KEELEKONTAKTIDE JA MITMEKEELSUSE KEELELISED, SOTSIAALSED JA KOGNITIIVSED ASPEKTID

Linguistic, Social and Cognitive Aspects of Language Contacts and Multilingualism

SISUKORD

EESSÕNA

Anna Verschik

Tallinna ülikool

Selle aasta kogumiku teema on „Keelekontaktide ja mitmekeelsuse keelelised, sotsiaalsed ja kognitiivsed aspektid". Ükski keel ei eksisteeri teistest keeltest isoleeritult ja nii-öelda kontaktivabalt; iseasi on, kas see on uurija jaoks perifeerne asjaolu või vastupidi, uurimise põhiobjekt.

Kogumiku autorkond on rahvusvaheline, on nii tunnustatud kui algajaid teadlasi (magistrante, doktorante). Peaaegu kõik artiklid käsitlevad kontaktsituatsioone, kus üks osaline on eesti keel.

Teemade ring on päris lai. Lea Meriläineni, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi ja Hanna Lantto artikkel on ülevaade teooriatest, mis ühel või teisel määral käsitlevad tõlkelaene. Tõlkelaenudele makedoonia-inglise kakskeelses kõnes läheneb kontaktlingvistika seisukohalt ka Jim Hlavac. Virve Vihmani ja Jim Hlavaci artiklid testivad kontaktlingvistikas tuntud teoreetilisi mudeleid ja tõdevad järjekordselt, et universaalseid piiranguid pole olemas ning et keelekontaktide protsessis sünnivad uuendused, mis ei järgi kummagi keele ükskeelset grammatikat. Anette Ross käsitleb Eestis elavate romade murret (Lotfitka) teiste roma keelekujude kontekstis ja üldisel keelekontaktide intensiivsuse skaalal (Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

Kaks artiklit keskenduvad mitmekeelsele virtuaalsele suhtlusele. Kristiina Praakli uurib Soomes elavate eestlaste suhtlusrühma mitmekeelse pragmaatika seisukohalt ning Helin Kask arutleb inglise keele mõju üle eesti moeblogides.

Koodikopeerimismudelit (Johanson 1993) kasutab Helin Kask just mainitud artiklis, aga ka Elīna Joenurma eesti-läti kakskeelse kõne uurimiseks. Viimases pööratakse tähelepanu mõlemasuunalisele mõjule.

Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene ja Ad Backus käsitlevad eesti-vene retseptiivset kakskeelsust. Erinevalt teistest autoritest on nende artiklis tegu eksperimentaalse metodoloogiaga. Võib öelda, et retseptiivse kakskeelsuse teema kerkib üles ka Kristiina Praakli artiklis, kuna ta uurib kahe lähedase sugulaskeele kontakte.

Lähemalt artiklitest

Ad Backus ja Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene käsitlevad retseptiivset mitmekeelsust *(lingua receptiva* ehk LaRa) eesti-vene suhtluses. Retseptiivne mitmekeelsus tähendab seda, et kumbki osapool kõneleb oma keeles või vajaduse korral mugandab seda ning et kumbki osapool suudab enam-vähem mõista, mida teine omas keeles räägib (lähemalt vt Rehbein, ten Thije and Verschik 2012). Selline suhtlemine ei piirdu ainult lähedaste sugulaskeelte paariga, vaid on võimalik ka mittesugulaskeelte puhul, kui kummalgi kaasvestlejal on teise keele passiivne oskus. Eksperimendi andmete põhjal selgus, et teise keele oskus ei ole alati ainuotsustav ning et edukas suhtlus on võimalik ka piiratud keeleoskuse puhul. See võib tähendada seda, et keelejuhid on hinnanud oma keeleoskust liiga tagasihoidlikult, aga ka seda, et kommunikatsioon ei sõltu ainuüksi keeleoskusest, vaid sõltub ka nn meta-kommunikatiivsetest strateegiatest.

Jim Hlavac räägib makedoonia-inglise koodivahetusest Austraalias, pöörates tähelepanu eelkõige kergverbile. Kergverb kui analüütiliste verbikonstruktsioonidega osa (inglise keeles *light verb* ehk *dummy verb*) eksisteerib makedoonia keeles marginaalselt (keelekorraldajad on pidanud vajalikuks see analüütiline konstruktsioon kirjakeelest välja rookida), kuid olemasolev võimalus „tuleb appi", kui on vaja integreerida inglise verbe. Tavaliselt on tuumaks mõni üldise tähendusega verb, nagu tegema, saama vms. Nõnda tekib konstruktsioon, nagu *walking praješ* 'jalutad' (tegijanimi verbist *walk* 'kõndima' + makedoonia verb tähendusega 'tegema' vastavas isikus, arvus ja ajas). Pole selge, kas mudeliks on marginaalselt eksisteeriv makedoonia konstruktsioon või mõni inglise püsiväljend,

nagu *to do shopping* 'sisseoste tegema', *to have lunch* 'lantši sööma' > makedoonia *ima lunch* (ima 'omama').

Elīna Joenurma keskendub eesti-läti kakskeelse keelejuhi kõnele. Tasakaalus kakskeelsuse tingimustes ei saa öelda, kumb keel on nii-öelda tugevam, kuigi kronoloogiline pilt on selge (eesti keel on omandatud esimesena). Kuigi mõju kahesuunalisus ei ole kontakt-lingvistikas uudne asi, on täiskasvanud kakskeelsete uurimustes tavaliselt rõhuasetus kas K1 > K2 (teise keele omandamise uurimu-ses) või K2 > K1 (enamik kontaktlingvistilist kirjandust). Siin aga pöörab autor tähelepanu mõlemale suunale, läti-eesti ja eesti-läti, kasutades koodikopeerimismudelit (Johanson 1993). Selgub, et see, mida ja kuidas kopeeritakse, on mõlema suuna puhul küllalt sar-nane. Erinevusi võib leida diskursuspragmaatiliste sõnade kopee-rimisel: pigem kopeeritakse eesti keelest läti keelde kui vastupidi. See võib tähendada muuhulgas seda, et keelejuhi jaoks on eesti keel pragmaatiliselt domineeriv (Matras 1998 terminoloogias).

Helin Kask uurib inglise-eesti koodikopeerimist eestlaste moe-blogides. Inglise keele positsioonist ja mõjust Eestis on seni kirju-tatud pigem makrotasandil, toetudes küsitlustele. Artikli keskmes on aga kontaktlingvistilised aspektid. Enamik koopiaid inglise kee-lest on täielikud koopiad (sõnad, püsiühendid, väljendid). See on oodatav ja arusaadav, sest leksikaalne ja semantiline mõju avaldub keelekontaktide varajases staadiumis. Samas oleneb palju ka teksti-tüübist: mitmekeelsus on moeblogides pigem norm, blogi on mono-loogiline formaat (erinevalt jututoast, foorumist vms) ja seetõttu ei ole isegi pikemad lõigud teises keeles võimatud. Inglise elemen-did pole aga alati eesti grammatika kohaselt mugandatud. Lisaks semantiliselt spetsiifilisele (valdkonna omasele) sõnavara kopeeri-misele esineb hulgaliselt inglise diskursuspragmaatilisi sõnu (*well*, *anyway* vms). Viimased esinevad ka noorema põlvkonna suulises kõnes ning ei ole valdkonna ega tekstitüübi spetsiifilised. Valikulisi koopiaid (mallide ja konstruktsioonide kopeerimist) on vähe (2% juhtumitest), kusjuures segakoopiaid (*epic-kiire* taolisi näiteid) on rohkem (7%).

Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi ja Hanna Lantto, vaatlevad, kuidas eri distsipliinid (teise keele omandamise uuringud, kontaktlingvistika ja tõlketeadus) käsitlevad tõlkelaene. Kõnealused distsipliinid kasutavad päris erinevat metakeelt ja suhtumine tõlkelaenudesse erineb, kuigi tõlkelaenamise kognitiivseid aluseid nähakse samamoodi. Teise keele omandamise seisukohalt nähakse tõlkelaene eelkõige esimese keele mõjuna. Selle tagajärjel produtseeritakse vorme, mis sihtkeeles puuduvad (nn *non-target forms*). Kontaktlingvistika käsitleb tõlkelaene neutraalselt kui emma-kumma keele mõju all tekkinud uuendust. Tõlketeaduses on teema üllatavalt marginaalne. Tõlkelaene käsitletakse neologismidena. Kõigi kolme puhul on ühine, et tõlkelaen ei ole pelgalt leksikaalne nähtus, vaid võib sisse tuua ka morfosüntaktilisi ja semantilisi uuendusi.

Kristiina Praakli analüüsib materjali, mida ta on kogunud Soomes elavate eestlaste Facebooki rühma leheküljelt. Võrreldes teiste artiklitega, on see kõige vähem keelesüsteemikeskne. Põhirõhk on kakskeelse suhtluse pragmaatikal. Teemaalgataja keelevalik on ühtlasi vihje kommenteerijatele. Antud virtuaalkeskkonnas, nagu suulises kõneski, on refereerimine (tsiteerimine, teiste isikute sõnavõttudele viitamine/ümberjutustus) koodivahetuse põhifunktsiooniks. Koodivahetus on rühmas pigem kirjutamata norm kui erand, siiski väga pikki soomekeelseid lõike ei taheta aktsepteerida. Kui eestlased omavahel kirjutavad pikalt soome keeles, tekitab see paljudes imestust ja kutsub esile metalingvistilisi kommentaare keelevaliku kohta. Koodivahetus on sujuv ja peaaegu ei mõjuta morfosüntaksi (vrd näiteks Virve Vihmani ja Helin Kase artiklitega).

Anette Ross uurib Eestis elavate romade keele suhteid teiste roma keelevariantide ja muude mõjukeeltega (vene, läti, eesti). Artikkel paigutab Eestis elavate romade Lotfitka keelevariandi Thomasoni ja Kaufmani (1988) laenatavuse skaalasse. Keele säilitamise puhul algavad muutused sõnavarast, järgmises staadiumis on võimalik tähenduste ja mõningate struktuuride laenamine (sõnajärg, rektsioon, intonatsioon vms) jne. Eestis elavad romad on enamasti pärit Lätist ning kõnelevad nn Lotfitka (Läti) murret, mis kuulub

kirderoma murderühma (koos Venemaa romade murde Xaladytka, Poolas kõneldava Polska romaga jne). Lotfitkale on ajalooliselt mõju avaldanud läti ja vene keel. Samuti elab Eestis teatud hulk Xaladytka variandi kõnelejaid. Praeguseks on läti keele mõju nõrgenenud ja eestikeelses keskkonnas on uue mõjukeelena üles kerkinud eesti keel. On märgata eesti keele leksikaalset mõju, aga ka tähenduste laenamist. Mitmed leksikaalsed laenud säilitavad eesti foneeme. Kontaktid eesti keelega paiknevad Thomasoni ja Kaufmani skaalal esimese (juhuslik kontakt) ja teise (intensiivsem kontakt) staadiumi vahel.

Virve-Anneli Vihman mõtestab lahti kontaktlingvistikas laialt tuntud mudeleid (maatrikskeeleraamistiku mudel ehk MKR ja selle täiendatud versioon, nn 4M mudel) ja püstitab küsimuse, kas keelekontaktid toimuvad ühe osalause sees või ka mujal. Ta järeldab, et mudelid töötavad siis, kui maatrikskeel on selgelt määratav, aga alati see nõnda pole. Üks sisestatud verb võib muuta kogu lause grammatikat, nt ütluses *doesn't täida soovid* 'ei täida soove' peaks MKR järgi eestikeelne osa käituma eesti grammatikale vastavalt (oodatav oleks mitmuse osastav), aga nii ei juhtu. Seega ei saa alati öelda, kumb keel annab ette grammatilise raamistiku. Seega mõlemad keeled võivad dikteerida kakskeelse kõne grammatikat. Sarnaseid tähelepanekuid on ka teiste keelepaaride kohta (Auer and Muhamedova 2005).

Toimetaja loodab, et selle kogumikuga õnnestub kontaktlingvistika probleemistik lugejale lähemale tuua ja näidata, et kõik autorid osalevad ühises rahvusvahelises diskussioonis ja kasutavad sama metakeelt, olenemata sellest, mis keelte materjaliga nad töötavad.

KIRJANDUS

Auer, Peter; Muhamedova, Raihan 2005. 'Embedded language' and 'matrix language' insertional language mixing: Some problematic cases. Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di linguistica 17 (1), 35–54 (special issue, ed. G. Berruto).

Johanson, Lars 1993. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. – Immigrant languages in Europe. Eds. G. Extra, L. Verhoeven. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide, 197–221.

Matras, Yaron 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing – Linguistics 36 (2), 281–331.

Rehbein, Jochen; ten Thije, Jan D.; Verschik, Anna 2012. Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. Eds. Jan D. ten Thije, Jochen Rehbein, Anna Verschik. Lingua Receptiva. International Journal for Bilingualism 16 (3), 248–264.

Thomason, Sarah Grey; Kaufman, Terence 1998. Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

INTRODUCTION

Anna Verschik

Tallinn University

The topic of the current yearbook is „Linguistic, social and cognitive aspects of language contacts and multilingualism". No language exists in isolation nor in a contact-free environment; another matter is whether this knowledge is peripheral for a researcher or, on the contrary, is the focus of his/her research.

The authors of the current article collection come from different countries, and include both acknowledged scholars in the field of contact linguistics as well as beginners (MA and PhD students). Almost all the papers deal with linguistic situations where Estonian is involved.

The range of topics is rather broad. For instance, Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi and Hanna Lantto provide an overview of theories that explore loan translations to a greater or lesser extent. The topic of loan translations is considered from a contact linguistic perspective by Jim Hlavac. The papers by Virve-Anneli Vihman and Jim Hlavac test some well-known contact linguistic theoretical models and arrive at the conclusion that universal constraints on language contacts do not exist and that in the process innovations emerge that are not „well-formed" from the point of view of two separate monolingual grammars. Anette Ross describes the Lotfitka variety spoken by the majority of Roma in Estonia against the background of other Romani varieties and considering the scale of borrowability proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988).

Two articles explore multilingual communication on the internet: Kristiina Praakli describes practices of communication in a Facebook community of Estonians living in Finland from a pragmatic perspective, while Helin Kask considers English impact in Estonian fashion blogs.

Two articles employ a code-copying framework (Johanson 1993): the above mentioned article by Kask and a study on Estonian-Latvian bilingual speech by Elīna Joenurma. The latter focuses on bidirectionality of impact.

Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene and Ad Backus investigate Estonian-Russian receptive bilingualism. Differently from the rest of the authors, their research is based on experimental methodology. One may say that the topic of receptive bilingualism arises also in Praakli's article because she focuses on the contact of two closely related languages, Estonian and Finnish.

Brief summary of the papers

Ad Backus and Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene describe receptive multi-lingualism *(lingua receptiva* or LaRa) in Estonian-Russian commu-nication. Receptive multilingualism is a mode of communication in which each participant uses his/her language and adjusts language use if needed. Thus, all participants are able to understand to an extent what is being said (for more details see Rehbein, ten Thije and Verschik 2012). This mode of communication is not limited to closely related varieties but is also possible if both participants have at least a passive command of each other's variety. As communica-tion in this experimental setting demonstrated, proficiency in the co-participant's language is not the only decisive factor that con-tributes to successful communication, and that achievement of com-municative goals is possible also if proficiency is limited. This may mean that the informants are too critical in their assessment of their proficiency and/or that success depends on so-called metacommu-nictive strategies as well.

Jim Hlavac describes Macedonian-English code-switching in Australia with a special focus on light verbs. Light verbs exist in Macedonian, albeit marginally (language planners considered it their business to purge them from the standard language). Yet, the tendency comes in handy when there is a need to integrate an English

verb into a Macedonian grammatical matrix. Thus, constructions emerge such as *walking praješ* 'you walk' (the gerund form of the verb *walk* + Macedonian verb 'to do' in the appropriate person, number and tense). It is not entirely clear whether the marginally existing possibility in Macedonian has served as a model or whether English fixed expressions such as *to do shopping*, *to have lunch* and the like have resulted in Australian Macedonian *ima lunch*.

Elīna Joenurma focuses on the speech of an Estonian-Latvian bilingual informant. In the situation of balanced bilingualism it is not possible to determine which of the two languages is dominant, although the chronology of acquisition is clear enough (Estonian is L1). Although bidirectionality of impact is not unknown in contact linguistics, in research on adult bilingualism the stress is either on L1 > L2 impact (SLA research) or L2 > L1 (most contact linguistic research). The author considers impact in both directions and employs a code-copying framework (Johanson 1993). What gets copied and to what degree is not very different in Estonian to Latvian and in Latvian to Estonian copying. The difference is in copying of discourse pragmatic particles, where the direction of copying is from Estonian to Latvian. This may mean that, in the terms of Matras (1998), Estonian is pragmatically dominant language for the informant.

The contribution by Helin Kask deals with English-Estonian code-copying in online fashion blogs. So far the position of English in Estonia has been mostly described and analysed from a macro-sociolinguistic perspective (based on surveys, etc.). The article concentrates of contact linguistic aspects of the English influence. Most of the copies are global copies (one or multi-word lexical items, idioms). This is rather expected and understandable because lexical and semantic impact appears in early stages of language contact. Yet much depends on the genre of text in question: multilingualism is a norm in Estonian fashion blogs. A blog is a monological format (different from chats or forums) and, therefore, even longer stretches in another language are possible. English lexical items are not always

entirely integrated into Estonian grammar. In addition to semantic-specific lexical items (fashion terms), English lexical impact is visible in discourse pragmatic particles (e.g. *well*, *anyway*). The latter are present in oral speech of young Estonians as well and are not specific to any topic or text type. In the data, selective copies are rather rare (2 % of all copies) and mixed copies (for instance, *epic-kiire* 'epic fast') are slightly more frequent (7 % of occurrences).

Lea Meriläinen, Helka Riionheimo, Päivi Kuusi and Hanna Lantto provide a picture on how different linguistic disciplines view loan translations. The disciplines in question (SLA, contact linguistics, translation studies) use rather different metalanguage, although all three agree on the cognitive basis of loan translations. SLA primarily sees loan translations as L1 impact. This impact is responsible for production of non-target forms. Contact linguistics sees loan translations in a neutral light as innovations appearing as a result of impact from either language. Surprisingly, the topic is somewhat marginal in translation studies, where loan translations are viewed as neologisms. All three disciplines agree that loan translations are not a merely lexical phenomenon but that they can also introduce morphosyntactic and semantic innovations.

Kristiina Praakli analyses data from a Facebook group of Estonians residing in Finland. Compared to the other articles, this one is less concentrated on linguistic structures. The author instead chooses a pragmatic approach to bilingual communication. Language choice by topic starter is also a hint to commentators. Like in oral communication, one of the main functions of code-switching in this virtual environment is the reference function (quotation, rendition of other people's speech, digest). Code-switching is an unwritten norm in the community, yet very long stretches in Finnish do not seem to be acceptable. The fact that some Estonians choose to communicate to each other in Finnish is surprising to others and leads to meta-linguistic comments on language choice. Code-switching is smooth and does not affect morphosyntax (but see Kask, Vihman in this volume).

Anette Ross describes Estonian Lotfitka, a variety used by Roma people in Estonia with reference to the other Romani and non-Romani varieties (such as Russian, Latvian, Estonian) that have impacted it. The language is placed into the context of the borrowability scale proposed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988). In the situation of language maintenance, changes start from the lexicon and later borrowing of meaning and non-core structural elements (word order, intonation, argument structure, etc.) becomes possible. The Roma in Estonia have mostly arrived from Latvia and their variety belongs to the North-Eastern family of Romani varieties (together with Russian Romani (Xaladytka), the Polish variety of Polska Roma, etc.). There exist some Xaladytka speakers in Estonia as well. Historically, Lotfitka has been impacted by Russian and Latvian. As of today, Latvian impact on Estonian Lotfitka has weakened and Estonian has a growing influence. There is evidence of Estonian lexical and semantic impact. New lexical items preserve Estonian phonemes. In the framework of Thomason and Kaufman, contacts between Estonian and Lotfitka are between stage one (casual contact) and stage two (more intensive contact).

Virve-Anneli Vihman tests highly influential models such as MLF and the M4 model and questions whether language contacts occur within a clause or also outside it. She concludes that the models are accurate in situations where the matrix language is clear, but this is not always the case. For instance, an inserted English verb may affect the grammar of the entire clause: in *doesn't täida soovid* 'does not fulfil wishes' the Estonian verb phrase is not well-formed from the point of view of Estonian monolingual grammar and instead the partitive plural (*soove* 'wishes') should appear; yet, the form *soovid* is in nominative plural. Thus, both languages can contribute to the grammar of bilingual speech. Similar observations have been made about other language pairs as well (Auer and Muhamedova 2005).

It is my hope that the collection will familiarise readers with contact linguistic research and will successfully demonstrate that

all authors participate in an international discussion and share theoretical metalanguage, no matter what language pair(s) they investigate.

REFERENCES

Auer, Peter and Muhamedova, Raihan 2005. 'Embedded language' and 'matrix language' insertional language mixing: Some problematic cases. *Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di linguistica* 17 (1), 35–54 (special issue, ed. G. Berruto).

Johanson, Lars 1993. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. – *Immigrant languages in Europe*. (Eds.) G. Extra, L. Verhoeven. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide, 197–221.

Matras, Yaron 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing – Linguistics 36 (2), 281–331.

Rehbein, Jochen, ten Thije, Jan D. and Verschik, Anna 2012. Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. In ten Thije, J. D.; Rehbein, J. and Verschik, A. (Eds.) Lingua Receptiva. *International Journal for Bilingualism* 16 (3), 248–264

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Kaufman, Terence 1998. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LIMITED COMMON GROUND, UNLIMITED COMMUNICATIVE SUCCESS: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY INTO LINGUA RECEPTIVA USING ESTONIAN AND RUSSIAN

Daria Bahtina-Jantsikene
University of Helsinki

Ad Backus
Tilburg University

Abstract. Previous research on Estonian-Russian interaction suggests that *lingua receptiva* (LaRa), or Receptive Multilingualism, has the potential to create, boost or restore common ground, or mutual understanding, in situations where common ground is jeopardized. This mode is characterized by the simultaneous use of multiple languages as interlocutors each speak their mother tongue and count on the receptive skills of the other. Alignment in the LaRa mode was tested in a series of experiments. The use of various meta-communicative strategies provided insight into the mechanisms behind LaRa. Their distribution was influenced somewhat by L2 proficiency and exposure to multilingual communicative situations. Interestingly, higher L2 knowledge was not a prerequisite for success. Moreover, it was the composition of the dyad rather than the characteristics of the individuals that had predictive power regarding communicative success.

Keywords: lingua receptiva, meta-communicative devices, L2 proficiency, multilingualism, common ground, Estonian, Russian

Introduction

Communicative success can be conceptualized as the degree to which interlocutors manage to reach common ground (Clark 1996). At the most atomic level of a communicative exchange, two alternating turns between two people engaged in a dialogue, a speaker aims

to get a message across and the hearer is supposed to understand that message. If the latter indeed 'gets it', the two partners may be said to have reached maximal common ground, as they both now know the same thing. In designing a message, a speaker takes into account an educated guess about the state of knowledge the hearer possesses before the exchange. This is easier if there is already a lot of common ground to begin with. In such cases, the hearer will understand most things without problem, including not just the words and grammatical patterns that the speaker uses, but also what's behind all the stylistic choices, the nods and head turns, the intonation patterns, etc. This is why communication with friends or family members about familiar topics in familiar settings tends to be so fast and effortless. At the other extreme are unfamiliar communicative settings. Lack of familiarity can result from at least two sources. The interlocutors might not know each other well, or the communicative task may be unfamiliar. Lack of familiarity produces stressful situations characterized by low degrees of common ground. Communicative success needs effort.

This article reports on an experimental study in which pre-existing common ground was kept small, to see how people would handle this situation and what strategies they would use to nevertheless ensure successful communication. Specifically, language choice was manipulated. Bilingual speakers of Estonian and Russian were instructed to only use their mother tongue in communication with mother tongue speakers of the other language, a pattern known as Lingua Receptiva (LaRa) or Receptive Multilingualism. This way of communicating, while conventional in a number of multilingual settings around the world, was virtually unknown to the participants. Some of the results were somewhat surprising, as it turned out that limitations in pre-existing common ground sometimes had a beneficial effect for the conversational task, essentially because it induced people to help each other more.

The first section will discuss the role of common ground in communication in general and the way in which it was kept small in the

present study. The subsequent sections present the methodology and the results, focusing on the abovementioned surprises. The final section explores the implications of these findings for future studies.

Common ground

The importance of 'common ground' for communication was emphasized by Clark (1996), as the central concept in his theory of communication (and also taken up by Pickering, Garrod 2004, Tomasello 2008, Croft 2009, and others). In communication, people strive towards maximizing the common ground between them, and the inherent puzzle of communication is how this is achieved given that two interlocutors can never know for sure how much common ground they have between them.

Common ground is greater the more familiar the communicative setting is, and familiarity is high when interlocutors know each other well, and the setting is like many other settings the interlocutors have experienced in the past. Often, these two sources of familiarity go together, for example when a group of close friends engage in small talk on their weekly night out. However, close friends too may sometimes engage in a conversation type they don't experience together often, for example when one of them suddenly has to explain a dramatic development at his job (e.g. lay-offs) despite the organizational features of his workplace having never before been a topic of conversation in the group. Other examples would include an academic professor telling his/her non-academic cousin about his research when he/she has never done such a thing before, or colleagues running into each other in town, and realizing they have so far only talked about task-related issues at work and never exchanged small talk.

In psycholinguistics, common ground is often conceptualized as alignment between speakers. Research tends to focus on 'deep' cognitive processes that are beyond the conscious attention of language users (Pickering, Garrod 2004). Primary evidence for unconscious or

automatic processing is the existence of priming effects in dialogue. If Speaker A uses a particular word or construction, the chances that Interlocutor B will use it too increase, without any evidence that this was because of a conscious act of imitation or because Speaker A somehow urged him to. Alignment can exist at various levels, and Pickering, Garrod (2004) argue for a system in which alignment on one level induces alignment at 'higher' levels, so that priming at lexical and syntactic levels contributes to speaker and hearer mentally representing the same proposition (which they call alignment of 'situation models'). At the same time, however, alignment can also be achieved through more conscious efforts, for example by actually checking whether the hearer has understood what was said. Also, if communication partners are interested in harmony, understanding and conviviality, they might imitate and accommodate to each other for social reasons. A desire for cementing the bond between speaker and hearer increases the chance of mutual understanding because it increases the wish to align. The present study focuses on such conscious ways of facilitating alignment. The participants in our study had to overtly attempt to bring about alignment at the propositional level, and one of our prime objectives was to investigate the means by which they did that.

We particularly focus on how interlocutors overcame the limitation of not being allowed to use the other's first language, and how they used 'meta-communicative devices' (henceforth: 'MCDs') to do this. MCDs and similar concepts have been discussed in various schools in pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics and conversational analysis, and have consequently been referred to with various terms (e.g. 'hearer-oriented strategies' in Functional Pragmatics, cf. Rehbein et al. 2012). Non-automatic alignment is achieved on the basis of conscious moves that speakers and hearers make in conversation. As these serve to regulate the communication itself, rather than convey referential content, they are 'meta'-communicative. Examples include explicit negotiation about the communicative task at hand, or explicit attention to how a particular word should be