

Anticipation in exolingual communication

Katarína Chovancová, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica

Monika Zázrivcová, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica

Katarína Gajdošová, Slovak Academy of Sciences

Exolingual communication calls for the presence of speakers with heterogeneous language repertoires and asymmetric communicative competences. These speakers do not share a common language and, in order to communicate, they have to seek alternative solutions to deficiencies in comprehension. The paper studies three-participant and four-participant oral interactions between Slovak and French natives and non-natives. The focus is on strategies adopted to make the interaction efficient: intercomprehension, reformulation, translation, use of bridging languages etc. To use these strategies, speakers have to lean on specific discourse operations. Anticipation is among them. The qualitative empirical research identifies occurrences of anticipation in micro-contexts of pairs of utterances and brings an overall analytical view of this sample set. It seeks to look at anticipation from the perspective of its interlinguistic/intralinguistic nature, enunciative origin as well as relevance and efficiency of anticipation in the corpus. The study is based on an exolingual oral corpus constructed and published within Slovak National Corpus project.

Keywords: *linguistics, communication, pragmatics, language contact, oral*

Anticipation is a discursive operation widely used by speakers in everyday communication to ensure a smooth flow of their oral interactions. In the linguistic study of co-construction techniques and cooperation principles put into practice by speakers in their authentic everyday linguistic productions, anticipation, by its presumed omnipresence and by the wide variety of its forms, stands out as one of highly significant tools capable of ensuring efficiency of the interaction. Some communicative contexts appear to present a specific interest for linguistic studies on anticipation, raising questions related either to a possibly higher or lower relevance of anticipation, or to the links between anticipation and other operations in service of dominant communication strategies applied. In this sense, studying anticipation in a situation marked by the contact of languages seems to have its importance in order to learn more about the nature of plurilingual communications.

The paper studies anticipatory strategies in a pilot exolingual corpus, composed of a series of oral interactions between university students and university teachers. Its aim is to find out whether anticipation is present, and if so, to what extent, in pivoted (mediated) interactions involving more than two partners and, among them, speakers with a specifically-defined role, those of mediators (pivots, facilitators) of the information exchange between the other participants that would otherwise stand low chances to understand each other. It focuses on the potential relationship between the use of anticipation on one hand and applying of some elements of linguistic intercomprehension on the other hand, in interlingual micro-contexts in which Slovak language and French language are present as mother tongues of speakers involved. The existence of the functional link between anticipation and intercomprehension is empirically tested on a limited data sample of anticipatory turns.

1. General framework and reference points for the study of anticipation in exolingual communication

In order to set up a general framework of the research, a reference must be made to the notion of exolinguality and to the notion of anticipation as a discourse operation. Both of these rich concepts are subject to interdisciplinary views in linguistic theory and in applied research, from foreign language teaching to translation studies.

1.1. Pivoted exolingual communication

The exolingual communication (de Pietro 1988; Dausenshon-Gay 2003; Porquier 1984, 2003; Rosén & Reinhardt 2003) takes place between speakers whose mother tongues are not identical. Each of these speakers has got his/her own linguistic repertoire, in terms of a set of languages he/she acquired, in which he/she has a certain competence, i.e. those he/she is able to use either with proficiency or only to some extent in communication. In exolingual communication contexts, speakers do not have a common language, i.e. there is no language they would be equally competent in. For languages both/all of them are familiar with, there is an asymmetry of communicative competences. Typically, the mother tongue of one of the speakers is the language in which the interlocutor has but a minimal competence or it is the language he/she is learning. This kind of communicative situation is witnessed when people travel to other countries or when they face the necessity to communicate with foreigners. In this case, the main question is: which solutions are available to ensure the success of the communication facing the non-identity of linguistic codes available to the interlocutors? Among these, the possibility to use human mediators deserves a specific attention.

Exolingual communication, observed in the working corpus of oral interactions, is characterized by the fact that the participants are well aware of their own limited competence in the language of the other and of the fact that they are communicating in foreign languages, the mastery of which was reached in a process of institutional or non-institutional acquisition. The conscience of the disparity in competences between the interlocutors can be considered as crucial in exolingual communication. A cooperative approach is present in the communicative behaviour of all the participants, as well as a higher level of tolerance towards non normative productions and a supportive attitude to the less competent speakers can be observed. Specific operations of adjustment related to the choice of lexical means (searching for the right word, repetitions, lexical creativity and use of neologisms, paraphrasing, descriptive expressions etc.) is also present. The speakers try to prevent problems in communication and incomprehensions, to signalize situations of this kind and to repair them. To ensure the efficiency, various means are used, especially gestures, vocal and non-verbal signals.

Discursive operations aiming at producing, co-constructing, recovering and restauring meanings in interaction can be situated in the intermediate space between “*explicite vs. implicite*”. Among the strategies of *explicite* meaning co-construction, reformulation holds an important place. Reformulation, as we understand it, covers a series of phenomena, mostly related to repetition with or without modification. There is intralinguistic or interlinguistic reformulation, the latter connecting to transcoding (translation). *Implicite* operations of meaning reconstruction are based on the speaker’s individual experience, on the level of his/her communicative competence and on his/her capacity to make an active use of his/her linguistic and metalinguistic repertoire. We are speaking about the capacity to reconstruct the meaning with the aid of the linguistic context. Linguistic intercomprehension, for instance, means the

recognition of linguistic forms based on comparing and associating, and on testing hypotheses about semantic contents, making use of the knowledge about parental links between different languages.

Discursive operations mentioned so far can be viewed also in the perspective of their intralinguistic or, on the contrary, interlinguistic nature. Again, reformulation illustrates well the opposition. Reformulation can be situated within the limits of one language or it can overcome these limits when it is linked to transcoding (translation). The translation is considered as one of the principal remediating strategies available in exolingual communication. It relates to translanguaging, exercising intermediate language codes, to the development or the use of lingua franca (Veverkova & Gallayova 2015). The research is also concerned with the representation of various discursive operations in the exolingual communication, with their concurrence and their synergy.

1.2. Anticipation in the exolingual communication

In a general view of linguistics, anticipation means that “the processor expects something to follow in a forthcoming portion of the language input” and “that it can specify certain aspects of what will follow. However, the exact content of prediction can be varied, and this issue will be discussed later.” (Kamide 2008: 2–3)

In the narrower perspective of the enunciation theory, anticipation is a phenomenon related to order and linearity (cf. Fuchs 2004). Its aim is to “assurer l’articulation cohérente avec le co-texte antérieur et une visée prospective anticipatrice du co-texte ultérieur” (Fuchs 2004: 2). Fuchs speaks, in this sense, of the pressure of “the already produced” and the pressure of “to be produced”.

Kleiber (2003) has proposed a typology of forms of anticipation, making a distinction between A. anticipation in production (or active anticipation) and B. anticipation in comprehension (or passive anticipation). Another opposition is between C. objective anticipation (inherent to the linguistic expression, i.e. a series of linguistic markers and/or significant configurations) and D. subjective anticipation, depending on the choice of the speaker. These distinctions will be taken into account in our reflection, with a specific focus on anticipation in comprehension (trackable in the reactive utterances of receptors) and subjective anticipation, not relying on objective linguistic markers, but rather focusing on identifying interactional settings that are favourable to the appearance of anticipatory turns.

Apart from some specific communicative situations like those in simultaneous interpreting (Chernov 2004; Gile 2009; Pařová & Kiktová 2019; Pařová & Zelenáková 2019), the importance of anticipation is stressed in didactic contexts, i. e. in the contexts of asymmetric exolingual communication. In these situations, “skilled listeners can easily aid non-skilled speakers (e.g. toddlers, second-language learners) by completing the utterance for the speakers” (Kamide 2008: 1). A very similar communicative behaviour can be observed in exolingual communications in general, outside strictly defined teaching/learning contexts, i.e. in everyday communicative encounters between native and non-native speakers. In these situations, anticipation is an integral part of cooperative strategies developed jointly by speakers and this is precisely what attracts our interest in the study presented further below.

In general, one of the most prominent benefits of anticipation is the ability to help the cognitive system (e.g. language processor) to prepare for the future. For example, good preparation for the future should free up cognitive capacity for subsequent events the system encounters. However, possible disadvantages of anticipation are equally

apparent. For instance, a prediction could turn out to be incorrect, in which case extra costs might be required for repairing the incorrect commitment. Also, processing extra information in addition to the stimuli at hand would be particularly costly when the processing involves continuous, incremental inputs and outputs, as in language processing. Thus, it seems that the system should be designed to anticipate only when the benefits outweigh the costs. (Kamide, 2008: 2)

Anticipation means activating one's individual communication history and experience gathered in communication practices. In plurilingual contexts of various kind it may require mobilizing the totality of one's linguistic repertoire. This is the focal point of interest of this study.

2. Data set description

The study contributes to a larger corpus-based research on exolingual communication. In order to get insight on anticipation strategies, a sample of 2 exolingual interactions has been selected, in the total length of 1 hour 56 minutes 29 seconds. One of these interactions involves 4 speakers, the other one involves 3 speakers. Speakers are either native Slovaks or native French, with variable communicative competence in the language of the other. Basically, there are three subgroups of speakers: a) native Slovaks with a very basic (or zero) knowledge of French language, b) native French with a very basic (sometimes with a pre-intermediary) knowledge of Slovak language, c) native Slovaks with a perfect knowledge of French (pivots/mediators). In each interaction, every subgroup is represented by one speaker at least. Basic parameters of the sample are stated in the Table 1.

Table 1: General parameters of the sample interactions

Interaction	Date	Length	Interventions	Participants
1	2017-09-26	62:55	1442	4
2	2018-11-21	53:34	1124	3
Total	-	1:55:29	2566	7

Speakers and their communicative roles are identified in the Table 2 below. Out of 7 speakers (3 women and 4 men) involved in the analyzed interactions, 3 speakers (M, C and R) act as pivots, the rest are non-pivots. The interaction n. 1 involves 4 speakers, 2 pivots and 2 non-pivots. The pivot M is a native Slovak with a perfect mastery of French as L2. The pivot C is a native French with a perfect mastery of Czech (C1) and an upper-intermediate mastery of Slovak (B2). The speaker K is a native Slovak with a partial communicative competence in English and German (estimated as A2) and zero mastery of French. The speaker A is a native French with a very good mastery of Spanish and English and a basic level of competence in Slovak (A1). In the interaction n. 2, R acts as pivot thanks to his very smooth mastery of French (C1) and a solid knowledge of English. F and S are non-pivots, both very competent in English, but quasi-incompetent in the language of their communication partner.

Table 2: Identification of speakers

N.	N. interaction	Reference	Status	M/F
1	1	A	native French non-pivot	F
2	1	K	native Slovak non-pivot	F
3	1	M	native Slovak pivot	F
4	1	C	native French pivot	M
5	2	R	native Slovak pivot	M
6	2	F	native French non-pivot	M
7	2	S	native Slovak non-pivot	M

The data gathered here for the analysis form a pilot sample extracted from a corpus of exolingual simulations. It needs to be stressed that encounters of speakers were organized ahead and speakers were informed of the purpose of their chatting together. This factor must be taken into account as it had impact on the nature of conversations (setting up topics to discuss, metalinguistic comments etc.).

3. Objectives and hypothesis

The paper studies the presence of selected structures in the corpus described above. It focuses on identifying heteroenuciative pairs of interventions I1 and I2 in which I2 is an anticipatory turn incited by I1.

In the corpus analyzed, anticipatory turns (I2) are modelled in two different ways. In the model A, anticipation is induced by an unsuccessful enunciation of the speaker 1 containing the initial part of a word that is then re-used and well restored by the speaker 2. Thus, the anticipation, in the utterance of the speaker 2, has got a tangible basis:

- (1) A: *bývala som v košic- v košic-* (I1)
K/M: *v košiciach* (I2)

[A: I lived in košic- in košic-
K/M: in košice]

- (2) A: *vo toulouse eh- je eh- veľmi parky a ľudí hrá pétanque a mol'-* (I1)
K: *mol'ky uhm* (I2)
A: *mol'ky*

[A: in toulouse eh- there is eh- very parks and people play pétanque and mol'-
K: mol'ky
A: mol'ky]

Anticipatory turns (I2) in the B model do not contain repetition or reformulation of previous segments, but complete their I1s directly, syntactically and semantically. The turns of this kind deserve a close attention as their success is based by a correct contextual prediction done by the anticipating speaker.

- (3) R: *myslí si, že bude hrať aj keď si bude musieť*
S: *dávať pozor*

[R: he thinks that he will have to play even if he has to
S: be cautious]

- (4) R: *pochopil si, čo ti hovoril, že*
S: *či som bol tam áno I've never been there*

[R: have you understood what he told you that
S: if I've been there right I've never been there]

Anticipation relies on a fine processing of information available in the context, on confronting it with and fitting it into communicative experience of the speaker and on predicting the development of what will be communicated next and in what manner. A close link between anticipation and contextual prediction is the basis for relaying anticipation and intercomprehension. In fact, both of these discourse operations consist in making an active use of available linguistic and contextual information in order to foresee further evolvement of the communicative event with the aim to ensure its smooth flow. In this perspective, it might be presumed that a high number of anticipatory turns would mean that speakers also have a good intercomprehensive competence.

According to the principal hypothesis to be tested in this study, oral exolingual communication contains a high number of anticipation turns. In most cases of anticipation observed in exolingual communication, anticipation is based on intercomprehension between different languages.

4. Analysis and results

The analysis conducted revealed that anticipation, as defined above (subjective and active, in the sense of Kleiber 2003) has a relatively limited number of occurrences in the pilot exolingual corpus. Anticipatory turns of this kind represent 1.2 % of the total number of turns. Out of 30 anticipatory turns identified in the two interactions analyzed (the total of 2566 turns), 13 anticipatory turns are constructed according to the structural scheme A described above, i.e. they contain an explicit hint, an unfinished word then completed by the interlocutor. On the contrary, implicit anticipatory turns are present to a slightly larger extent, representing 17 cases out of 30.

As far as the authorship of anticipatory turns is concerned, most anticipatory turns are produced by pivots, i. e. speakers acting as mediators between monolingual natives (non-pivots). The terms monolingual and bilingual are used in a narrow sense here, in reference to the pair of core languages studied within exolingual data set (Slovak and French). Speakers from groups a) and b) defined in the point 1 of this paper are referred to as monolingual natives, as they are natives in one of the two languages in contact and have zero or minimal competence in the other language of the studied pair. Bilingual pivots have developed good communicating skills in both languages of the studied pair, while still being native speakers of Slovak (with the exception of the speaker C). Narrowing the sense of monolingual/bilingual categorization for the purposes of this study does not exclude the fact that speakers may well be skilled in other languages, e.g. English, Spanish, German, Russian etc. These may be used, in various moments of exolingual interactions, as bridging codes.

The presence of anticipation marks in the speech of pivots is observed in 22 anticipatory turns. (Out of the total amount of 1060 pivots' interventions, 2.1 % are affected by anticipation.) In a much lower number of cases (8 utterances), anticipatory turns are authored by non-pivots:

- (5) R: *niečo nie že európe sa aj tak darí že grécko a španielsko*
S: ***majú krízu***

[R: something no that europe is still doing well that greece and spain
S: are going through a crisis]

Finally, micro-contexts I1-I2 containing anticipatory turns have been viewed from the perspective of their interlingual or intralingual character. Out of 30 micro-contexts under focus, 27 was intralingual and 3 can be classified as interlingual, as they involve a code-switching element. One of the very few examples of anticipation with interlingual nature would be the following:

- (6) F: *il a il a joué il a joué un match cette année* [he has he has played one match this year]
S: *draxler*
F: *c'est pas un milieu de terrain c'est* [it's not a mid-field it's] (I1)
S: ***on na krídlo myslí*** [he means winger] (I2)
R: *hej* [yeah]
S: *it's winger*
F: *c'est un côté ou un relayeur* [it's a winger or a mid-field]

All the cases of intralingual anticipations are in Slovak. This is due to the fact that speakers complied with the task to stick to Slovak language as the main language of conversation. A prevailing number of intralingual anticipatory micro-contexts are constructed as A-model paired structures (exs. 7 and 8), a smaller number of intralingual pairs follows B-model scheme (exs. 9 and 10).

- (7) A: *a mám mám rada jaz- jaz-* (I1)
M: ***jazyky hovoríš akými jazykmi ešte hovoríš*** (I2)

[A: and I like lang- lang-
M: languages you speak what other languages do you speak]

- (8) A: *ah slovo po španielsky veľmi slovo sú z arabi-* (I1)
M: ***z arabského jazyka z arabštiny*** (I2)

[A: ah a word in Spanish are a lot words form arabi-
M: from Arabic language from Arabic]

- (9) K: *o tom sme sa rozprávali že mnoho vecí je* (I1)
M: ***je gestom*** (I2)
K: *v tej komunikácii môžu byť gestami*

[K: that's what we have spoken about that many things are
M: are gestures
K: in that communication are gestures]

- (10) M: *no toto neviem či toto je tvoja stáž alebo ty už si skončila štúdium*
A: *teraz nie je stáž je* (I1)
M: ***už je práca*** (I2)
A: *ano*

[M: well I don't know if this is your internship or you've already finished your studies
A: now it is not a stage it is
M: it is work
A: yes]

As it can be seen, anticipatory micro-contexts often have a metalinguistic dimension. Speakers comment on what is said or what is intended to be said, on the means of expression selected and on the difficulties in communication. This metalinguistic dimension is of a particular interest for further research.

5. Discussion

The hypothesis postulating the frequent use of anticipation in exolingual communication was not confirmed in our sample exolingual interactions. Contrary to expectations, the pilot exolingual data set contained a very low number of anticipatory turns. This may be due to some of the specific and distinguishing features of exolingual communication. The three-participant setting can be one of these. In this particular setting, marked by asymmetry in competencies, turn-taking management is more complicated than in 'classical' endolingual (monolingual) interactions between two participants. In our case, Slovak and French natives with a low competence in the language of the interlocutor are fully occupied trying to decipher turns produced in a language they are not familiar with. When these speakers try to co-construct the interaction the turns they produce tend to be shorter and simpler both lexically and syntactically:

- (11) C: *francouzština to je kif kif no* [french that's kif kif]
A: *francúzština je kif kif (laugh)* [french is kif kif]
C: *kif kif*
K: *čo je kif kif* [what is kif kif]
A: *kif kif riž comment on dit pareil déjà* [kif kif lipstick how do you say similar]
M: *rovnaké rovnaké* [similar similar]

Short and simple utterances succeed each other at a relatively quick pace. It is the case for both analyzed interactions. This conversational style does not leave space for anticipation, as turns end too soon to let the interlocutor predict their end. The lack of time can be considered as a typical feature of spontaneous (unprepared) conversation and its impact on the character of the interaction has been acknowledged.

In order to understand the functioning of exolingual communication, the communicative behaviour of pivots should be studied very closely. In fact, it is them who are really capable of ensuring the efficiency of the communication event. Taking a closer look at their speech production, various individual communication styles can be identified, depending on personal characteristics of each speaker and on their linguistic repertoire. According to differences in individual characteristics of pivot speakers, we can notice differences in the overall character of interactions or their parts.

Getting back to the initial hypothesis about the significant relationship between anticipation and intercomprehension in exolingual settings, this assumption is not confirmed in its second part either. The link between anticipation and intercomprehension did not show apart from very rare cases in which intercomprehensive work can be presumed to be effectuated by the pivot (ex. 12). However, interlingual anticipatory micro-contexts are almost inexistent in the sample.

- (12) M: *ale nevedela si nič o slovensku*
A: *nepoz-* (I1)
M: ***nepoznala si*** (I2)

[M: but you didn't know anything about slovakia
A: I didn't know
M: you didn' know]

The example 12 shows hesitation of the speaker A concerning the lexical choice between two Slovak verbs: *vedieť* and *poznať*, corresponding in French to *savoir* and *connaître*. Despite of the opening turn produced by the speaker M containing the verb *vedieť* (in the past negative 3rd person form *nevedela si*), the speaker A chooses *poznať* (neg. *nepoznať*). The speaker M understands the reason of this lexical choice by intercomprehension (M being able to guess that A chooses *poznať* as Slovak equivalent of the verb *connaître* that would be used in the same context in French) and accepts it by catching up on it in I2 turn.

- (13) C: *a až jsem po- jsem se naučil angličtina v čechách aj čeština a potom jsem šel do na prázdniny a jsem jsem byl zvyklý že jako nerozumím všetko ale jako rozumím kontextu kvuli tomu mechanicky jazyky a všetni všetko jsem šel tam a ty vole no tak asi rozumím no tak jako jestli mně*
M: ***iné jazyky nepomáhajú pri tom***

[C: and when I un- I learned english and then czech in czechia and then I went on holiday and I was used to not understanding all but understanding the context thanks to the mechanics of languages and everything and I went there and omg I really do understand now I would bet that
M: other languages help it]

In the example 13, we can observe a perfect syntactic coherence between the adjacent turns produced by two speakers (M and C are both pivots). C speaks Czech, but M understands without a problem and pursues in Slovak. It must be noted that Slovak language and Czech language speakers still coexist in a state of a relatively perfect passive bilingualism.

6. Conclusion

The paper is a contribution to the analysis of exolingual communication, focusing on some of its specific features. Exolinguality represents a subject matter of a high interest for linguistics, yet not well explored. It is certain that the presence of pivots (mediators) can contribute crucially to the success of exolingual communication events. The question is: what are the strategies that really work in exolingual communications? Should pivot speakers translate? Should the participants, collectively, identify a common bridging language and then stick to it as much as possible? Should they mostly rely on intercomprehension? Or what is the right mixture of these strategies?

The study conducted upon a sample taken from the pilot exolingual corpus focused on the potential relationship between anticipation and intercomprehension. It was based on the assumption that three-participant and four-participant pivoted exolingual communication is richer in anticipation than endolingual communication events. This assumption was motivated by the fact that turn-taking management between 3 or 4 speakers is more complicated than in interactions between 2 speakers only and, consequently, on the fact that it might leave an extra space for unfinished utterances, difficulties of expression and, in general, all sorts of gaps in communication. These obstacles to comprehension may stimulate contextual prediction and enhance activities oriented towards anticipation. Exolinguality also means the absence of a common communication code and the access to a plurality of communication codes that are but partially mastered. Code-mixing and code-switching elements, as well as juxtaposition of segments in various languages, are the features that create the necessity for the speakers to activate their communicative competence to the fullest, to make use of the totality of their linguistic repertoires and to rely on, more than in other communicative situations, on intercomprehension.

Despite these assumptions, the sample interactions did not show many examples of anticipation. Anticipatory turns represent but 1,2 % of the total number of conversational turns. These turns are modelled in two different ways, according to the presence or the absence of repetition. Anticipation featuring repetition is slightly less numerous than anticipation without repetition. More anticipatory turns are produced by pivots than by non-pivots. A large majority of anticipation turns is intralingual. Interlingual anticipation, possibly related to intercomprehension, is observed in rare cases only. The link between anticipation and intercomprehension is not confirmed.

Exolingual communications are open to transdisciplinary investigations. More complex longitudinal and transversal studies are needed, based on multilingual (specifically, exolingual) corpora characterized by the presence of phenomena arising from the contact of languages.

References

- Bírová, Jana. 2018. *La vérification empirique de mise en place des concepts de l'interculturel dans le contexte FLE*. Berlin & Bern & Bruxelles & New York & Oxford & Warszawa & Wien: Peter Lang.
- Chernov, Ghelly V. 2004. *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dausendschön-Gay, Ulrich. 2003. Communication exolingue et Interlangue. *Linx* 49. 41–50.

- De Pietro, Jean-François. 1988. Vers une typologie des situations de contacts linguistiques. *Langage et société* 43. 65–89.
- Fuchs, Catherine. 2004. La co-énonciation, carrefour des anticipations linguistiques. In Sock, Rudolph & Vaxelaire, Béatrice (eds.), *L'anticipation à l'horizon du présent*, 181–192. Brussels: Mardaga.
- Gile, Daniel. 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kamide, Yuki. 2008. Anticipatory Processes in Sentence Processing. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(4). 647–670.
- Pickering, Martin J. & Garrod, Simon. 2004. Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 27(2). 169–190.
- Paľová, Mária & Kikťová, Eva. 2019. Prosodic anticipatory clues and reference activation in simultaneous interpretation. *XLinguae* 12(1). 13–22.
- Paľová, Mária & Zelenáková, Mariana. 2019. On prosodic anticipatory hint. *XLinguae* 12(1). 165–180.
- Porquier, Rémy. 1984. Communication exolingue et apprentissage des langues. In Py, Bernard (ed.), *Acquisition d'une langue étrangère III*, 17–47. Neuchâtel: Centre de linguistique appliquée & Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Porquier, Rémy. 2003. Deux repères de recherche sur l'interaction exolingue. *Linx* 49. 51–62.
- Ráčková, Lucia & Schmitt, François. 2019. *Les interférences linguistiques du français sur le slovaque: L'exemple du système verbal*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Riest, Carina & Jorschick, Annett B. & de Ruiter, Jan P. 2015. Anticipation in turn-taking: mechanisms and information sources. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6. 89.
- Rosén, E. & Reinhardt, C. 2003. Les risques (limites) du métier... La dimension de l'expertise dans le continuum exolingue/endolingue. *Linx* 49. 91–108.
- Veverková, Darina & Gallayová, Zuzana. 2015. Anglický jazyk ako nástroj výučby globálneho vzdelávania na Technickej univerzite vo Zvolene. In Veverková, Darina & Danihelová, Zuzana & Lupták, Marek (eds.), *Aplikované jazyky v univerzitnom kontexte – elektronická podpora vzdelávania*, 34–46. Zvolen: Technická univerzita vo Zvolene.

Katarína Chovancová,
 Matej Bel University
 Faculty of Arts
 Tajovského 40, 974 01 Banská Bystrica,
 Slovakia
 katarina.chovancova@umb.sk

Monika Zázrivcová,
 Matej Bel University

*Faculty of Arts
Tajovského 40, 974 01 Banská Bystrica
Slovakia
monika.zazrivcova@umb.sk*

*Katarína Gajdošová
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Ludovít Štúr Linguistic Institute
Panská 26, 811 01 Bratislava
Slovakia
katarinag@korpus.juls.savba.sk*

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2020, vol. 17, no. 4 [cit. 2020-10-27]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL45/pdf_doc/05.pdf. ISSN 1336-782X