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Abstract

This empirical study deals with the issues of language choice and code alternation as a common practice in the organization of the complex check in activity with multiple participants in hospitality properties in Sweden. In particular, it discusses several interactional tasks that code alternation may accomplish in that setting and represents a crossroad of general linguistics, bilingualism studies and conversation analysis. In the light of arising interest of specialists of different areas of linguistics in bilingualism in formal settings, it deals with institutional bilingualism in Sweden, an EU country with a comparatively high level of bilingualism among residents.

In the era of the new economy with its globalization and human mobility, bilingualism has become an emergent practice in many tourism settings, the hospitality sector of tourism among them. In hospitality as a tourism setting with a potentially high concentration of foreign tourists, it is inevitable that certain groups of hotel guests include members who expose different language abilities and preferences. As a result, in the interaction with one single group of guests two or even more languages can be used at the same time, as oriented to the needs and preferences of each and every guest.

This investigation aims at discussing some possible accomplishments of language choice and code alternation in a standardized hotel check in activity where a single group of guests has to be addressed in two languages, Swedish and English, and where the language choices are crucial for participation and the accomplishment of the check in activity in general.
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1. Introduction

This empirical study deals with the issues of language choice and code alternation as a common practice in the organization of the complex check in activity with multiple participants in hospitality\(^1\) properties in Sweden. In particular, it discusses several interactional tasks that code alternation may accomplish in that setting and represents a crossroad of general linguistics, bilingualism studies and conversation analysis (henceforth CA). In the light of arising interest of specialists of different areas of linguistics in bilingualism in formal settings, it deals with institutional bilingualism in Sweden, an EU country with a comparatively high level of bilingualism among residents.

The current era of the new economy is characterized by “[s]ocietal changes, such as the globalisation of spaces, the circulation of goods, the mobility of individuals and the spread of new technologies, occupy an increasingly important place in all spheres of social life - economic, political and educational” (Duchêne 2009: 29). In these conditions, bilingualism has become an emergent practice in many tourism settings, the hospitality sector of tourism among them. In hospitality as a tourism setting with a potentially high concentration of foreign tourists, it is inevitable that certain groups of hotel guests include members who expose different language abilities and preferences. As a result, in the interaction with one single group of guests two or even more languages can be used at the same time, as oriented to the needs and preferences of each and every guest. In this respect, one of the most common language combinations at the hotel reception in Sweden is Swedish (as the only official language in Sweden) and English (as a lingua franca).

The competence in the English language among tourism sector employees in Sweden is extremely high, partly because of generally high competence in English of the Swedish population, partly because foreign language proficiency is nowadays a common prerequisite for hospitality employment. Due to the high concentration of foreign tourists in hotel establishments, the hotel receptionists involved in this study use two

\(^1\) In this study the use of term “hospitality” will be delimited to its most recent meaning “the provision of accommodation, food and drink for people away from home for reward” (Medlik 2003: vii). Therefore, the term “hospitality industry” will be used as synonymic to “hotel and catering industry/services” (ibid.: 86).
languages (Swedish and English) at work on a daily basis. This necessity to speak foreign languages is presumably connected with the “recipient design” of interaction (Sidnell 2010: 5) and the hospitality associates’ responsibility to provide the best possible service and contribute to the positive image of the hotel. Because of that, the hotel receptionists are highly oriented both to the language abilities of the different guests and to their language preferences, which may result in their language choices and code alternations even with one single group of tourists.

In order to understand the characteristic features of interaction between receptionists and guests in this setting, it is also important to keep in mind that the check in activity commonly involves a number of different operations. Among them are: working in the reservation system, printing out the electronic room keys, accepting the payment, providing additional information on hotel services (e.g. restaurant, internet etc), providing information about other matters (restaurants and activities in the town etc), answering the telephone, serving drinks etc. That is why some non-verbal resources in the receptionist’s interaction with a group of guests, e.g. the participants’ actions, body position, gestures, gazes etc., appear relevant for the discussion of the hotel reception setting and may shed light on the specificity of bilingualism performance in hospitality.

With the aforementioned features of the hospitality sector of tourism in Sweden in view, this investigation aims at discussing some possible accomplishments of language choice and code alternation in a standardized hotel check in activity, where a single group of guests has to be addressed in two languages, Swedish and English.

In accordance with the aims of this investigation, it addresses three main research questions. First of all, the study is concerned with the question what the use of language choice and code alternation may accomplish within the complex participation frameworks in the highly standardized hotel check in activity. Secondly, it deals with the impact the code alternation has on the participation status of the parties. Finally, it aims at discovering how the participants orient to the plurilingual resources available within the multiple participation framework, i.e. a kind of participation status of everyone in the perceptual radius to a speech event (Goffman 1981 : 3).
The study has the following structural organization. First of all, in chapter (2), I discuss the previous research on different service and tourism settings that may shed light on the bilingualism use in hospitality properties, taking into account the characteristic features of the activity and the specific participation framework. In chapter (3) I review the data and methodology applied in the current study. In chapter (4) dealing with the analysis I introduce three possible accomplishments of language choice and code alternation which have been singled out within multiple participation frameworks at the hotel reception:

1) Addressing a new participant;
2) Shifting the participation status of parties from “ratified hearer” towards “ratified listener”;
3) Excluding certain parties from the interaction.

In that chapter, I provide the transcriptions of six extracts of multiple-party check in interaction at the hotel reception; they are analyzed from the point of view of the conversation analytic approach on bilingualism.

In the final chapter (5) I outline the possible accomplishments of language choice and code alternation during the check in procedure at the hotel reception. I conclude by discussing their impact on the multiple-party interaction in this institutional setting where language competences of the participants may vary and may therefore require constant code alternation for accomplishing the activity in general.

2. Theoretical background

In spite of the growing interest of the CA analysts and multilingualism researchers in interaction in institutional settings, the hotel branch of tourism with its high degree of bilingual interaction has been hardly discussed by linguists or conversation analysts. Most often, the available resources on multilingualism in hospitality properties are limited to study materials for second language learners and do not touch upon any practical problems of interaction that CA is especially concerned with and that will be addressed in this paper.

For exploring the issue of language choice and bilingualism performance at the hotel reception in Sweden in this study, let us consider previous theoretical research in the
following spheres relevant for the current analysis. Section (2.1) is devoted to the previous studies on tourism and service settings and the institutional interaction in general. Section (2.2) deals with different aspects of bilingual talk that are relevant for the purposes of this investigation. Section (2.3) studies language within activity and the interaction with multiple participants.

### 2.1 The hotel reception among other service and tourism settings

Among the scarce resources on the interaction in hospitality properties, Kurhila (2006), to the best of my knowledge, has the only published research that contains some data recorded at the hotel reception. However, the “heterogeneous” data (Kurhila 2006: 7) for that research is not limited to this type of properties for CA in institutional settings and also covers other types of institutional and non-institutional conversation. Besides, the researcher’s focus on native versus non-native interaction in Finnish leaves the issues of language choice and code alternation untouched.

In the absence of extensive previous linguistic studies on hospitality and the performance of multilingual individuals in it, the existing research on service encounters and other tourism settings could be of help for understanding this particular setting, too. In fact, service encounters and tourism settings have long been discovered as fruitful sites for language use and multilingualism research. For example, Kidwell (2000) has studied the interaction between English language speakers at the reception of a university-bound English language study programme, with the focus on native and non-native language command in institutional settings; Torras & Gafaranga (2002) discuss multilingualism operations and social identity in informal institutional service interaction; Torras (2005) reports on social identity expressed through language choices in her study on multilingualism in service encounters in Catalonia in Spain.

In addition to interaction in service encounters, a great number of multilingualism researchers have explored the issues of bilingualism and standardization in tourism institutional settings, with the predominance of call-centres among other research settings. Duchêne (2009) considers the role of language and multilingual call-centre services dictated by the societal changes, as well as puts forward the issue of authenticity and legitimacy as gained through multilingual services. Sylvie (2003) also
touches upon the problem of societal redefinition of bilingualism in the new economy, on the example of English-French customer-oriented call centre activities.

Professional, or institutional, interaction, as opposed to an ordinary, or “mundane” conversation (Arminen 2005: 43), is characterised by a high degree of the influence of institution and context, or “the context’s procedural relevance” (ibid.: 31). Arminen puts it like this:

[...] institutional interaction is a particular type of social interaction in which the participants (A and B) orient to an institutional context (C), such as medical, juridical or educational, in and for accomplishing their distinctive institutional actions [...] (ibid: 32)

In this investigation, the accomplishment of certain institutional procedures, i.e. the check in activity at the hotel reception with the help of available language resources, is without any doubt highly oriented to by the participants in the course of interaction. According to Mondada, formal settings usually employ “more controlled forms of bilingualism” (2007a: 298). Drew and Heritage define the “institutionality of interaction” with the help of the following dimensions (Drew & Heritage 1992 in Arminen 2005: 53):

1. Turn-taking organization
2. Overall structural organization of the interaction
3. Sequential organization
4. Turn design
5. Lexical choice
6. Interactional asymmetries

The second of the above-mentioned dimensions, i.e. the “overall structural organization of the interaction” in an institutional setting, has been chosen as the main focus in this study. The investigation particularly focuses on the question how language choices are articulated in this highly organised and standardised institutional activity and where in the general structure they occur.

The accomplishment of this activity at the hotel reception represents a rather complex process, where certain stages may intertwine and overlap. In her study on front desk
service encounters, Kidwell provides the following general outline of the sequential organization of an activity at service encounters (2000: 20-21):

1. Opening
2. Request for Service
3. Optional Interrogative Series
4. Provision, or not, of Service
5. Closing

In fact, the aforementioned outline could be to a certain extent adopted in front desk hotel interaction studies, as it seems to present all main stages of that activity. However, due to the research delimitation to the hotel reception setting and the check in activity in particular, a specific outline characteristic of that activity has been developed. That structure, nevertheless, has some similar features with the above-mentioned structure by Kidwell:

1. Greeting the guests
2. Identifying the guests
3. Finding the guests’ names and the rooms that have been booked for them in the computer reservation system
4. Handing over the keys to the right person
5. Providing additional information
6. Activity closing, or saying goodbye

These six phases of the check in activity are approximate, and, presumably, may be overlapping in the course of interaction.

The aims of this “front regions” (Goffman 1959: 134 in Goodwin 1995: 173) activity in a setting with a high concentration of tourists dictate the necessity of a high competence in foreign languages among the employees of the hospitality sector of tourism. Cohen & Cooper explain the emergence of bilingual talk in hospitality the following way:

Tourism is commercialized hospitality; locals, especially those engaged in the tourist industry, have an economic interest in the tourists’ visit. Hence they tend to accommodate to the tourists’ needs and preferences, rather than demand that the tourists accommodate to the local situation (as other kinds of foreigners might be asked to do). Such accommodation includes, among other things, the acquisition by locals of the TL2.

(1986: 539; original italics)

2 Here: tourist’s language
Already as early as in the 1980s, the tourism researchers put forward that “the client is king”, which was associated with the linguistics accommodation of tourists according to their language abilities and, therefore, high foreign language competence of the tourism-related branches (ibid.: 546). Nowadays, in the conditions of the “new economy”, “[...] language has become a key tool” and “communication skills have become a selling point” (Duchêne 2009: 30). That is why it is not surprising that “bilingual professionals” who use at least two languages in their professional activity on a daily basis (Day & Wagner 2007: 392) have become an inseparable part of hospitality properties. Being institutional, the language of hotel employees can be referred to as “instrumental [...] in orientation”; thus, it is characterized by certain linguistic features and a set of phrases dictated by the institutional roles and obligations of personnel (Cohen & Cooper 1986: 547).

2.2 Bilingual talk: language choice and code alternation

This section presents an overview on the previous research on some features of bilingual interaction and touches upon such issues as plurilingualism, language choice, code alternation and code-switching.

Let us start by defining the term “plurilingual” which is widely employed in this study.

Plurilingual and pluricultural competence refers to the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social agent has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures. This is not seen as the superposition or juxtaposition of distinct competences, but rather as the existence of a complex or even composite competence on which the user may draw. (Council of Europe 2001: 168)

Taking into account the language situation in the era of the new economy, it has been argued that in the 21st century the terms “plurilingualism” and “pluriliteracies” appear more suitable for referring to the language practices than the terms “bilingualism” and “biliteracy” (García, Bartlett & Kleifgen 2007: 208).

In general, the use of more than one language in interaction “[...] rather than being a random phenomenon [...] serves specific interactional tasks for participants” (Gafaranga 2007: 279-280). However, Musk has argued that “[...] it would not be difficult to
question the idea of a bilingual being equivalent to two monolinguals” (2006: 44). He supports the argument with the following explanation:

Most bilinguals use their languages for different purposes and in different situations, and hence “balanced” bilinguals, those who are equally fluent in both languages, are probably the exception and not the norm. (Grosjean 1982: 235 in Musk 2006: 44)

In his discussion on the use of two or more codes in the interaction, Auer distinguishes “discourse-related” and “participant-related” code-switching (1998: 8), whereas Blom and Gumperz make a distinction between “situational switching” and “metaphorical switching” (1972 in Wei 1998: 157). Wei describes “situational switching” as caused by a change in the communicative situation (Wei 1998: 157) and puts it like this:

The underlying assumption was that only one of the co-available languages or language varieties was appropriate for a particular situation and that speakers needed to change their choice of language to keep up with the changes in situational factors in order to maintain that appropriateness. (ibid.)

Within a complex participation framework at the hotel reception analysed in this study, the “situational switching” may be as well caused by the orientation to the participants of interaction and their language preferences and abilities. This orientation has been formulated by Sidnell as the “recipient design” of interaction (2010: 5). The situational switching is therefore widely used in settings where the language abilities of the participants are not the same. With all this in view, one may conclude that in the multilingual hotel setting where the receptionist meets guests with different language abilities the “metaphorical switching”, i.e. not provoked by a change in the communicative situation (Blom & Gumperz 1972 in Wei 1998: 156), is not as relevant as situational switching.

Thus, the prevailing type of code-switching in the multiple-party interaction at the hotel reception is situational switching, and this type will be in focus in this investigation. Since code alternation may be “interactionally meaningful” (Auer 1998: 20), this paper has to take into account Myers-Scotton’s statement that in a multilingual setting “[...] switching to a language not known by all participants is a common means of exclusion, often conscious” (2000: 157). Myers-Scotton also claims that “[t]he switching itself conveys that the speakers share an identity others do not have and narrow the social
Fishman supports this idea by mentioning the importance of group membership as a factor defining the language choice (2000: 90). In relation to group membership, Fishman makes a distinction between “within-group (or intragroup) multilingualism” and “between-group (or intergroup) multilingualism” (ibid.: 89). As opposed to intragroup multilingualism distinguished by the use of more than one code for the “internal communicative processes” by one population, intergroup multilingualism is characteristic to the interaction of different groups that make use of two or more separate codes for external communication (ibid.: 89). This distinction between different types of multilingualism and its connection with group membership may also shed some light on the possible accomplishments of code alternation in this study.

Auer discusses the relation of code-switching to the turn boundaries; in addition to code-switching performed within the boundaries of a single turn, he introduces the so-called “turn-internal switches” (1998: 20). He also mentions that certain elements of the speech may provoke code alternation (Auer 2007: 322). Auer puts it like this:

> Among the clear cases of ambivalence are so-called homophonous diamorphs or their approximations, but also discourse markers such as hesitation particles (*uhm*) or agreement markers (*mm*), and proper names. Since Michael Clyne’s 1967 book, we know ambivalent stretches of talk may facilitate or even trigger switching from one language into the other. (ibid.)

The language choice which this study is concerned with is defined by Boyd as “[t]he decision to speak one of the two or more languages available to a multilingual in a conversation with one or more other multilinguals” (1985: 60). Further on, Boyd provides the following definition of the language choice: “code switching between languages [...] at conversational openings” (ibid.: 170). Auer insists that the language choice for the turn organization by a participant inevitably influences the following language choices of this or any other participant of the interaction, which he terms “the sequential implicativeness of language choice” (1984: 5). He describes the role of the sequence in language choice and code alternation the following way:

> [...] any theory of conversational code alternation is bound to fail if it does not take into
account that the meaning of code-alternation depends in many ways on its ‘sequential environment’. This is given, in the first place by the conversational turn immediately preceding it, to which code-alternation may respond in various ways. (Auer 1995: 116)

It goes without saying that code alternation at the hotel reception may have some similar features with other settings, e.g. other spheres of tourism, service encounters and a number of other institutional settings, as it may share certain characteristics with those settings. However, the specific tasks of the check in activity may call forth certain features characteristic to this particular branch of tourism. The following section (2.3) will describe some of those features related to the kind of activity and the relevant participation frameworks.

2.3 Language within activity and participation framework

The hotel facilities where the data for this study were collected represent a well-structured and highly customized setting, where language assists in building a complex activity within a multiple participation framework. As the CA research is primarily concerned with the so-called “activity focus” and the “interactional accomplishment of particular social activities” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 17; original italics), in this study the language choice and code alternation will be considered as means for that accomplishment. According to Goodwin, the activity, or the human action, “[...] is built through the simultaneous deployment of a range of quite different kinds of semiotic resources” (2000: 1489). He provides the following explanation: “Strips of talk gain their power as social mutual orientation made by the actors’ bodies” (ibid.: 1492).

Among the variety of available resources, the role of language within the activity is unquestionable. Language has been described as “not simply a medium for the expression of intentions, motives, or interests but also a site for uncovering the method through which ordered activity is generated” (Wei 2002: 160). Mondada highlights the importance of language and code alternation as one of the primary resources for organizing action and interaction. She states: “[c]hoosing code switching instead of another possible resource for organizing a given practice confers a specific accountability or intelligibility to the activity and to its actors, and produces specific interactional and social positioning of the participants” (2007a: 300).
Another important feature of the human activity is participation, and the number of participants is a key issue in the process of the organization of talk and action. Goffman introduces the term “participation framework” which, together with ritualization and embedding, for him form the three central themes in the human talk (1981: 2-3). He explains that “[t]he relation of any one such member to this utterance can be called his ‘participation status’ relative to it, and that of all the persons in the gathering the ‘participation framework’ for that moment of speech” (ibid.: 137).

Goodwin defines participation as a “temporally unfolding, interactively sustained embodied course of activity” (1996: 375), whereas Schegloff states that participating parties “can and do design their conduct and understand one another’s conduct as shaped in part by reference to number of participants” (1995: 31). Goodwin draws the readers’ attention to the possible ambiguity between participants and nonparticipants (1981: 3) and concludes about his preference in using the term “participant” “[…] in a broad enough sense to include someone who is momentarily disattending the conversation” (ibid.). While Goodwin tends to analyse the participation status in accordance with different types of participation of “the speaker” and “the hearer” (1981: 3-5), Goffman goes further and makes a distinction between two large categories of interaction participants: ratified participants and unratified participants (1981: 9), i.e. not ratified ones (ibid.: 132). He divides ratified participants into the following types: “ratified speakers” (ibid.: 28), “ratified listeners” who are not entitled for giving a speech (ibid.: 146) and “ratified hearers”, i.e. participants who are “ratified to listen but fail to do so” (ibid.). In addition to the aforementioned distinction, Goffman introduces the concept of “bystanders”, i.e. “persons who are not ratified participants and whose access to the encounter, however minimal, is itself perceivable by the official participants” (ibid.: 132). He also makes a division between addressed recipients and the unaddressed ones (ibid.: 133).

Goffman goes on to say that the implications of one pair’s extended dialogue within the complex participation may differ considerably in accordance with the communicative situation. He provides the following examples: “[…] their talk can move to private topics and increasingly chill the involvement of the remaining participants, or it can be played out as a display for the encircling hearers […]” (1981: 133).
When the participants are placed “into a range of quite different positions” in the interaction, e.g. the position of addressed recipient, unaddressed recipient, ratified speaker, ratified listener and ratified hearer, the participation frameworks are referred to as complex (Goodwin & Goodwin 2006: 231). Within the given complex participation framework in the hotel setting with a high frequency of the plurilingual resources, the use of some of the codes can result in what Goffman calls “chilling” the participation of certain parties (1981: 133). In the hotel setting the chilling of those parties whose language abilities do not coincide with the code chosen for the turn construction takes place. As Goffman claims, “[...] an utterance does not carve up the world beyond the speaker into precisely two parts, recipients and non-recipients, but rather opens up an array of structurally differentiated possibilities, establishing the participation framework in which the speaker will be guiding his delivery” (ibid.: 137). Of course, this fact cannot be ignored in the analysis of the interaction with the use of plurilingual resources where participants have different language abilities and, in addition, expose their language preferences.

In his research on the participation framework, Goodwin (1981), among other aspects, focuses on the organization of engagement and the organization of some of the co-participation structures in the interaction. However, that empirical study is mostly built upon the examples of dyadic conversations where participation unfolds in a quite different way than within complex participation framework described by Goffman (1981).

Taking into consideration the great variety of available types and forms of interaction, Arminen concludes that “[t]he formally distinct patterns of interaction are not only a unique “fingerprint” through which the analyst can recognize the type of interaction in question, but, first and foremost, are the members’ way of organizing and structuring the accomplishment of practical institutional tasks” (2005: 44). Instead of identifying the existing interactional patterns, the conversation analysts aim at demonstrating how they actually function (ibid.). The accomplishment of certain practical tasks by means of plurilingual resources and language choice will be the central issue in this empirical study, which discusses what code alternation may accomplish at the hotel reception, and how it may depend on the character of the check in activity and, as a consequence, affect the complex and dynamic participation frameworks.
3. Data and methodology

This chapter deals with the primary sources used in this study, the methodology applied for the data interpretation and the ethical principles which are of primary importance for the current data collection and analysis. It also covers some technical details on the recording equipment and the software for the analysis.

3.1 Data

The data for this empirical study were videotaped from October 2011 till January 2012 at a hotel that will be called Solliden\(^3\), a medium-sized four-star hotel in a small touristic town in the south of Sweden. The hotel offers 102 rooms and is popular with both conferences and private guests, due to its advanced conference premises, its restaurant which can accommodate over 300 people, a SPA complex and a number of tourist activities the town offers in summer.

The data are comprised of 26 hours of videotaped naturally occurring\(^4\) interaction in an institutional tourism setting, the hotel reception in particular. Some of the video extracts contain more than one instance of code alternation; some extracts include telephone conversations in Swedish in the middle of face-to-face interaction in English. From the total amount of video recordings, four sequences were chosen. All these sequences document the hotel check-in complex interaction with multiple participants; they have been chosen as representative of certain recurrent patterns distinguished in the recorded interaction of the receptionists with groups of guests where more than one code is used for accomplishing the check in activity. As these sequences are quite lengthy and cover up to eight minutes of interaction, six shorter extracts have been chosen from the sequences to be presented in the current analysis.

The recorded data were narrowed to multiple-party interaction during the check-in procedure, whereas the dyadic interaction was deliberately excluded. The following types of participants are presented in the recorded extracts: a hotel receptionist, a Swedish guest, or the so-called “host” who assists in checking-in and provides / inquires

\(^3\) According to the ethical principles, the name of the hotel is changed. See 3.3
\(^4\) For further information on naturally occurring interaction, see 3.2
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additional information, and one or a few foreign guests. The data are characterised by two working languages: Swedish and English, performed by one of the two daytime receptionists employed at the hotel and by the hotel guests. These were the main criteria in the process of the data selection.

3.2 Methodology

This study presents an in-depth qualitative analysis of the selected extracts of the check in interaction at the hotel reception. It is concerned with the interaction which occurs spontaneously, or the so-called “naturally-occurring” verbal communication, i.e. observed in real-life situations and therefore exposing a non-experimental character (ten Have 2007: 68-73). That is why the conversation analytic approach to the data treatment has been chosen as the most appropriate methodology for the purposes of this investigation. In general, the CA data may be comprised either of audio- or videotaped interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 73). Since this particular study focuses not only on the verbal interaction but as well the language choices negotiation and code alternation accomplishments in the particular kind of institutional activity, only videotaped data are used. In addition to the thorough analysis of the verbal resources employed by the participants of the recorded interaction, the video recordings are extremely rich in details which may provide some explanation to the verbal resources, i.e. pauses or code alternation. Therefore, the video recordings have been used as the main source of empirical details in this investigation.

The recorded data are supported with detailed transcriptions of the relevant extracts. Even though the transcriptions aim at providing a very detailed report on the verbal and non-verbal interaction, for the purposes of “readability”, transcriptions cannot include all available details on the interaction (Pallotti 2009: 41). For that reason, in addition to the details traditionally recognized as important by the CA researchers, e.g. timed pauses, overlapping utterances, hesitations (ibid.), due to the aim of this study on bilingualism operations in multi-tasking potentially bilingual environment, it appears equally relevant to include other details. Among such details are: code alternation between utterances in Swedish and English languages, translation of Swedish utterances into English and certain details on multimodal resources performed by the receptionist and the guests (see Appendix B: Transcription Notation). Those resources may include
the participants’ bodily position, gestures, glances and actions performed as a part of the highly standardized check-in procedure. Moreover, the multimodal resources may also provide an explanation to extended pauses that constantly occur in the recorded interaction and are connected with the specificity of the check-in procedure in a hotel setting. The analysis of the detailed transcription of the extracts is provided in chapter (4).

The methodological approach of CA which “[...] characteristically takes shape as pieces of inductive reasoning structured around short extracts of transcripts from tape-recorded conversation” (Wei 2002: 162) has been adopted in this study, which treats the data from the viewpoint of the hypothesis-free inductive analytical approach.

Finally, the recorded data and the supporting transcriptions are analysed from an “emic perspective” (Seedhouse 2005: 252). Thus, the analyst considers interaction “from within the sequential environment in which the social actions were performed” (ibid.). Being highly concerned with the participants’ interpretation of the events (Pallotti 2009: 42), he / she should avoid speculations or “a preconceived point of view on the data” (ibid: 41). This CA methodological perspective has also been adopted in this study, as it provides an opportunity to study the data independently from the researcher’s own understanding of the events and focuses on that of the participants instead.

3.3 Ethical principles

The ethical principles appear one of the central issues in any investigation which requires audio- and video recording of human interaction. Therefore, the data recording and any data handling in this study are strictly following the Ethical Principles in Research in the Arts and Social Sciences by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet 2002).

For obtaining the participants’ permission, a special form entitled “Information on project participation and permission” was made, in Swedish, English and German, as those are the most spoken languages by guests at the fieldwork hotel. The form can be found in Appendix C: Information on project participation and permission. For abiding by the ethical principles, a plate with the notice “Communication project in process.
Your talk can be recorded” (both in Swedish and English) was placed on the reception desk, visible to any guest approaching the reception. Directly after the recording, each participant was introduced to the project, the responsible researchers, the aim of study and the conditions of participation. Since the participation is strictly confidential, no real names or any other information revealing the participants’ identity are mentioned in this written report. For that reason, all names of the participants were changed; the hotel name Solliden was intentionally invented in order not to disclose the real name of the hotel where the data were collected.

3.4 **Technical specifications**

The data were recorded by two video cameras: Canon HG 20 and Sony DCR-TRV20E. One of the cameras was placed at the reception line, so both the receptionist and guests were recorded from the side (Fig. 1). The other camera was located in the back area of the reception and captured the guest facing the camera from a larger distance; that camera provides a better account of the participants’ organization of action and multimodal resources (Fig. 2).

![Figure 1. The reception desk from the side.](image1)

![Figure 2. The reception desk from behind.](image2)

Most often, the recording was done by two simultaneously working cameras, thus ensuring the higher quality of sound and the opportunity of video synchronization from two different angles. For video decoding Final Cut Pro 4 was used; for data transcription and analysis Audacity and Windows Live Movie Maker were chosen as the most efficient software.
4. Analysis

This chapter represents a corpus of transcribed extracts of interaction at the hotel reception with the focus on the plurilingual resources. It aims to examine how code alternation and language choice are used in the complex check-in activity with multiple participants, and what the occurrence of those resources in this institutional setting may accomplish. First of all, section (4.1) will address how language choice and code alternation may serve as a resource for inviting a new participating party to the interaction. Secondly, section (4.2) will reveal how code alternation can be used for changing the participation status of the parties. Finally, section (4.3) will consider how language choice may contribute to the participation exclusion.

This chapter is based on four different recorded check-in sequences with multiple participants: a receptionist (Rec), one Swedish guest (SG) and one or a few foreign guests (FG, FG1, FG2 etc.). Since two different receptionists employed at Solliden appear on the recordings, it has been decided to differentiate them as Receptionist A (RecA) and Receptionist B (RecB). The four different sequences are numbered from Hotel_1 to Hotel_4; the time of the extracts within the sequence is represented in the parenthesis, e.g. “Hotel_1 (00:17-00:47)”; the six shorter short extracts taken from those sequences are numbered from (1) to (6).

4.1 Code alternation as a resource for addressing a new participant

This section will address one of the most common accomplishments of code alternation in a multiple-party activity with different language resources suiting the participants’ abilities, i.e. addressing a new party.

In extract (1) a Swedish guest approaches the reception first, followed by three foreign guests whose arrival is marked in the transcription with the “┼” sign. Let us review how the status of the three participating parties (the receptionist, the Swedish guest and foreign guest one) changes and how the code alternation is used for addressing a new participant:
1. **Hotel_4 (00:04-00:37)**

1. **RecA:** hej hej,
   
   **SG:** (.) hej sa:n,
   
   **RecA:** välkom↑NA:, welcome
   
   **SG:** (0.8) från universitet.

2. **RecA:** hej he:j, hello
   
   **SG:** (. ) hej sa:n.

3. **RecA:** välkom↑NA:, welcome
   
   **SG:** (0.3) från universitet.

4. **RecA:** "får vi se: var ni kan komma ifrån då?:" let’s see where you come from
   
   **SG:** (. ) från universitet.

5. **RecA:** ABC universitet ja:. vad ↑mn? ABC university, yes, what is your name?
   
   **SG:** (.) Emil Franžén,

6. **RecA:** yes then let us see

7. **RecA:** has approached the reception looking at RecA
   
   **RecA:** walks and takes the room key - >
   
   **RecA:** searches for his ID card - >

8. **RecA:** your room is two hundred sixty-eight

9. **RecA:** hands over the room key to FG×

10. **RecA:** you will stay on the second floor to the left

11. **RecA:** has approached the reception

12. **RecA:** has approached the reception

13. **RecA:** +shortly looks at RecA+

14. **RecA:** looks up at RecA

15. **RecA:** checks out is latest ten o’clock for you tomorrow (I said)

16. **SG:** looks at SG - - - - - - - >

17. **RecA:** looks up at RecA

18. **RecA:** +widesly smiles at RecA & hands over his ID card ->

19. **FG1:** → hehehe

20. **RecA:** +thank you very much. (. )
Extract (1) begins with interaction between the receptionist and the Swedish guest. After the greeting, the receptionist asks the name of the Swedish guest and finds it in the reservation system, then she gives him the room key and provides the details on the room location and the check out time. Meanwhile, one of the foreign guests (FG1) approaches the reception, finds his ID card and establishes an eye contact with the receptionist. The foreign guest hands over his ID card to the receptionist, then she finds his name in the reservation system and returns the card.

As we may see, the foreign guest (FG1), while approaching the reception in the middle of the receptionist-Swedish guest interaction in Swedish, does not perform any verbal greeting (line 11). However, by looking at the receptionist, he arguably indicates his readiness for participation. Soon afterwards (approximately 1.2 seconds later), the foreign guest starts searching for his ID card. Then he indicates his participation position by looking at the receptionist after the end of her turn-constructional unit, or TCU (line 14), i.e. an “interactive organizational” unit5 (Mondada 2007b: 195). According to Goffman’s division of the ratified participants of the interaction (1981), the foreign guest approaching the reception (line 11) appears to be an unaddressed recipient, or a ratified hearer, because he is a ratified participant who fails to listen to the interaction (Goffman 1981: 146). This failure occurs because of the foreign guest’s lack of competence in the current language of interaction, Swedish. At the same time, the Swedish guest performs as an addressed recipient and a ratified listener. During the later transition in the participation status of the Swedish and the foreign guests (lines 17-18), unfortunately, the recording does not show the non-verbal activity of the receptionist. However, the multimodal activity performed by the foreign guest (a broad smile and a gesture in line 17) presumably reveals his eye contact with the receptionist. This transition of his participation status is further on confirmed by the receptionist’s verbal activity (“yes ×helLo::”) coordinated with the gesture (accepting the ID card from the guest) in line 18. Later on, the guest’s laughing serving as a form of a verbal greeting is confirmed by the receptionist’s laugh (lines 18-19).

5 Mondada describes a TCU as “a specific kind of unit, praxeologically defined by the local achievements of the participants, interactively negotiated, emerging within the temporal moment-by-moment unfolding of talk as it is jointly, situatedly, contingently produced by the participants” (2007b: 195).
As the analysis of extract (1) has revealed, the pre-beginning phase of the participation between the foreign guest and the receptionist is characterised by the use of a number of non-verbal resources. In extract (1) these resources are extensively used between the foreign guest and the receptionist in their greeting procedure (lines 14-19), and they may to a certain extent replace certain verbal resources, i.e. the verbal greeting (line 17).

The English language choice of the receptionist preceding any verbal activity of the foreign guest could presumably be caused by the non-verbal activity of the latter and the lack of verbal resources he uses. Besides, as the pre-made electronic room keys confirm, the receptionist has received a list of conference participants in advance, and thus knew about the numerous foreign participants. These two facts could possibly provide an explanation of the fact that the stage of language collaboration with the foreign guest is skipped.

As opposed to extract (1) where the choice of the English language for the interaction with the foreign guest is not collaborated, in extract (2) all three participants are involved in the process of language collaboration at the transition-relevance place (TRP), or a “point of possible unit completion” and “a place for possible speaker transition” (Sidnell 2010: 43). At that TRP the status of the Swedish guest is changed from an addressed recipient towards an unaddressed one, and the foreign guest becomes an addressed recipient. The nomination of the foreign guest for speakership by the receptionist is preceded by an introduction of the Swedish guest. As the Swedish host only mentions the number of guests and the name of the company, without saying their proper names, that information does not let the receptionist project the code alternation as she chooses a new addressed recipient:

2. Hotel_1 (00:16-00:35)

1 SG: två: >killar +från< a: be:↓jeg: *som ska bo ↑här↓ ○
   recB: these two guys from ABC will stay here
   +.......looks in the booking system - - >
2 RecB: JÅ¥ÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅÅå

3 recB: (0.6) *då ska ve see:: (1.3) hm hm:: ○
   let’s see  hm hm  yes

4 → (6.5)+ ^då >ska vi se< hur var namnen?
   let’s see, what were your names?

recB: - - >+
In extract (2) the Swedish guest introduces the other two guests by naming the company they represent. The receptionist consults the reservation system and addresses one of those guests directly, instead of addressing the host. The Swedish guest interferes and makes a remark (“in English::”). This remark and an undecipherable utterance by the other guest (FG1) make the receptionist repair the choice of language and ask the same information in English. Being asked in English, the foreign guest provides his name, and the receptionist consults the reservation system.

The impersonal introduction by the Swedish guest (line 1) raises further questions from the receptionist which is revealed later on in line 4. In her responding turn, the receptionist uses a highly standardized hotel reception phrase in Swedish “då ska ve se:: (1.3) hm hm:: (let’s see hm hm)” (line 3). Pronounced in a lower voice than the previous (line 2) and the following (line 4) TCUs as the speaker consults the reservation system, this utterance appears to perform as a self-talk. 6.5 seconds later, instead of asking the same participant for more details, the receptionist addresses an identification question to another guest directly (line 4). By changing her body position, turning towards another guest (FG) and the gaze directed at him, the receptionist performs a transition in the participation framework. During that transition, the participation status of both guests is changed: the Swedish guest who had previously introduced himself as

6 A repair has been defined by Schegloff as a way of dealing with “troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding of ‘talk’” (1979: 261). He claims that such troubles “are not limited or necessarily occasioned by independently establishable ‘error’, and are therefore referred to not as ‘correction’ but by the more generic rubric ‘repair’”. (ibid.)
a host becomes an unaddressed recipient, while the foreign guest – an addressed one, nominated for the next turn. The turn nomination is conducted in the form of a question (line 4) which serves as the first part of the question-answer adjacency pair. The adjacency pairs have been introduced by Sacks as “two-utterance, adjacentely placed sequences” (1992: 532) which play an important role in the overall structural organization of interaction (ibid.: 522) and its turn-taking system (ibid.: 525). The question-answer adjacency pairs have been also referred to as “question-answer exchanges” (ibid.). In this kind of adjacency pair, a question is “conventionally followed” by an answer (Liddicoat 2007: 106); therefore, a reply from the addressed participant, i.e. the foreign guest, is expected by the receptionist.

As the first participant of the interaction has constructed his preceding turn in Swedish, the receptionist’s choice of language complies with that of his even when she performs a transition of the participation framework (line 4) and by her non-verbal activity confirms the participation status of the Swedish guest as a ratified listener. However, after her question addressed to the foreign guest the second part of the question-answer adjacency pair is delayed by a full second pause (line 5). This delay of the second pair part produces a contradiction to the claim that gaps are not typical for adjacency pair construction (Sacks 1992: 527).

In this participation framework the Swedish guest does not perform as a nominated speaker; he becomes an unaddressed recipient as soon as the receptionist nominates the other guest (FG1) for the turn. The self-selection of the Swedish guest for the speakership is performed in a lower voice and serves as an insertion in the middle of the question-answer adjacency pair; his turn does not complete the first part of the adjacency pair.

The new participation status of the foreign guest initiated by the receptionist, i.e. the transition from an unaddressed recipient towards an addressed one, has as well influenced the participation status of the other parties, and first of all of the Swedish guest whose status has become a ratified listener instead of an addressed recipient. Since the participation framework has been changed, the Swedish host as an unaddressed recipient constructs a TCU by using the common language, i.e. English (“in English::””) (line 6). This utterance also momentarily modifies the participation
framework, as the Swedish guest selects the receptionist as an addressed recipient, and the foreign guest as a ratified listener. By switching to English, the Swedish guest presumably indicates his group membership and shows his relation to the group of guests he hosts. In comparison with that sequence in Swedish where the foreign guest failed to listen to the content of the Swedish guest-receptionist interaction because of their language choice (lines 1-4), the English language choice makes the foreign guest a ratified listener, as he can both hear and understand the utterance (line 6).

The above-mentioned verbal act of the Swedish guest, followed by ambivalent phrase of the foreign guest (line 8), may have contributed to the receptionist’s repair of the language choice (line 9). Here she switches towards English as the “common language-of-interaction” (Auer 1998: 10) in order to meet the guest’s language competences. As the initiation by the Swedish host is quite obvious, the receptionist’s repair of language choice preceded by the request of the Swedish guest and an undecipherable utterance by the foreign guest appears to be an other-initiated repair, i.e. constructed “by any party other than speaker of the trouble source” (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977: 364). The indirect question previously stated in Swedish (line 4) is structured as a shorter, elliptical utterance in English to inquire the same information (line 9): “your name”. This code-switching towards English has resulted in the foreign guest’s completion of the question-answer adjacency pair opened in line 4, as 0.4 seconds later he provides the second part of the pair, i.e. the answer: “(Weuter) (xxx×x)”. After that reply the receptionist continues the check in procedure (line 11), so it can be concluded that the language choice repair by the receptionist and the code alternation made it possible to continue the process.

This section has demonstrated how code alternation may be used as a resource for addressing a new participant in a multiple-party interaction at the hotel reception. As the participation framework is shifted and the foreign guest is addressed by the receptionist for the first time, the language choice can be performed without the process of language negotiation, as in extract (1), or with language negotiation, as in extract (2) where the participation status of the Swedish and foreign guest shift quite rapidly.
4.2 The use of codes for shifting the participation status: “ratified hearer” versus “ratified listener”

The previous section has revealed how the code alternation performs as a means for addressing a new participant in the interaction. This section will reveal how, with the help of code alternation, the participation status of one of the parties may be changed from “ratified hearer” towards “ratified listener”. As it has been mentioned in section (2.2), Goffman makes a distinction between two categories of listeners who are ratified for participation: “ratified listeners”, or “participants who don’t have the floor”, and “ratified hearers”, or participants who are “ratified to listen but fail to do so” (1981: 146). This is a key distinction in this section which will address the shift of the participation status of one of the parties and show how it may change from a ratified hearer towards a ratified listener with the help of code alternation.

Extract (3) considered here represents a continuation of extract (2) given above. In this extract, the foreign guest (FG1) self-selects for participation on the boundary between the two codes, Swedish and English, when his proper name is pronounced by the receptionist:

3. Hotel_1 (00:32-00:55)

9 RecB: ^=your name
recB ^=looking at FG1->
x=leans towards FG1 ->

10 FG1: (0.4) (W(eu×ter) (xxx×x)^
recB ------------------------------^>
--------------------------------->^>

11 +(0.4)
recB +consults the reservation system ->

12 SG: ^=dubbelv<e: u: te: e: oo
   doubleyu i: yu: ti: i:
recB ------------------------------>

13 (1.2)
recB --- ->

14 RecB: ^=da ska vi àse: oo.
   let’s see
recB ------------------>
fgl Δ....looks away from RecB ->

15 ^=() +(3.0)
recB --- ->
fgl --- ->
fgl +turns away
In extract (3) the receptionist inquires the name of the foreign guest (FG1) in English. The latter provides his name, and the Swedish guest spells it in Swedish. When the receptionist finds the name in the booking system and repeats it, both the Swedish and the foreign guest confirm it. Directly afterwards, another foreign guest (FG2) introduces himself, and the receptionist replies that she would take his name later.

According to Goffman’s classification (1981), in line 9 the foreign guest (FG1) is an addressed recipient and a ratified listener. After his TCU in line 10 where the foreign guest becomes a ratified speaker, the Swedish guest interferes and constructs his TCU in Swedish as she spells the name (line 12). After a 1.2-second pause (line 13) the receptionist constructs a TCU which seemingly represents self-talk, also in Swedish: “då ska vi se” (a similar case has been mentioned earlier in extract (2), section 4.1). During the above-mentioned sequence in Swedish (lines 12-14) between the receptionist and the Swedish host, the foreign guest (FG1) presumably becomes a ratified hearer, as the language choice of other participants does not correspond to his language competences. This new status is also achieved by the foreign guest in an embodied way: he looks away from the receptionist (line 14) and turns away (line 15).
The receptionist’s mentioning of his name (line 16) serves as an “ambivalent” element on the border of two codes. According to Auer, proper names may belong to any of the codes “in play” and may therefore trigger code alternation (2007: 322). That is why it is not surprising that the proper name (line 16) causes both the immediate non-verbal reaction, as the foreign guest turns towards the receptionist and looks at her (line 16), and the verbal response (lines 19, 21). These two types of response presumably demonstrate that the foreign guest becomes a ratified listener and considers himself an addressed recipient.

As the transcription of extract (3) shows, during that interactional episode the receptionist has eye contact neither with the Swedish host, nor with the foreign guest, as she continuously looks at the computer screen as she consults the hotel reservation system, starting in line 11. That is why it can be concluded that the verbal resources alone have provoked the shift in the participation status of the foreign guest. His status as a ratified listener is soon confirmed by the receptionist’s TCU in English “yes” (line 20) which overlaps with the end of the foreign guest’s TCU: “th’s righ” (line 21) and complies with his language choice.

Extract (3) has revealed how an ambivalent element, such as proper name, may trigger a shift of participation status of a party, from a ratified hearer towards a ratified listener, and may therefore trigger a code alternation.

Extract (4) represents a case of code alternation triggered by a foreign guest who, after being checked in and having received a key to his room, is excluded from participation by the language choice in the interaction between the receptionist and the Swedish guest (performed in Swedish). The body position and the multimodal resources of the participants play an important role in this process of shifting the participation status of the foreign guest (FG1 in the transcription) as he is striving for participation:

4. Hotel_2 (06:33-06:57)

1 RecB:         #och DET VAR +som internet+ ^ko rd].
              and it was like an internet code

   recB         +points to the paper she had given to SG earlier+
              ^turns away from the guests to the desk
              looking for something- - - - - - - - ->
 och det är samma (xx xx).

and this is the same (xx xx)
Extract (4) starts with the interaction between the receptionist and the Swedish guest in Swedish who discuss the internet access at the hotel. The receptionist hands over a piece of paper with the name of the connection and the internet code to the guest and starts searching something behind the reception desk. Meanwhile, one of the foreign guests (FG1) leans over the reception desk, looks at the paper given to the Swedish guest, as Figure (2) above shows, and reads aloud the name of the internet connection. Shortly afterwards, the receptionist hands a similar paper over to the foreign guest as she continues discussing problems with the internet access with the Swedish guest. After the end of that sequence, the latter turns towards the foreign guest and retells the information he received in a condensed form.
The interaction between the Swedish guest and the receptionist is conducted in Swedish, which obviously excludes the three foreign participants by the language choice (lines 1-16). During that interaction, the foreign guest – who does not display competence in Swedish - performs a number of activities that trigger code alternation (lines 17-18) and therefore establishes a new participation status of the foreign guest (lines 18-24).

The foreign guest displays an interest in the discussion between the receptionist and the Swedish guest from the beginning of extract (3); this interest is demonstrated by his continuous gaze in their direction (Figure 1). His first seeming attempt of to get involved in the interaction is performed in line 4, by his leaning over the paper given to the Swedish guest. This non-verbal attempt is soon followed by a verbal one: “er” repeated twice (line 5); “er” represents a hesitation marker, or filler, as it belongs to the group of non-words which are used in the process of formulating an utterance and express hesitation (Davis & Maclagan 2010: 190). As both the non-verbal and the verbal attempts to get included in the interaction are left unattended by the two current participating parties, directly after the repetition of the filler the foreign guest (FG1) constructs a turn following the receptionist’s next hesitation marker (line 4) as he reads aloud the text on the paper given to the Swedish guest: “es brunn.”, i.e. the name of the hotel internet connection (line 5). Directly after his TCU the receptionist who has found another paper with the internet code behind the desk hands it over to the foreign guest (line 6), which soon provokes a verbal reaction of the foreign guest: “okay.” (line 10); at the same time the receptionist continues her interaction with the Swedish guest (lines 9-16). Except for the affirmative statement of the Swedish guest “yeah” (line 7) as a first verbal reaction to the verbal and non-verbal resources of the foreign guest (line 5), all verbal interaction is still conducted in Swedish, which means that the foreign guest striving for participation is still excluded by the language choice. His participation status is finally changed at the end of the current sequence with the receptionist, when, after a 1.6-second pause (line 17), the Swedish host addresses the foreign guest in English (line 18). Thus, after several attempts of the foreign guest to participate, the Swedish guest conducts a participant-related code alternation (Auer 1998: 8). This code alternation is shortly preceded by the Swedish guest’s change of the body position as he turns towards the foreign guest and at the same time makes a gesture with his mobile phone (Figure 3, line 17) and soon afterwards establishes an eye contact with him (line 18), as Figure (4) shows (line 18).
Now let us discuss this communicative situation in terms of participation framework described by Goffman (1981) and discussed previously in section (2.3). While the Swedish guest and the receptionist discuss certain details of the group’s stay at the hotel, the status of the three foreign guests who are present during the interaction is changed from ratified listeners to ratified hearers, as their lack of language competence in Swedish does not allow them to perform as full-fledged listeners (lines 1-16). This participation status is questioned by the foreign guest performing as an unaddressed recipient who, by using the above-mentioned non-verbal resources followed by verbal ones, attempts to change his participatory status towards a ratified listener and, in fact, starting from line 17, finally acquires that status.

As extract (4) has revealed, the process of a shift in participation status can be developed within a quite extensive sequence between other participating parties and can be accompanied by a complex combination of multimodal activities. It has demonstrated how ratified participants of the interaction who fail to listen because of the language barrier may actively strive for a full-fledged participation and demand code alternation according to their language abilities. It has shown how such a participant, being a so-called ratified hearer whose language abilities do not coincide with the language chosen by the current active participants (the speaker and the addressed recipient) may negotiate, or even trigger, code alternation and by doing it would acquire the status of an addressed recipient and a ratified listener.

This section has shown how code alternation and language choice may affect the participation status of certain parties whose language competences do not comply with the language choice of others. It has revealed how a ratified hearer may become disengaged, as in extract (3), or try and follow the others’ interaction and even actively strive for participation as a ratified listener, as in extract (4). In both of the examples above a ratified hearer becomes a ratified listener when he takes his own initiative by inserting fillers, certain words or constructing his own turns. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that self-selection is absolutely necessary for acquiring the status of a ratified listener by a ratified hearer. Extract (5) in the following section (4.3) represents an example where this kind of status is acquired through the receptionist’s nomination. The following section will review the opposite direction of the code alternation accomplishment, as it will deal with participant exclusion.
4.3 Language choice as a means for participant exclusion

The previous sections have revealed how language choice and code alternation may be employed for including a participant in the interaction: while addressing a new participant (section 4.1) and in the interaction with previous participating parties (section 4.2). However, being a resource for including more participants in the interaction, the “[d]istribution of the plurilingual resources functions as a way of delimiting different co-participation formats and different activities and sequences” (Mondada 2004: 37).

The current section will show the reverse application of the plurilingual resources, i.e. the participant exclusion by means of language choice and code alternation. It will be primarily concerned with the impact of code alternation on the participation status of the foreign guests who – after being invited into the interaction by the receptionist – become excluded by the participants’ language choice which does not correspond to their language abilities. For that purpose, let us first of all consider extract (5). It starts with code alternation as a means for inviting a new participant (line 2) which was previously discussed in section (4.1). However, in comparison with switching between different turns like in the previous examples (extracts 1-2), the first English code alternation in extract (3) is performed within the boundaries of a single turn. This kind of code-switching belongs to the type described by Auer as “turn-internal switches” (1998: 20).

5. Hotel_3 (00:12-00:36)

1 SG: a:: då har vi;; (1.4) +två: ×mister Chavez och en Carlos.
   recB +,........., looks at the computer screen - ->
   fg1 ×searches for something in his bag ->
2 RecB: → (0.5) ↑mm: (.)×ska vi se: < Chavez ↑Julio, is th+^at you? =
   mm: let us see: Chavez Julio
   recB ++++++++++++++++++ >+
      ^,,looks at FG1 - ->
   fg1 - - - - - >×
          ↓..........looks at RecB - - - - - - - - - ->
3 FG2: Δ= J\Xu\io\ =
   recB - - >^×looks at FG2
   sg Δlooks at FG2 ->
   fg1 - - - - >
Extract (5) starts with an introduction of the foreign guests by the Swedish host. The receptionist consults the reservation system, finds their names and addresses one of them by switching to English. Shortly afterwards, after a 0.5-second pause, the Swedish guest starts a new turn concerning the payment issues, and the receptionist confirms;
directly after the confirmation of the Swedish guest, she addresses the foreign guest again as she gives him the room key and provides the directions.

Language choice and code alternation result in the participant exclusion in line 6 when the Swedish guest, after the sequence between the receptionist and the foreign guest (lines 2-4), constructs his new turn in a relevant TRP, i.e. after the receptionist’s turn (line 4) followed a 5.8-second pause (line 5). This turn is constructed in Swedish as a common language of interaction and, moreover, the mother tongue for the Swedish guest and the receptionist. In the interaction of two Swedish language native speakers, Swedish appears to be a natural language choice when the interaction is conducted between these two participants only. Thus, this “participant-related switching” (Auer 1998: 8) may have been performed for the Swedish-speaking participants’ convenience. At the same time, the information provided by the Swedish guest as he code-switches concerns the payment details which, presumably, the Swedish guest prefers to address to the receptionist only.

In any case, the Swedish language choice in line 6 inevitably leads to excluding the three other participants whose language competences do not allow them to participate (FG1, FG2 and FG3). In terms of participation framework in this communicative situation, by performing this code switch, the Swedish guest becomes a ratified speaker and shifts the participation status of the two other participants: the status of the receptionist switches from a ratified speaker (line 4) towards an addressed recipient (line 6), whereas the participation status of the foreign guest (FG2) switches from an addressed recipient (line 4) towards a ratified hearer (line 6). Thus, one may conclude that excluding the foreign participants from the interaction has apparently become the main accomplishment of the English-Swedish alternation in extract (5). In line 9 the receptionist initiates another switching of the participation framework by constructing an utterance in English preceded by a number of preparatory multimodal activities in lines 4-8: consulting the hotel reservation system, approaching the desk where the electronic room keys are kept, taking a key and handing it to the foreign guest. This code alternation is characterised by an opposite direction in the participation framework, as it includes the foreign guest and makes him an addressed recipient.
With all this in view, extract (5) has demonstrated how code alternation may result in excluding certain parties from the interaction, a group of foreign guests in particular. The payment issues are managed between the hotel and the Swedish hosting company in the native language of the two participating parties; meanwhile, this Swedish language choice obviously convenient to both participants may at the same time serve as a means of sharing the seemingly confidential information by delimiting the addressees. However, according to extract (5), this way of delivering information does not always result in participants’ disengagement. On the opposite, in extract (5) one of the foreign guests (FG1) who appears to be an unaddressed recipient and is visible in the recording remains calm and continues looking at the receptionist as he waits for being checked in at the hotel. His body position and face expression do not change (starting from line 2), no matter if English or Swedish is used by the other participants. The embodiment of the participation status of the other foreign guest involved in the interaction (FG2) can unfortunately not be seen in the recording, as the guest is standing further away from the reception desk and is concealed from the camera by a column.

In comparison with extract (5) where the exclusive code alternation is followed by the discussion of payment issues which may be confidential, in extract (6) the code alternation towards Swedish is performed both by the receptionist and the Swedish guest as they start discussing some organizational questions almost at once (lines 7-8). It also excludes the foreign participants as the chosen code does not comply with their language abilities, but its content does not seem to bear any confidentiality:

6. Hotel_2 (04:53-05.39)
1 recB: ^two hundred thirty<--si:xy^. 
    ^hands the room key card to FG1^ 
    fgl ^examines the electronic key card he received ->
2 recB +prints room key card+ 
    ^hands the card to FG2 -> 
    sg ^leans on reception desk & looks in front of him^ 
    ^looks at RecB ->
    fgl 
3 ^two hundred thirty-sev^+en. (.)^ 
    recB ^looks at the key handed to FG2^ 
    sg 
4 (0.7) 
    sg -= ->
In extract (6) the receptionist hands over the electronic room key to one of the foreign guests (FG1); then she prints out the room key for the other foreign guest (FG2) and hands it over to him. The Swedish guest shows his confirmation of the activity in English and soon inquires about the availability of restaurants in Swedish. The receptionist provides some details on the hotel restaurant.
Directly after the receptionist-foreign guest interaction in English follows the Swedish host’s confirmation of the check in process, expressed both non-verbally by his gaze (lines 3-5), and verbally pronounced in the language which complies with the participants’ previous choice: “PERFECT.” (line 5). The Swedish host’s gaze at the receptionist and the foreign guest’s examining the key are documented in Figure (1). Because of this language choice for constructing a TCU by the Swedish guest, the participation status of the foreign guest (FG2) is not changed: he remains a ratified listener. After a 1.0-second pause (line 5), the Swedish guest starts another TCU, again in English, which is directly followed by an ambivalent filler: “s≥:o: e:r” which overlaps with the start of the receptionist’s TCU in Swedish: “└så┘” (lines 7-8). The Swedish guest performs a “turn-internal” code-switching (Auer 1998: 20) as he continues his turn in Swedish: “┌>vart kan man gå┐å < kää:ka hä:r;,” (line 7) which overlaps with the receptionist’s “└och se:n:─┘” (line 8).

In this extract the choice of the Swedish language is first performed by the receptionist (line 8), whereas the Swedish guest starts his turn in English, as being influenced by the previous language choices of other participants, which may be an evidence of Auer’s “sequential implicativeness of language choice” (1984: 5) discussed in section (2.2). The code alternation performed by the receptionist and the Swedish guest (lines 7-8) results in the participant exclusion from the interaction, as well as in the shift of participation status of the three foreign guests: they become ratified hearers instead of ratified listeners.

This participation exclusion may be connected with the specificity of the professional activity: as the Swedish guest performs the role of a host for the group of guests, he is obliged to assist in a number of organizational issues. The recorded interaction at the hotel reception has revealed that inquiring and providing additional information as an important phase of the check in activity is most often performed in Swedish, possibly because the host and the receptionist do not consider it crucial for the guests’ stay in the hospitality property. The preference of the Swedish guest for Swedish is revealed again later, when he becomes a ratified speaker again and constructs a TCU in Swedish (line 14) as he enquires for additional information; this language choice confirms the exclusion of the three foreign guests from participation again.
Now let us consider the degree of participation and the reaction of the foreign guests to the change of their participatory status. The detailed analysis of the body position and gaze of the foreign guest who is visible in the recording (FG1) reveals that he is only for a short time concerned with the code alternation towards Swedish which does not comply with his language competences. His concern is revealed in his gaze towards the receptionist (line 7) and his following her gesture with the gaze (line 9), as Figure (2) shows. However, before the current code alternation, the foreign guest displays disengagement, as he examines his electronic key card before the alternation towards Swedish (lines 3-7) and soon after it (lines 10-14). Presumably, the disengagement of the foreign guest which started already in line 3 has made the further code alternation possible and relevant for the Swedish guest and the receptionist (lines 7-8). The reaction of the foreign guests to their change of the participation status has been previously mentioned in the analysis of extract (5) where the foreign guest does not disengage or display any signs of being insulted when Swedish is chosen by the other participants. However, as it has been pointed out in the analysis of extract (3), in other cases participants may demonstrate disengagement as they become ratified hearers. In extract (4) above which represents a continuation of the current extract (6), on the opposite, the foreign guest starts to strive for participation as a ratified listener.

This section has demonstrated how language choice and code alternation in the multiple-participant interaction may result in the exclusion of certain participating parties from the interaction. Being convenient for the native Swedish language speakers, code alternation may at the same time be performed for discussing the seemingly private or confidential issues, as in extract (5), or organizational issues which are presumably considered important to be discussed with the host as a representative of the whole group, as in extract (6).

5. Summary and conclusion

This study has examined a few examples of the possible accomplishments of the so-called “interactionally meaningful” (Auer 1998: 20) code alternation within the hotel check in procedure. It has explored how the use of plurilingual resources can assist in accomplishing the complex multiple-participant activity with different language competences of the parties, when code alternation is crucial for the guests’ participation.
It has also reviewed what impact code alternation may make on the participation framework of the institutional hotel setting.

It has been revealed that, in accordance with Fishman’s distinction of the relation of multilingualism to group membership, the hotel check in multiple-participant interaction where the language competences of the parties are different is a typical example of “between-group (or intergroup) multilingualism”, i.e. using more than one code for external communication between the groups (Fishman 2000: 89).

Taking into consideration the “intergroup” (ibid.) status of bilingualism in the check in process at the hotel reception, this study has singled out three possible accomplishments of language choice and code alternation which occur in the hotel check in interaction. First of all, it has addressed code alternation as a common resource for addressing a new participant (section 4.1). Here the language choice may be negotiated with the new addressed recipient or not, when the choice of another code is made due to some reasons, e.g. foreign names in the reservation system. Secondly, this investigation has addressed the problems of language choice for shifting the participation status from “ratified hearer” towards “ratified listener” (section 4.2). Finally, in comparison with the previous two sections which discussed code alternation as a resource for including certain participants in the interaction, the third analysis section has discussed how language choice may result in participant exclusion (section 4.3). The Swedish guest, or host, may wish to discuss some confidential or private issues of which he does not want to inform other guests, as in extract (5) where the Swedish guest discusses the payment issues with the receptionist. In other cases, the guest who excludes others by language choice may presumably choose to do so because he / she does not consider it necessary to share the information on that particular stage, e.g. if he / she inquires some additional information which would be shared later, if necessary.

The detailed analysis of six extracts of the hotel check in institutional interaction within a complex and dynamic participation framework has confirmed that the participation status of the parties may be constantly changing, and is often defined by the choice of code which may or may not comply with their language abilities. Therefore, different participants may be either included in the interaction or excluded from it. The investigation has revealed that, in case of different language competences of the
participating parties, the issue of language choice has a crucial meaning for the participation status of the participants. When by means of code alternation the participants are included in the interaction, as in section (4.1) and (4.2), their participation status is shifted from unaddressed recipients towards addressed ones. In other words, the status is shifted from ratified hearers - whose language abilities do not coincide with the code chosen by others and thus prevent them from understanding the interaction – towards ratified listeners. When code alternation is employed for excluding certain parties from the interaction, as in section (4.3), their status as an addressed recipient is changed towards an unaddressed recipient, and they become ratified hearers instead of ratified listeners or speakers. As the analysis of the corpus has demonstrated, in the process of shifting the participation framework at the hotel reception the body position and the multimodal resources of the participants play a crucial role.

The study has demonstrated that participants strongly orient to the plurilingual resources available within the multiple participation frameworks. For example, among their possible reactions to the use of language choice that does not correspond to their language abilities, the following behaviour has been noticed:

1) The guest disengages and shows no concern, as in extract (3);
2) The guest displays no disengagement, as in extract (5);
3) The guest shows concern only for a short period of time, as in extract (6);
4) The guest strives for participation, as in extract (4).

With all this in view, this investigation has revealed that the use of code alternation may have a crucial meaning for the total accomplishment of the highly standardized complex check in activity at the hotel reception. It becomes extremely relevant in the hotel settings where the language abilities of the participants alongside with the service obligations of the hospitality personnel make them choose languages that would suit the guests’ needs and their preferences. Due to the hotel receptionists’ assumed objective to provide the best possible service and establish a positive image of the hotel, language choice and code alternation serve as a powerful means for establishing professional relationships with different categories of hotel guests and at the same time creating a positive image of the hotel. Thus, the ability to skilfully operate with plurilingual resources during the check in procedure appears to be a crucial issue whenever the language competences of different guests within one group are not the same.
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Appendix A: List of Abbreviations

CA – conversation analysis
FG, FG1, FG2 etc (in transcriptions) – foreign guests
RecA, RecB – two different receptionists of Solliden who appear in the recordings
SG, SG1, SG2 etc (in transcriptions) – Swedish guests
TCU – turn-constructional unit
TRP – transition-relevance place
Appendix B: Transcription Notation

For transcribing the verbal part of the recorded interaction, Jefferson’s notation system was used (2004):

\( \text{┌word} \) the left-side brackets indicate the starting point of overlap
\( \text{└word} \) the right-side brackets indicate the ending point of overlap
\( \text{word\textbackslash r} \) equal signs indicate no gap between utterances
\( \text{=} \) numbers in parenthesis indicate the timed pause by tenths of seconds
\( \text{.} \) a full stop in parenthesis indicates a brief pause, usually shorter than two tenths of a second
\( \text{ºwordº} \) the degree signs indicate that the word or phrase are pronounced softer than the surrounding speech
\( \text{>word<} \) the utterance or its part is pronounced faster than the surrounding speech
\( \text{WORD} \) word in the upper case indicates that word was pronounces considerably louder than the surrounding speech
\( \text{wo:rd / word:} \) colon after a vowel or a consonant indicates its prolongation
\( \text{word} \) underlined word or syllable indicates that it is accentuated by the speaker
\( \text{word-} \) dash indicates a cut off word or phrase
\( \cdot hh \) an inbreath
\( \text{hehe} \) laugh
\( \text{(word)} \) words or phrases in parenthesis are dubious
\( \text{(x)} \) words or phrases that are not understood by the transcriber in the speech flow, the number of “x” signs corresponds to the number of syllables
\( \uparrow \) the upper arrow indicates the rising pitch
\( \downarrow \) the lower arrow indicates the falling pitch
\( ,.? \) punctuation markers indicate the intonation at the end of a sentence or TCU

The notation of non-verbal resources is developed after Mondada’s conventions (2006, 2007b):
\( +, *, ^, \int, \frac{\pi}{x}, \Delta \) crosses, stars and some other graphical devices delimitate continuing multimodal details considered relevant for the current transcription
gesture or action described continue until the same symbol is reached

dagger signs indicate momentary actions or gestures

preparation of gesture

retraction of gesture

hash signs in the transcription indicate the places of figure shots

For code-switching details, the following distinction is used:

word Times New Roman medium font is used for words / sentences in Swedish

word Times New Roman in bold is used for words / sentences in English

word Times New Roman in bold italics is used to mark words / sentences in English in the translation from Swedish in case of insertions and code-mixing

word dashes underlining a word indicate that the utterance is ambivalent; the code cannot be recognized as Swedish or English

name dashes underlining a name indicate that the name is ambivalent, and may belong to either Swedish or English

(words or phrases underlined with dashes are ambivalent, not clearly understood by the analyst, and the language of utterance is not determined

word Times New Roman in italics is used for idiomatic translation of words / sentences in Swedish into English

Additional symbols:

AMB different capital letters are used to indicate the name of companies that cannot be mentioned due to the ethical principle
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