Apparatus

Although LaRa has been largely ignored or suppressed throughout the twentieth century due to language policies mentioned above (e.g. Rindler Schjerve, 2008), receptive multilingualism has led and still leads to an intercultural discourse. Koole & ten Thije (1994, 2001) refer to that as *discursive interculture(s)* where new forms of understanding are construed and misunderstanding, failure, problems and deficit of communication are transcended. Ten Thije (2003b) distinguishes seven features for the emergence of discursive interculture(s). These features are summarised as follows: (1) interlocutors have enduring contact within a collective; (2) they have linguistic competencies in various languages; (3) their interaction is determined by superordinate institutional purposes, (4) their interpersonal contact is not unique, but has an repetitive character, (5) achieving the institutional purposes depends on the extent to which interlocutors are capable of coping with the multilingual constellation (6) the choice of language for their contact is not completely fixed by the language policy of the organization and participants have a certain action space to develop new discourse structures; (7) the communicative setting itself arises from and is related to supranational developments. Based on this list of characteristics one could estimate which social constellations could be felicitous for LaRa communication. Examples of discursive interculture(s) are cross-border settings (e.g. Dutch-German, Danish-Swedish) as well as cross-generational LaRa within family discourse (e.g. Turkish-Kurdish).

Discursive interculture implies interactive construction of a discursive common ground, as well as aspects of the common ground that are already available (Koole & ten Thije, 2001: 583). This interactive construction has been conceptualised as the notion of *cultural apparatus* (e.g. Rehbein 2006). The latter helps interactants routinise action practices, thought structures, pattern knowledge, forms of imagining, social experiences and fixed emotional structures that are collectively changed and communicatively adapted. In terms of LaRa, the cultural apparatus can be applied creatively by the speaker and/or the hearer. The former multilingual Habsburg Empire can serve as an example of these practices since its multilingual layout also demonstrates a long tradition of how receptive multilingual discourses formed specific new forms of understanding among the participants by means of the cultural apparatus' creativity. All in all, the continuous praxis of LaRa discourses may add up to new stable forms of discursive interculturalities as creative outcomes that are 'both original and of value' (e.g. NACCCE, 1990).

6. Characteristics of *lingua receptiva*

6.1 Ideological components of asymmetrical understanding

The conditions under which interlocutors are able to use *lingua receptiva* in an effective way are

not at all clear. In this respect, it is interesting that the activation is not symmetrical: as previous studies confirm, speakers of Danish activate knowledge of Swedish easier than their Swedish counterparts activate Danish (Schüppert and Gooskens; this volume). The same holds true for German-Dutch (Beerens, 2010) and Turkish-Azerbaijani (Sağın-Şimşek & König, this volume) constellations where speakers of one language are more apt to use *lingua receptiva* based on their language attitudes than those of the other. Thus, although the ‘close relationship’ is respectively identical, the employment of the common linguistic knowledge is far from being the same. Negative attitudes may block comprehension in one direction whereas the other direction is still active. Ideological reservations against languages and their speakers permanently reinforce or reflect languages’ inequality (e.g. Irvine & Gal, 2009).

6.2 Inferences and linguistic repertoires

Lingua receptiva relies heavily on inference-making, a mechanism that has not yet been sufficiently explored. Second and foreign language learners are aware that ‘inference-making’ is a relevant skill that helps to process text and discourse. Receptive multilingualism is no exception, and inference-making is essential to all constellations. It should be emphasised that inferences can be seen as mental activations in multilingual communication. A number of studies reports on other aspects of inferencing, such as activation in bilingualism (e.g. Grosjean 2008, 2010), LaRa communication (e.g. Rehbein & Massakowa, to appear) and connection between understanding and inferencing in reading texts (Berthele, 2007a,b).

Harvey Sacks’ (1985) chapter on the ‘inference-making machine’ investigates a conversational type-based mechanism which is used by interactants to make inferences from the preceding to the follow-up utterance, and vice versa. Although the data comes from monolingual American-English conversation, such a ‘machine’ that connects seemingly unconnected utterances supposedly operates also in *lingua receptiva*.

Singer (2007: 343) states that ‘virtually every aspect of language comprehension is inferential’. This implies that the process of inference is based on ‘world knowledge’ rather than linguistic knowledge, so that receptive multilingualism can draw on this shared competence without having to pay extra efforts for the lack of genetic proximity between languages?

Paradis (1994, 2004) illustrates two types of understanding strategies of bilinguals by means of a schema which is also relevant for *lingua receptiva*. According to this schema, with one strategy, understanding is achieved at cognitive level via perception of all formal linguistic components of the utterance (phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical), which is a non-modular strategy. With the other strategy, the hearer immediately draws inferences separately,

module-by-module, from one linguistic component of the received utterance to the other and thus achieves the cognitive level without having reconstructed every linguistic component in detail but in a modular way (Piccaluga & Harmegnies, 2008: 193).

It should be mentioned that the ‘inference-making machine’ comprises not only formal linguistic knowledge, but also common institutional knowledge, discourse-type knowledge, pattern knowledge and, last but not least, linguistic knowledge of language family type and language-contact type in order to construct understanding. As far as societal knowledge is concerned, inference making in *lingua receptiva* communication can be blocked or modified by the intervention of ethnic or other prejudices (see section 5).

According to Gumperz (e.g. 1971, 1995) speech communities are based on language repertoires of conventionalised social styles. Misunderstandings arise when interactants, within the same interactive frame, draw, by means of contextualization cues, incompatible inferences from repertoires or interpret them in incompatible ways. Extending Gumperz’ theory, Lüdi states that a broad range of multilingual repertoires is available for the multilingual speaker, contrary to the monolingual speaker (e.g. Lüdi, 2006, 2007; Lüdi, & Py, 2009). In receptive multilingualism the interactants make alternating use of their *diverse* linguistic repertoires. An advantage of repertoire theory, one could argue, is that the linguistic knowledge of the linguistic varieties multilingual interactants have at their disposal is not absolutely compartmentalized, as many grammatical theories suppose. Instead, these linguistic repertoires are in constant interaction and future research will focus on differences between hearer’s activation of versus speaker’s access to their respective multilingual repertoires.

6.3 Idiomaticity in multilingual communication

Idiomaticity is a particularly crucial point in second and foreign language modes of multilingual communication. According to the investigation of Roberts (2005), the English-as-a-foreign-language speaker avoids idiomaticity (formulaic expressions), although, as corpus linguistics shows, this is characteristic of everyday common understanding (e.g. Sinclair, 1991; Corrigan, Moravcsik, Ouali & Wheatley, 2009). In receptive multilingualism, however, it is just the mutual familiarity of common speech formulae which bridges the way across languages and varieties. This is definitely true of Turkish - Azerbaijani communication where the languages, as a result of their close contact during centuries, demonstrate a vast common stock of common speech formulae. In fact, this applies to multilingual communication in many linguistic areas, such as the Southern Balkans to Macedonia (Albanian, Macedonian, Balkan, and Turkish). In general, multi-

lingual corpora with various LaRa pairs should be made available for research (e.g. Schmidt, 2006; Rehbein, Herkenrath & Karakoç, 2007).

7. Lingua Franca, LaRa and other modes of multilingual communication

Having analysed the characteristics of *lingua receptiva*, we would now like to have a closer look at the constellations where it can be effectively applied. In most constellations both *lingua receptiva* and *lingua franca* (LF), or rather, *linguae francae* are available for multilingual communication. In pertinent literature on *lingua franca* (Seidlhofer, Breiteneder & Pitzl, 2006: 5; Seidlhofer, 2004; House, 2003; Alptekin, 2010.) one distinguishes between top-down applications of ELF (fulfilling functions in various professional domains) and bottom-up (used by speakers from all levels of society in practically all walks of life). In situations of the first type that the use of English underlies the native-like norms (ELN: English of a native-like competence). Another typical occurrence of this mode is English in ‘informal settings’ as a vehicle of communication among groups of non-native participants, as a lingua franca in a strict sense (ELF).

It is mostly true that groups as well as individual interactants have an option to choose between English as lingua franca (global language for international communication) and regional *lingua franca* (ReLF). Other languages, such as French, German, Italian, Russian, or even Turkish function as ReLF: ‘As regards language of international communication, we are well aware that most people would today opt for English. However, some could well choose French, Spanish, Portuguese, Mandarin or any other language’ (European Commission, 2008: 7). Given the broader list of option for multilingual communication, it is crucial to make these modes comparable in a systematic way. The latter can be approached in terms of different relationships of languages involved. There are the following eight modes of multilingual communication (e.g. House & Rehbein 2004 for this term):

1. foreign language usage
2. second language usage
3. English as lingua franca communication in informal
4. receptive multilingualism (LaRa)
5. immigrant language talk
6. code-switching
7. code-mixing
8. ‘pure’ bilingualism (i.e. from early childhood)

Based on this list it is possible to make some comparative remarks on *lingua receptiva* versus other modes and explain its unique characteristics. We will now explain the comparative dimension from the table below (e.g. table 1).

First of all, neither foreign nor second language modes incorporate the multilingual basis of the learners, which presupposes the separation (with potential for transfer) of linguistic repertoires. *Lingua franca* in informal settings, immigrant languages and code-switching (e.g. Backus, 1996) as well as code-mixing (e.g. Matras & Bakker, 2003), on the other hand, integrate diverse linguistic repertoires to a certain extent and thus implement the core concept of receptive multilingualism. To put it differently, these modes (3 to 7) do not separate linguistic repertoires, which results in enrichment rather than reduction of plurilingual sources.

Considering the multilingual quality within this group, it is clear that *lingua franca* still employs one linguistic repertoire as communicative tool whereas all the other modes (4 to 7) use at least two at the same time.

Another important dimension of multilingual communication presupposes involvement of both speaker and hearer in terms of various language uses. Code-switching and code-mixing alike focus on speaker-oriented linguistic activities. In contrast, speaker and hearer are involved in modes of *lingua receptiva* and immigrant languages, with hearer-dominant focus in the former and both speaker-hearer orientation in the latter. Yet, immigrant talk has a relatively restricted use and cannot be used as a vehicular language which implies that this mode is not widely used as communicative means for multilingual interaction either by native or non-native speakers (in contrast to 'pure' *lingua franca* where no native languages are involved).

Considering the fact that English is still commonly used as a *lingua franca*, it is necessary to make an explicit comparison between this mode and *lingua receptiva*. As it has already been mentioned, ELF in some settings relies on diversity of linguistic repertoires and adheres to one repertoire as communicative tool. In respect to the processes of understanding, ELF and LaRa both incorporate speaker and hearer but differ in preferential succession towards the two: the former presupposes focus on speaker whereas the latter on hearer.

Finally, analysing the potential of both modes for being used as vehicular languages, it is claimed that in ELF the target language (global English) exclusively functions as vehicular language whereas involved L1s do not. What concerns LaRa, both L1s are indeed the target languages and collaboratively function as vehicular.

	Modes of multilingual communication (without interpreting/translation)							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Foreign language usage (norms of target language)	Second language usage	Lingua franca English (in informal settings) (ELF)	Receptive multilingualism (LaRa)	Immigrant language talk (Catalyst language)	Code-Switching/ Code alternation	Code-Mixing	“Pure” bilingualism/ multilingualism
Separation of linguistic repertoires	yes (but transfer)	yes (but transfer)	no, instead: access to diverse linguistic repertoires by speakers and/or hearers in multilingual communication					absolute separation
Employment of (at least) two ling. repertoires as com. Tools	No	no	No	yes	yes	Yes	yes	yes
(Speaker / Hearer) orientation in discourse analysis	speaker, reader	speaker and hearer	speaker > hearer	hearer > speaker	hearer and speaker	speaker	speaker	speaker
Usable as vehicular language	TL yes; L1 no	L2 yes; L1 no	TL yes; L1 no	TL yes; L1 yes	L1 yes; L2 no	several L1	several L1	several L1

Table 1. General overview over modes of multilingual communication (without the help of third party). ‘ELF’: English as lingua franca; LaRa: Lingua receptive; ‘TL’: target language; ‘L1’: native, first or source language; ‘L2’: second language; ‘... > ...’: predominance relation of orientation on interactant (speaker, hearer)

Shifting the focus back to application of these modes with respect of multilingual communication, it is evident that LaRa has a far-reaching potential for successful understanding in certain constellations.

It should be borne in mind that the suggested mode of communication can be used in combination with other complementary modes. In ELF, one could rely on acquired repertoires which are ‘safe’ from the speaker’s perspective. Yet, in LaRa the interactants use L1 to verbalize what they would not be able to verbalize in ELF. In actual fact, plurilingual repertoires are activated ‘on the stage’ in the process of adaptation to the other L1 and thus become available for both

speaker and hearer. Both modes of multilingual communication proceed without the mediation of a third party, which implies low-cost communication and should thus be subject to further investigation as far as processes of understanding are concerned.

9. Quintessence and potential of *lingua receptiva*

The quintessence of LaRa integrates psycholinguistic, language psychological, pragmatic as well as socio-linguistic approaches to processes of understanding in multilingual communication. The notion of *lingua receptiva* encompasses a broader category than previously discussed *semicom- munication*, *intercomprehensibility* and *intelligibility of closely related languages*. LaRa represents an ensemble of multiple competencies that are applied by the interactants both in speaker and hearer position (production-to-comprehension switch). LaRa draws on the inference-making machine, available plurilingual repertoires and idiomaticity that exists between languages involved (both typologically close and genetically unrelated). It has been demonstrated that LaRa is an effective mode in various multilingual constellations and thus has a potential for solving communicative problems both by overcoming ideological asymmetries and establishing discursive interculture(s). It also promotes the idea of cultural and linguistic diversity in addressing two languages simultaneously: speakers of community languages (i.e. minority and immigrant languages), for instance, maintain or even revitalise their first language and yet could be integrated into ‘dominant’ society once LaRa become an accepted mode of communication. Finally, LaRa has been compared to other multilingual modes and it has been concluded that this mode has a far-reaching potential for achieving congruent understanding in various multilingual constellations, applied alone or in combination with other modes.

References

- AFSHAR, K. (2007). “Du sollst *baqal-e bābā* kommen, nicht er ...!” – Zum Sprachwechsel in einer persisch-deutschen Familie. In K. Meng, & J. Rehbein (Eds.), *Kinderkommunikation - einsprachig und mehrsprachig*. Mit einer erstmals auf Deutsch publizierten Arbeit von Lev. S Vygotskij, *Zur Frage nach der Mehrsprachigkeit im kindlichen Alter* (pp. 335-370). Münster, New York: Waxmann.
- AGOYA, C. N. (forthcoming) *Die Sprachsituation Kenias als Voraussetzung für die Vermittlung des Deutschen als Fremdsprache*. Münster, New York etc.: Waxmann.

- ALLWOOD, J. & ABELAR, Y. (1984). Lack of understanding, misunderstanding and adult language acquisition. In Extra, G. & Mitner, M. (Eds.), *Studies in Second Language Acquisition by Adult Immigrants* (pp. 27-55). Tilburg: University Press.
- ALLWOOD, J. & SIMONOT, M. (1984). Understanding, misunderstanding and breakdown. In Perdue, C. (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition. A Field Manual* (pp. 68-94). Rowley: Newbury House.
- ALPTEKIN, C. (2010). Redefining multicompetence for bilingualism and ELF. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 1, 95-110
- BACKUS, A. (1996). *Two in one. Bilingual Speech of Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: UP
- BEERKENS, R. (2010). Receptive multilingualism as a language mode in the Dutch-German border area. Münster etc.: Waxmann.
- BERTHELE, R. (2007a). Zum Prozess des Verstehens und Erschließens. In B. Hufeisen & N. Marx (Eds.), *EuroComGerm - Die sieben Siebe. Germanische Sprachen lesen lernen* (pp. 15-26). Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- BERTHELE, R. (2007b). Sieb 5: syntaktische Strukturen. In B. Hufeisen & N. Marx (Eds.), *EuroComGerm – Die sieben Siebe: Germanische Sprachen lesen lernen* (pp. 167-179). Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- BERTHELE, R. (2008). Dialekt-Standard Situationen als embryonale Mehrsprachigkeit. Erkenntnisse zum interlingualen Potenzial des Provinzlerdaseins. In K. J. Mattheier & A. Lenz (Eds.), *Dialektsoziologie / Dialect Sociology / Sociologie du Dialecte*. In *Sociolinguistica* 22 (pp. 87-107). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- van BERKUM, J. J. A.; ZWITSERLOOD, P.; HAGOORT, P. & BROWN, C. M. (2003). Research report: When and how do listeners relate a sentence to the wider discourse? Evidence from the N400 effect. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 17, 701-718.
- BLANCHE-BENVENISTE, C. (2008). Comment retrouver l'expérience des anciens voyageurs en terres de langues romanes? In V. Conti & F. Grin (Eds.)(pp. 33-51).
- BRAUNMÜLLER, K. (2002). Semicommunication and accomodation: Observations from the linguistic situation in Scandinavia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12:1, 1-23.
- BRAUNMÜLLER, K. (2007). Receptive multilingualism in Northern Europe in the Middle Ages: A description of a scenario. In J. D. ten Thije & L. Zeevaert (Eds.)(pp. 25-47).
- BÜHLER, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fischer.
- BÜHRIG, K. (1996). *Reformulierende Handlungen. Zur Analyse sprachlicher Adaptierungsprozesse in institutioneller Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.
- BÜHRIG, K. & TEN THIJE, J. D. (Eds.) (2006). *Beyond misunderstanding. Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- CLARK, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- CALVET, L.-J. (1996). *Les politiques linguistiques*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- CARROLL, J. B. & FREEDLE, R. O. (Eds.) (1972). *Language comprehension and the acquisition of knowledge*. New York: Wiley.
- CASAD, E. (1974). *Dialect Intelligibility Testing*. SIL Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, nr. 38. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- CASAD, E. (2005). *Analyses of Intelligibility / Verständlichkeitsanalyse*. Art. 125. In Ammon, U. et al. (Eds.) *An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 1261-1272). Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.
- CHAOJU, T. AND VAN HEUVEN, V. J. (2009) *Mutual intelligibility of Chinese dialects experimentally tested*. *Lingua* 119, 709–732.
- CLARK, H. H. & HAVILAND, S. E. (1977). *Comprehension and the given-new contracts*. In R. O. Freedle (Ed.), *Discourse production and comprehension* (pp. 1-40). Norwood: Ablex.
- CONTI, V. & GRIN, F. (Eds.) (2008). *S'entendre entre langues voisines: vers l'intercompréhension*. Chêne-Bourg: Georg.
- CORRIGAN, R. L. MORAVCSIK, E.A. , OUALI, H. AND WHEATLEY, K.M (Eds.) (2009). *Formulaic language*. 2 vol. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- DASCAL, M. (2003). *Interpretation and Understanding*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DE ANGELIS, G. (2007). *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- EHLICH, K. & REHBEIN, J. (1986) *Muster und Institution. Untersuchungen zur schulischen Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.
- ETHNOLOGUE (n.y.) *Dialect intelligibility testing*. Index of SIL publications on Dialect intelligibility testing listed by country. http://www.ethnologue.com/show_subject.asp?code=DIT&type=index
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2008). *A rewarding challenge - How language diversity could strengthen Europe*. Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission. EC, Education and Culture DG: Brussels 2008.
- FABRICIUS-HANSEN, C. & HERINGER, H.-J. (1988). *Die Idee einer rezeptiven Grammatik und ihre Realisierung*. *InfoDaF. Information Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 15, 2, 164-175.
- FISHMAN, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theory and Practice of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- FISHMAN, J. A. (2004). *Language Maintenance, Language Shift, and Reversing Language Shift*. In T. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 406-436). Oxford: Blackwell.
- FREEDLE, R.O. (Ed.), *Discourse production and comprehension*. Norwood: Ablex.
- van GOMPEL, R. P. G. & PICKERING, M. (2007). *Syntactic parsing*. In M. Gaskell & M. Gareth (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics* (pp. 289-307). Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- GOOSKENS, C. (2007). *The contribution of linguistic factors to the intelligibility of closely related*

- languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28, 445-467.
- GRIN, F. (2008). L'intercompréhension, efficience et équité. In V. Conti & F. Grin (Eds.)(79-109).
- GROSJEAN, F. (2008). *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: University Press.
- GROSJEAN, F. (2010). *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. (1971). *Language in social groups. Essays*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Oxford: University Press
- GUMPERZ, J. J. (1995). Mutual inferencing in conversation. In I. Marková; C. F. Graumann, & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Mutualities in dialogue* (pp. 101-123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. & ROBERTS, C. (1991). Understanding in intercultural encounters. In Bloemnaert, J. & Verschueren, J. (Eds.), *The Pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51-90.
- HAUGEN, E. (1962). Semicommunication: The Language Gap in Scandinavian. In Lieberson, S. (Ed.)(1967) *Explorations in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 152-69) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- HAUGEN, E. (1981). Interlanguage. In id. (1987). *Blessings of Babel. Bilingualism and language planning* (pp. 77-81). Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HERKENRATH, A. (2011). Receptive multilingualism in an immigrant constellation: examples from Turkish-German child language. (this volume).
- HINNENKAMP, V. (2000). Constructing misunderstanding as a cultural event. In A. Di Luzio; S. Günthner, & S. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture in Communication. Analyses of intercultural situations* (pp. 211-243). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HOLTGRAVES, T. (2007). Second Language Learners and Speech Act Comprehension. *Language Learning*, 57:4, 595-610.
- HÖRMANN, H. (1976). *Meinen und Verstehen. Grundzüge einer psychologischen Semantik*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- HOUSE, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 556-578.
- HOUSE, J., & REHBEIN, J. (2004). What is 'multilingual communication'? In id. (Eds.), *Multilingual Communication. Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 3* (pp. 1-17). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- INGRAM, J. C. L. (2007) *Neurolinguistics. An Introduction to Spoken Language Processing and its Disorders*. Cambridge: UP.
- IRVINE, J. T., & GAL, S. (2009). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 402-434). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- JANIN, P. (2008). L'intercompréhension dans une politique francophone du plurilinguisme. In V. Conti & F. Grin (Eds.)(pp. 53-77).
- JENSEN, J. B. (1989). On the Mutual Intelligibility of Spanish and Portuguese. *Hispania* 72, 4, 848-852.

- KAMEYAMA, S. (2004). Verständnissicherndes Handeln. Zur reparativen Bearbeitung von Rezeptionsdefiziten in deutschen und japanischen Diskursen. Münster, New York: Waxmann.
- KELLERMANN, E. (1977). Toward a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2, 58-145.
- KELLERMANN, E. (1995). Crosslinguistic influence: transfer to nowhere. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 125-150.
- KOMPASOVÁ, S. (1999/2000) Čeština ve vysílání slovenské televizní stanice Markíza [Czech in the broadcasts of the Slovak television channel Markíza]. *Češtinář*, 10, 156–163.
- KOOLE, T., & ten THIJE, J. D. (1994). The construction of intercultural discourse: Team discussions of educational advisers. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- KOOLE, T., & ten THIJE, J. D. (2001). The construction of intercultural discourse. Methodological considerations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 571-587.
- LÜDI, G. (2006). Multilingual repertoires and the consequences for linguistic theory. In K. Bührig & J. D. ten Thije (Eds.)(pp. 11-42).
- LÜDI, G. (2007). The Swiss model of plurilingual communication. In K. Bührig & J. D. ten Thije (Eds.)(pp. 159-178).
- LÜDI, G., & PY, B. (2009). To be or not to be ... a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6, 154-167.
- MATRAS, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: University Press.
- MATRAS, Y., & BAKKER, P. (Eds.) (2003). *The Mixed Language Debate. Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- NÁBĚLKOVÁ, M. (2008) Slovenčina a čeština v kontakte: Pokračovanie príbehu [Slovak and Czech in Contact: Continuation of the Story]. Bratislava, Praha: Veda, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy v Praze.
- NACCCE (1999) *All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture And Education*. National Advisory Committee On Creative And Cultural Education, UK <http://www.cypni.org.uk/downloads/alloutfutures.pdf>
- PARADIS, M. (1994). Toward a neurolinguistic theory of simultaneous translation: The framework. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 3(29), 319-335.
- PARADIS, M. (2004). *A Neurolinguistic Theory of Bilingualism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- PICCALUGA, M., & HARMEGNIES, B. (2008). Aux sources de l'intercompréhension. Facteurs psycholinguistiques de la qualité interprétative en langues proches. In V. Conti & F. Grin (Eds.)(pp. 169-195).
- PICKERING, M. J. AND GARROD, S. (2004) Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27: 169-225.
- PISONI, D. B., & REMEZ, R. E. (Eds.), (2005). *The Handbook of Speech Perception*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- REHBEIN, J. (1977). *Komplexes Handeln. Elemente zur Handlungstheorie der Sprache*. Stuttgart:

Metzler.

- REHBEIN, J. (1984). Reparative Handlungsmuster und ihre Verwendungen im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Rologipapir 30/1984. Roskilde: Universitetscenter.
- REHBEIN, J. (1987). Diskurs und Verstehen. Zur Rolle der Muttersprache bei der Textverarbeitung in der Zweitsprache. In E. Apelauer (Ed.) *Gesteuerter Zweitspracherwerb* (pp. 113-172). München: Hueber.
- REHBEIN, J. (2001). Turkish in European Societies. In *Lingua e Stile*, 35,, 1-2, 317-334.
- REHBEIN, J. (2006). The cultural apparatus. Thoughts on the relationship between language, culture and society. In K. Bührig & J. D. ten Thije (Eds.)(pp. 43-96).
- REHBEIN, J. (2008). Vorurteile. In S. Steinmann, & U. Riedner (Eds.), *Alexandrinische Gespräche* (pp. 199-238). München: Judicium.
- REHBEIN, J., & KAMEYAMA, S. (2003). Pragmatik. In U. Ammon; N. Dittmar; K. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), "Sociolinguistics" / "Soziolinguistik". *An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 556-588). Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.
- REHBEIN, J.; HERKENRATH, A. & KARAKOÇ, B. (2007). Rehbein-SKOBI (Sprachliche Konnektivität bei bilingual türkisch-deutsch aufwachsenden Kindern und Jugendlichen). Universität Hamburg, EXMARaLDA: SFB 538-Korpora: E5.
Download: http://www.exmaralda.org/sfb_e5.html.
- REHBEIN, J. (2007). Erzählen in zwei Sprachen – auf Anforderung.. In K. Meng, & J. Rehbein (Eds.), *Kinderkommunikation - einsprachig und mehrsprachig*. Mit einer erstmals auf Deutsch publizierten Arbeit von Lev. S Vygotskij, *Zur Frage nach der Mehrsprachigkeit im kindlichen Alter* (pp. 389-453). Münster, New York: Waxmann.
- REHBEIN, J.; HERKENRATH, A. & KARAKOÇ, B. (2009). Turkish in Germany – On contact-induced language change of an immigrant language in the multilingual landscape of Europe. In *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*, 62, 3, 161-204.
- REHBEIN, J., & MASSAKOWA, G. (to appear). Inferential procedures in Kazakh-Turkish talk. In J. D. ten Thije; J. Rehbein & A. Verschik (Eds.). (In prep.).
- ROBERTS, C. (1996). A social perspective on understanding: some issues of theory and method In K. Bremer et al. (1996). *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters* (pp. 9-36). London: Longman.
- ROBERTS, P. (2005). *Spoken English as a world language: International and intranational settings*. PhD thesis. University of Nottingham.
- RONTU, H. (2010, November). Putting policies into practice. Talk given at the EUNoM Symposium on Higher Education and Research on Multilingualism: Change or Opportunity? Leeuwarden, The Netherlands.
- SACKS, H. (1985). The inference-making machine: Notes on observability. In T. van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, V.3 (pp. 13-23). London: Academic Press.

- SAĞIN-ŞİMŞEK, Ç., & KÖNIG, W. (2011). Receptive Multilingualism and language understanding: intelligibility of Azerbaijani to Turkish speakers. (this volume).
- SCHMIDT, M.; KÖPKE, B.; KEIJZER, M. & WEILEMAR, L. (Eds.) (2004). First Language Attrition. Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- SCHMIDT, T. (2006). EXMARaLDA. Partitur-Editor Handbuch. Version 1.3.2. University of Hamburg: Collaborative Research Institute (SFB 538) Multilingualism.
Downloads: <http://www.exmaralda.org/downloads.html>.
- SCHÖBER, M. F., & BRENNAN, S. E. (2003). Processes of interactive spoken discourse: The role of the partner. In A. C. Graesser et al. (Eds.), Handbook of Discourse Processes (pp. 123-164). Mahwah etc.: Erlbaum.
- SCHÜPPERT, A. & GOOSKENS, C. (2011) The role of extra-linguistic factors for receptive bilingualism: Evidence from Danish and Swedish pre-schoolers (this volume)
- SEIDLHOFER, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24, 209-239.
- SEIDLHOFER, B.; BREITENEDER, A., & PITZL, M.-L. (2006). English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26, 3-34.
- SERRA, C. (2010, November). Social representations of plurilingualism and of plurilingual language teaching in universities' language policies and in academic teachers' discourse. Talk given at the EUNoM Symposium on Higher Education and Research on Multilingualism: Change or Opportunity? Leeuwarden, The Netherlands.
- SINCLAIR, J. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. Oxford: University Press.
- SINGER, M. (2007). Inference processing in discourse comprehension. In M. G. Gaskell e.a. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics (pp. 342-359). Oxford: University Press.
- SPOLSKY, B. (2004). Language Policy. Cambridge: UP.
- TEN THIJE, J. D. (2003a). The transition from misunderstanding to understanding in intercultural communication. In L. Komlósi; P. Houtlosser, & M. Leezenberg (Eds.), Communication and Culture. Argumentative, Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives (pp. 197-213). Amsterdam: Sic-Sac – International Centre for the Study of Argumentation.
- TEN THIJE, J.D. (2003b) Eine Pragmatik der Mehrsprachigkeit: zur Analyse, diskursiver Interkulturen. In: De Cillia, Rudi / Krumm, Josef / Wodak, Ruth (Eds.), Die Kosten der Mehrsprachigkeit – Globalisierung und sprachliche Vielfalt / The Cost of Multilingualism – Globalisation and Linguistic Diversity / Le Cout du Plurilinguism – Mondialisation et diversité linguistique' Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 101-125
- TEN THIJE, J. D. & ZEEVAERT, L. (Eds.) (2007). Receptive Multilingualism. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- VOEGELIN, C. F. & HARRIS, Z. S. (1951) Methods for Determining Intelligibility among Dialects of Natural Languages. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 95, 322-29.

- WERLEN, I. (2007). Receptive multilingualism in Switzerland and the case Biel/Bienne. In K. Bühlig & J. D. ten Thije (Eds.)(pp. 137-157).
- WOLFF, H. (1964). Intelligibility and Inter-Ethnic Attitudes. In D. Hymes (Ed.) *Language in Culture and Society*, (pp. 440-445). New York etc.: Harper and Row.
- WURM, S. A.; MÜHLHÄUSLER, P., & TRYON, D. T. (Eds.), (1996). *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- YAĞMUR, K. (1997). *First language attrition among Turkish speakers in Sydney*, Tilburg: UP.
- ZEEVAERT, L. (2004). *Interskandinavische Kommunikation. Strategien zur Etablierung von Verständigung zwischen Skandinaviern im Diskurs*. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.
- ZEEVAERT, L. (2007). Receptive multilingualism and inter-Scandinavian semicommunication. In ten Thije, J. D., & Zeevaert (Eds.)(pp. 103-135).
- ZEEVAERT, L & THIJE, J. D. ten (2007). Introduction. In THIJE, J. D. . ten, & ZEEVAERT (Eds.)(pp. 1-21).
- ZEMAN, J. (1997) K přijímání slovenské kultury Čechy po rozpadu Československa [Reception of Slovak culture after the dissolution of Czechoslovakia]. In S. Ondrejovič (Ed.), *Slovenčina na konci 20. storočia, jej normy a perspektívy* (pp. 182–186). Bratislava: Veda.
- ZEMAN, J. (2008) Konverzační opravy v projevech Slováků v českých médiích [Conversational repairs in the speech of Slovaks in the Czech media]. In L. Kralčák (Ed.), *Hovorená podoba jazyka v médiách* (pp. 51–56). Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa.