HAL
archives-ouvertes.fr

International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence towards and through English in tourist information interactions

Adam Wilson

▶ To cite this version:

Adam Wilson. International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence towards and through English in tourist information interactions. Anglophonia - French Journal of English Linguistics, Presses universitaires du Midi, 2018, 10.4000/anglophonia.1377 . hal-02177788

HAL Id: hal-02177788
https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02177788

Submitted on 9 Jul 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Anglophonia
French Journal of English Linguistics

25 | 2018
De l'accommodation à la non-accommodation : procédés et stratégies (2)

International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence *towards* and *through* English in tourist information interactions

Adam Wilson

Electronic version
URL: http://journals.openedition.org/anglophonia/1377
DOI: 10.4000/anglophonia.1377
ISSN: 2427-0466

Publisher
Presses universitaires du Midi

Brought to you by Université de Lorraine

Electronic reference
Adam Wilson, « International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence *towards* and *through* English in tourist information interactions », *Anglophonia* [Online], 25 | 2018, Online since 01 June 2018, connection on 18 March 2019. URL : http://journals.openedition.org/anglophonia/1377 ; DOI : 10.4000/anglophonia.1377

This text was automatically generated on 18 March 2019.

Anglophonia – French Journal of English Linguistics est mis à disposition selon les termes de la licence Creative Commons Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Pas de Modification 4.0 International.

International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence *towards* and *through* English in tourist information interactions

Adam Wilson

Introduction

1 Already one of the world's biggest industries, international tourism continues to grow exponentially. The United Nations World Tourism Organization estimates that there were 1.235 million international tourist arrivals in 2016, following seven consecutive years of sustained growth that shows no signs of abating (UNWTO 2017). Given that human mobility is at the very core of any definition of tourism, tourism has been referred to as one of "the greatest population movements of all time" (Bruner 2005: 10). Over the past few decades, this mobility has both intensified and diversified: more and more individuals, from more and more diverse backgrounds, are travelling to more and more destinations, which are becoming more and more diverse (UNWTO 2017). This has lead to certain scholars labelling tourism as a "hallmark of globalisation" (Jaworski & Thurlow 2010: 256) in that it both reflects and contributes to global social and economic flows.

2 Taking all of this into account, it is clear that tourism constitutes a situation of intense language contact as it brings together individuals from a diverse range of social and linguistic backgrounds. As with other globalised industries, recent developments linked to the intensification and diversification of mobility mentioned above can lead to "unexpected sociolinguistic effects" (Blommaert 2010: 5) both in terms of the dynamics underpinning language use and the linguistic phenomena themselves. Building upon decades of linguistic research into situations of language contact and intercultural

communication, a growing body of recent sociolinguistic work has focused on language use in tourism. For instance, a number of studies have shown how language plays a key role in the elaboration of the tourist experience: linguistic resources are "decontextualized" and "recontextualised" in tourism discourse in order to create the "authenticity" or "exoticness" sought by tourists (Dann 1996; Thurlow & Jaworski 2010). Other researchers have linked these findings to the "commodification" of language in tourism, that is the transformation of language into a sellable "product" (Heller, Pujolar & Duchêne 2014). The authors behind these new observations, concepts and theoretical paradigms highlight how tourism – as a situation in which social actors come together to elaborate and perform a social experience – constitutes a particularly fertile terrain for studying and understanding the interplay between language and social life.

3 Such terrains are not only an opportunity to elaborate new theoretical apparatus, they are also an occasion to revisit some of the more well-established concepts and tools in the field of linguistics. For example, studies focusing on tourism have helped to push forward work on linguistic landscapes (see Thurlow & Jaworski 2010) as well as research in a variety of sub-disciplines of discourse analysis (see Gotti, Maci & Sala 2017 or Held 2018, for example) by putting these disciplines' tools and concepts to the test in a context of intense human mobility.

4 However, up to present, (socio)linguistic work in contexts of tourism has tended to focus on written discourse. Thus, with the notable exception of guided tours (see De Stefani & Mondada 2013 or Schedel 2018, for example), spoken interaction between tourists, or between tourists and hosts, has received relatively little scholarly attention. Therefore, little research has been undertaken in order to challenge and refine theoretical concepts or tools centring in on spoken communication through their application to situations of face-to-face interaction in tourism. Linguistic accommodation (or communication accommodation) is perhaps one of the most well-established theoretical paradigms of this kind. Introduced by Howard Giles and colleagues in the 1970s and continually refined by a large number of scholars over the past four decades, communication accommodation theory has become a key theoretical paradigm in sociolinguistics and related fields. It has proved itself to be a powerful framework in helping researchers understand how speakers make themselves understood in a multitude of different situations. Yet, very little attention has been given to studying tourism through the lens of linguistic accommodation. It would seem however that much could be gained – both for the understanding of language use in tourism contexts and for the development of accommodation theory itself – from applying accommodation theory to contexts of international tourism as they present particular features that could be considered to create challenges in ensuring successful communication between speakers.

5 The aim of this paper is thus to explore accommodation processes in face-to-face exchanges between speakers in a situation of international tourism. The study presented here aims to explore the manifestations of accommodation in such a context, the dynamics that underpin these processes and their repercussions. Firstly, the communication challenges present in contexts of tourism will be explored and it will be shown why the theory of accommodation could be particularly pertinent in studying them. Following this, the methodological approach of the study, its fieldwork and data will be presented. English will be shown to be a particularly important linguistic resource in the context studied and two main manifestations of accommodation regarding English will be studied in detail. Firstly, the processes involved in speakers converging towards

English as a main language of interaction will be examined. Secondly, it will be shown how speakers accommodate through the use of English while interacting in another language. Finally, a discussion of the dynamics underpinning these accommodation processes and their repercussions will be provided before a brief conclusion offering potential avenues for further research.

1. Communicative challenges in contexts of tourism

6 Contexts of international tourism present three main factors that make face-to-face interaction particularly challenging for speakers: a large diversity of speakers, "fleeting" interactions (Jaworski & Thurlow 2010: 255) and specific interactional objectives. Each factor is presented in the following section.

7 In the past, many tourist destinations welcomed tourists from a relatively small range of countries of origin leading to locals requiring relatively predictable language skills in order to welcome tourists. However, over the past two decades, the typical profiles of tourists have diversified, increasingly characterised by heterogeneity in terms of cultural backgrounds and linguistic repertoires. This diversity creates challenges for communication, as speakers cannot necessarily rely on a shared body of linguistic resources and potential obstacles to understanding are multiplied by increased linguistic diversity.

8 The fact that encounters between individuals in tourist contexts tend to be "fleeting relationships" (Jaworski & Thurlow 2010: 255) further adds to the communicative challenges in this situation. In most cases of face-to-face contact in contexts of international tourism, speakers are meeting for the first, and usually only, time. Thus, speakers have no interactional history (Vion 1992) and no way of knowing each other's linguistic preferences. Speakers must therefore make efforts in order to discover, and adapt to, these preferences during interaction, adding to the work that must be undertaken in order for communication to succeed. Furthermore, interactions in contexts of tourism tend to be very short, mainly due to the fact that tourist destinations are generally very busy, leading to time constraints on exchanges between individuals. Not only do speakers have to actively learn about and adapt to their interlocutor's linguistic preferences, they must do so in a very short space of time.

9 Finally, even with the difficulties identified above, speakers must achieve a certain number of interactional goals in their exchanges. While this is true of all human interaction, individuals involved in exchanges in a context of tourism have various objectives which must be achieved if communication is to succeed. Firstly, professionals working in the tourist sector have a professional obligation to inform the tourists they are speaking with. Despite the potentially challenging linguistic environment, in order for them to do their job, they must ensure that their messages are transmitted. Professionals also have institutional objectives such as advising a certain number of tourists or reducing waiting times for those who wish to be advised. All of these objectives increase the constraints imposed by the "fleeting" nature of exchanges described above. From the tourist's point of view, though less of an "obligation", tourists try to minimise the length of tourist information interactions so they can get on with the "real business" of tourism. Tourists are also under pressure to correctly understand and interpret tourist professionals' advice in order to optimise their own tourist experience.

All of these objectives create pressure upon speakers, adding to the other challenges linked to ensuring successful communication in this context.

10 In sum, the three factors identified above – the heterogeneity of speakers, the fleeting nature of interactions and the existence of various interactional objectives – add extra pressures, constraints and complexity to communication in contexts of tourism. Speakers must thus demonstrate considerable ability to adapt their linguistic practices rapidly and, potentially, in a significant manner. As mentioned above, relatively few studies have explored speakers' interactional practices of adaptation in contexts of tourism. This paper aims to do just that. Given that communication accommodation theory has made significant contributions to understanding how speakers adapt to each other in interaction, it would seem that the analysis of interactions in contexts of tourism from this perspective could provide valuable insight into the linguistic and social phenomena and dynamics of this situation, as detailed in the following section.

2. Communication Accommodation Theory and tourism

11 In short, Communication Accommodation Theory (or CAT) "seeks to explain speakers' linguistic and behavioral choices in interaction as they relate to communicative adjustment" (Giles & Gasiorek 2013: 155). In order to do this, it conceives of language as "a multiply organized and contextually complex set of alternatives, ubiquitously available to communicators in face-to-face talk" (Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991: 2). Simply put, language is seen as a set of options available to speakers and speakers select from these options based on how they wish to linguistically adjust (or not) to their interlocutor. Within the CAT paradigm, this adjustment is typically seen as a process by which speakers make efforts either to reduce communicative and social differences in speech – convergence – or to further enhance these differences – divergence. The CAT framework provides tools for explaining linguistic phenomena that can be attributed to this accommodation process as well as their psychological and social motivations and consequences.

12 CAT has been used to study a large number of situations, from interactions between the elderly and younger members of society (Coupland *et al.* 1988) to communication in healthcare institutions (Jones *et al.* 2018). Despite this, tourism has remained relatively under-represented and Giles, Ota and Foley (2013)'s study on intergroup communication in tourism constitutes one of the only major exceptions. While the authors highlight potential communication problems in interaction between tourists and "hosts" as a defining feature of the tourist context, the main focus of the paper is on the role of accommodation in the formation of group identities and, especially, in the development of intergroup relationships in contexts of tourism in Russia.

13 CAT has clearly contributed significantly to understanding how speakers co-construct meaning in social interaction. It would seem then that CAT could shed light on how speakers in situations of international tourism overcome the contextual difficulties identified in the previous section to co-construct meaning. Furthermore, the intense nature of language contact observed in contexts of international tourism could provide a context that allows the boundaries of CAT to be pushed further.

14 With this in mind, this paper aims to study accommodation processes in interactions between international tourists and tourism professionals, paying special attention to linguistic phenomena linked to these processes as well as their underlying motivations and repercussions in the framework of CAT. Such a study requires the identification of a context in which these two groups come into contact in face-to-face exchanges as well as a methodological approach allowing these exchanges to be explored.

3. Research questions, methodology and data

15 Two criteria were foregrounded in identifying and selecting a pertinent context in which to undertake this study: a geographical location with a vibrant and developing international tourism sector and a situation in which face-to-face interaction takes place between international tourists and tourism professionals. With regards to the first element, Marseille is a particularly interesting case for studying tourism as it is currently reinventing itself as an urban tourist destination and international arrivals have been increasing and diversifying steadily over the past fifteen years (City of Marseille 2016). In this respect, Marseille offers a microcosm of tourism dynamics that can be observed more widely. In terms of the second factor, Marseille's Tourist Office and Convention Bureau (TO) was chosen as it is one of the key sites in which face-to-face encounters between international tourists and tourism professionals take place in the city. In 2016, 353,144 tourists visited the TO, 56% of whom came from outside France (City of Marseille 2016).

16 The TO thus became the chosen context for a long-term ethnographic fieldwork project which was part of a larger PhD project aimed at exploring the sociolinguistic dynamics of international tourism (Wilson 2016). Between 2014 and 2016, this researcher undertook observations, conducted interviews and collected internal and external documents at the TO. One of the main ways in which observation took place was the audio recording of a large number of interactions between tourists and the tourist advisers working on the TO's main information desk. In order to achieve this, discreet recording devices were positioned on the counter and set to record exchanges between tourists and advisers[1]. This produced a corpus of 93 audio recordings of interactions between international tourists and French tourist advisers, which were then transcribed and annotated according to conventions set out by Wilson (2016). These recordings, their transcriptions and their annotations come together to form the MITo corpus (Wilson 2016) which is at the centre of the above-mentioned PhD project and the focus of the present article.

17 This article aims then to use data from the MITo corpus in order to explore the manifestations of accommodation in face-to-face interactions between international tourists and tourism professionals in the TO. In order to achieve this principal objective, the following research questions are explored:

- What are the manifestations of accommodation in face-to-face interactions between international tourists and tourism professionals at the Tourist Office of Marseille?
- What are the wider dynamics underlying and motivating such processes of accommodation?
- What are the repercussions of accommodation both in terms of interpersonal relationships and wider social dynamics?

18 These questions are answered using an analytical framework aimed at describing and interpreting contextualised language by bringing together tools and concepts issued from linguistic ethnography, interactional sociolinguistics and other fields of interaction

analysis (such as Conversation Analysis). This framework – in the same way as its constitutive fields – conceives of language practices as the deployment of linguistic (or other communicative) resources in the co-construction of meaning. Transcribing recorded data following the conventions mentioned above allows detailed analysis of such language practices to be undertaken, exposing how speakers use linguistic and communicative resources to co-construct meaning in their exchanges. In other words, this fine-grained qualitative analysis can reveal the ways in which speakers make certain linguistic "choices" in accommodating to their interlocutor – a crucial part of the meaning-making process. The ethnographic approach provides an analytical framework which sees language as an intrinsic, constitutive element of its context. Thus, interactional analyses are informed by observational or interview data obtained during fieldwork. This gives the researcher access to certain details – such as the rationales and motivations underpinning language practices or the social consequences of linguistic choices – which would otherwise be difficult to obtain, adding granularity to the overall analysis.

19 The next section presents the results of this framework being used to analyse the data from the MITo corpus.

4. Linguistic accommodation at the Tourist Office

20 Qualitative analyses of the data from the MITo corpus presented above led to a large number of different manifestations of accommodation being identified. Therefore, the decision was made to focus here on two accommodative processes that seem to play a critical role in establishing and/or protecting successful communication. Numerous studies have shown how English often becomes a lingua franca in highly multilingual situations (see Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey 2011, for example), allowing communication between members of different linguistic communities. In this respect, the TO is no exception and the use of English as a vehicular language is at the heart of the two accommodative processes analysed in the following sections. Firstly, it will be shown how the selection of English as the main language of interaction in exchanges between tourists and tourist advisers constitutes a manifestation of accommodation. Secondly, the use of English as an accommodative "go-between" to rescue situations of potential communication breakdown will be explored.

4.1 Accommodation towards English

21 Linguistic accommodation can be explained as the choices made by speakers among the linguistic alternatives they have at their disposal in an attempt to take into account their interlocutor. As mentioned previously, such choices are rendered complex in situations such as the TO because speakers come from diverse linguistic backgrounds, share no interactional history and have no way of identifying each other's linguistic preferences. It could be argued that the TO is a French institution on metropolitan French soil, leading to French being identified as a default language choice. However, the TO exists for the sole purpose of welcoming and advising tourists, many of whom are not necessarily French-speaking. When coupled to the fact that other languages are clearly visible in the linguistic landscape of the TO, this somewhat blurs the status of French as a clear default language. Therefore, the first thing speakers must do in interaction at the TO is select a

main language of interaction, that is select a certain set of linguistic resources from a range of options. This is clearly then a manifestation of accommodation. As Giles, Coupland and Coupland (1991: 2) put it: "accommodation strategies can characterize wholesale realignments of patterns of code or language selection".

22 Speakers at the TO must embark on such "wholesale realignments" when entering into interaction. Given the heterogeneity of speakers mentioned previously, such processes of language selection between international tourists and tourist advisers at the TO could be considered extremely complex. However, data from the corpus show actual language practices to be extremely schematic. The following table shows the languages employed in the 93 interactions that make up the MITo corpus. For each language observed, the table specifies whether this was as a "primary resource", in which the language in question was the principal language of interaction or as a "secondary resource", that is, a language which was not the main language of the encounter but which was used sporadically, usually as a strategy to resolve problems in understanding.

Table 1. *Linguistic resources used in the Marseille Tourist Office and Convention Bureau*

Language	**Primary Resource (n° interactions)**	**Secondary Resource (n° interactions)**	**TOTAL (n° interactions)**
French	57	24	81
English	26	13	39
German	4	7	11
Italian	3	5	8
Spanish	3	2	5

(Source: MITo Corpus, Wilson 2016)

23 Two major patterns can be identified in these data, both of which constitute manifestations of accommodation in interactions between tourists and advisers at the TO. Firstly, speakers generally converge towards one language of interaction (and only one language of interaction). There is very little evidence of phenomena such as extensive and recurrent code-switching or linguistic resource bricolage (Mondada & Nussbaum 2012). Indeed, only one interaction of the 93 exchanges that make up the MITo corpus contains an exchange in which there is repeated code-switching (and even this interaction eventually "stabilises" when German is selected)[2]. Secondly, speakers converge towards a very select number of languages. Despite the MITo corpus being made up of 138 participants coming from at least 18 different countries (and no doubt a larger number of linguistic groups), only five different languages were observed in use in encounters between tourists and advisers.

24 While the above table identifies five languages, there is a clear discrepancy between the quantitative importance of the first two – French and English – and that of the remaining three. The convergence towards French suggests that it is indeed the default language in this situation, despite the sociolinguistic ambiguity of the TO discussed above. This

convergence towards French is more amply discussed by Wilson (2018) who reveals how the use of the local language holds symbolic value for a number of tourists. However, up to present, the role of English in these accommodative processes has not been explored. The following sections take a detailed look at how convergence towards English is negotiated in interaction, providing insight into how speakers undertake communication accommodation in this context. Convergence towards English comes in two forms in interactions at the TO: speakers explicitly negotiating the use of English and speakers implicitly selecting English in interaction. Each pattern of linguistic behaviour is explored in the following sections.

4.1.1 Explicitly asking for English

25 One way in which speakers converge towards English in interactions at the TO is through what will be termed here "explicit demands". These explicit demands are sequences in which speakers openly discuss the choice of language for the exchange. This phenomenon is relatively rare, appearing in only 13% of the interactions in the MITo corpus and initiated solely by tourists. In the corpus, explicit demands are undertaken extremely rapidly and take the form of a side sequence at the beginning of an interaction, usually immediately following the exchange of greetings and sitting before the first request made by tourists. The following extract provides a canonical example. Two English-speaking Irish tourists (T1 and T2, the latter not being featured in this extract) approach a francophone tourist adviser (CF6). The following extract presents the opening exchanges.

(1)[3]	
T1:	bonjour?
CF6:	bonjour messieurs dames
T1:	er parlez vous anglais?
CF6:	yes i do
T1:	er we'd like to do the bus tour (.) the open top bus tour?
CF6:	yeah (.) i will show you
T1:	ok

26 As can be seen, the opening greetings are undertaken in French before T1 formulates an explicit demand (in French) concerning the language of interaction. Her suggestion of English as a language of interaction is immediately ratified by CF6 who accepts not only by offering a preferred response but also by performing a code-switch into English. T1's explicit demand could be construed as an act of divergence – and therefore a threat to successful communication – as she is proposing a divergence away from the language of interaction that had been used until that moment. However, CF6 immediately converges to T1's apparent preferred language choice, both in terms of the content and the form of her utterance. This act of convergence leads to successful linguistic accommodation and the interaction continues in English.

27 Though initially appearing divergent, explicitly demanding a certain linguistic resource could be considered as convergent behaviour as it provides vital clues in the quest to decipher each other's linguistic preferences, something which has been shown to be highly complex in a situation such as the TO. In any case, selecting a common language suggested by an interlocutor is a clear example of convergence towards that individuals perceived (and real) linguistic preferences. In the example above – and in five other cases in the corpus – linguistic accommodation is achieved by converging towards English following an explicit demand from a tourist.

28 Having said all of the above, it is worth insisting upon the fact that explicit demands are rare. This rarity would seem to be linked to the status of the resources being requested. None of the explicit demands that request English ever result in any form of resistance. This is not the case for other examples of explicit demands concerning Italian, Spanish or German, all of which are refused once in the interactions of the MITo corpus (as can be seen in example (3) concerning German). It would seem then that English constitutes a somewhat unmarked language choice in the context of the TO meaning that speakers feel that they do not necessarily have to undertake explicit demands in order to suggest, and converge towards, this language. Instead, they opt for another process: tacit negotiation. Analysis of these negotiations of English as the principal language of interaction shows this even more clearly.

4.1.2 Tacitly negotiating English

29 Sequences in which speakers propose and ratify (or refuse) possible languages of interaction simply by using them during their turns, without ever explicitly mentioning the negotiation process that is underway, are much more common than explicit demands in the TO. These sequential sequences of language selection will be termed here "tacit negotiations". Given that speakers share no interactional history (Vion 1992), every interaction between tourists and advisers at the TO must necessarily include a language negotiation sequence (Auer 1998) of some form. Tacit negotiations are by far the most common form of such language negotiation sequences, taking place in 80 interactions or 86% of the corpus. Most of these tacit negotiations (60% in the MITo corpus) lead to French being selected. However, English is also selected in 20 interactions (22% of the corpus). Though language choice is not explicitly mentioned in these exchanges, information regarding the process of negotiation can be obtained through close analysis of their sequential organisation.

30 The following extract presents a typical example of a tacit negotiation. It features a Japanese tourist (T3) interacting with a French-speaking adviser (CF1). CF1 opens the interaction with a greeting in French, leading to a tacit negotiation initiated by T3.

(2)		
CF1:	bonjour?	
	(1.2)	
T3:	good morning=	
CF1:	=hello	

T1:	er i want to use a marseille city pass?	
CF1:	yes?	
T3:	er (.) can i buy here?	
CF1:	yes	

31 T3 returns CF1's greeting with a preferred response (another greeting) but diverges away from the language of interaction established by CF1 by replying in English. In much the same way as the explicit demand explored above, this signals a refusal of French as a main language of interaction and offers English as a potential alternative resource. This choice is ratified immediately by CF1 – perhaps understandably, given her professional obligation to advise the tourist with whom she is interacting – and she replies with another greeting in English, thereby converging towards T3's expressed language choice. The interaction then continues in English. While this exchange may seem trivial, the interactional work undertaken by the speakers is remarkable. In three turns, CF1 and T3 manage not only to enter into interaction through an exchange of greetings but also to negotiate the main language of interaction, a process which involves two proposals, one refusal and one ratification. What is more, this complex task is managed without ever being made explicit by the speakers.

32 Tacit negotiation of the main language of interaction between tourists and advisers is clearly a manifestation of accommodation in that it constitutes a convergence towards a shared linguistic resource. Sociolinguistically speaking, this phenomenon is interesting as it shows speakers converging to a common language which is unlikely to be the ultimate preferred language (as a speaker's L1 might be, for example) for either party. This is a clear case of speakers adapting to – or accommodating – each other in this complex environment. Despite this remarkable process, speakers never explicitly mention the selection of English in these tacit negotiations. In much the same way as in cases of explicit demands, English is proposed and ratified without ever being refused or questioned. In other words, convergence towards English takes place without ever being commented upon.

4.1.3 English as an object of convergence

33 In conclusion, the analyses presented above suggest that converging towards English constitutes one of the key manifestations of accommodation in interactions between international tourists and tourist advisers at the TO. This convergence is done in two ways: through explicit demands and, much more frequently, through implicit negotiations.

34 According to the figures given above, converging towards French would also constitute an important manifestation of accommodation at the TO. However, English is especially interesting as it is not only much more solicited than other non-local languages, it is also the only language to play the role of a "true" lingua franca, that is as a vehicular language in exchanges in which there are no native speakers present. Furthermore, English is never refused or even commented upon during selection of the main language of interaction, unlike, say, German in example (3) below. The language practices observed at

the TO would seem to suggest that speakers consider English to be a legitimate, unmarked language choice when wishing to accommodate. This normalisation of English's status as a lingua franca allowing for convergence is further demonstrated by less canonical examples in which speakers converge by repairing communication problems by using English, as discussed in the following section.

4.2 Accommodation through English

35 English is not only used as a main language of interaction at the TO, it is also used strategically by speakers in order to avoid, or solve, communication problems in interactions that take place in other languages. In this respect, English may still be considered as a key resource exploited by speakers in efforts to accommodate to each other. Used strategically, English can allow speakers to establish, protect or restore the common ground (Stalnaker 2002) necessary for successful co-construction of meaning. This is done in two main ways in the corpus: either through converging towards English in order to initiate a side sequence with a view to resolving the problem, or through reformulating a problematic item in English. Each of these strategies will be explored below with care taken to focus on how each one constitutes an accommodative process.

4.2.1 Side sequences

36 The following example shows how a speaker may initiate a side sequence in English in order to establish common ground and thus accommodate to their interlocutor. It features a French-speaking adviser (CF8) and a German-speaking tourist (T4) and the following extract covers the entirety of the interaction. Despite the fact that the question of linguistic resources is raised by CF8, the following extract is not an example of an explicit demand as no specific reference is made by either party to the choice of language for the exchange.

(3)	
CF8	bonjour?
T4	haben sie ein stadtplan?
CF8	er i don't speak dutch huh?
T4	er a map
CF8	a map {rires}
	{CF8 hands a map to T4}
T4	merci
CF8	you're welcome

37 Initially, T4 engages in divergent behaviour in that she doesn't return CF8's greeting and she formulates a request in a different language from that which is proposed by CF8.

Unlike the tacit negotiations presented previously, CF8's second turn does not seamlessly follow T4's first turn in that it provides neither a preferred or dispreferred response to T4's enquiry. Rather, CF8 initiates a side sequence in which she explicitly states the unsuitability of T4's choice of linguistic resource[4]. This constitutes divergent behaviour as it categorically rules out what is clearly T4's preferred language choice. However, the fact that CF8 states this unsuitability in English is interesting. Whilst using English in this turn may be considered as divergence, given that German is used by T4 in the previous turn, it may also be considered as an attempt at convergence. It would seem that CF8 has interpreted T4's use of German not only as a proposition of German but also as a refusal of French. Rejecting the use of German through English allows CF8 to propose English as a potential resource for interaction, thus proposing a solution for the current linguistic conundrum. This is ratified by T4 who formulates her request in English before switching to French in order to thank CF8. Thus, the side sequence initiated by CF8 leads to the successful selection of English in order to circumvent potential communication breakdown caused by an apparent lack of common code.

38 In the extract above, CF8 selects English in order to initiate a side sequence in an apparent, and successful, attempt to accommodate to her interlocutor. It comes to light through T4's ratification that this language choice constitutes an example of convergence towards a common code. It is worth noting that CF8's selection of English is very rapid and goes uncommented by both speakers. As with the examples given in the previous section, this would seem to suggest that English is seen as the "go to" option in situations where communication is in danger, even if the main language of interaction is not English. Thus, the use of English in side sequences in order to ensure mutual understanding is a clear example of accommodation in interaction at the TO. The use of English would appear to be unmarked as it is never refused or questioned in the corpus. Similar trends can be observed when exploring the use of reformulations in English.

4.2.2 Reformulation

39 The use of reformulation as a communication strategy has been widely studied in a number of disciplines (see Alber & Py 1986, Norén 1999, Pennec 2017). Reformulation may take many forms, among which Alber and Py (1986) identify that of temporarily using a language which is not the main language of interaction in order to repair or avoid obstacles to mutual understanding. The following example shows how English plays a key strategic role in this way in interaction between international tourists and tourist advisers at the TO. This extract shows part of an exchange taking place in French between three Dutch-speaking tourists (T5, T6 and T7) and a French-speaking adviser (CF1). CF1 is explaining the bike rental system that exists in Marseille when she comes upon a word – *caution* ("deposit") – that seems to cause problems in terms of mutual understanding.

(4)		
T5	AH mais c'est aussi pour des TOURistes?	
CF1	oui oui oui [il faut] une carte bleue	
T5	[a:::h]	

CF1	visa ou mastercard	
T6	[a::h oui]	
T5	[ah (.) ok]	
CF1	faut avoir (.) au moins cent cinquante euros dessus parce que c'est err >une caution<	
T5	ah oui oui ah oui erm	
	{T5, T6 and T7 look at each other}	
CF1	i- (.) **deposit**	
T5	ah ok ok yah	
CF1	ils y touchent pas (.) ils touchent pas au::x cent cinquante euros mais c'est au cas où	

40 It is worth noting that, up until CF1's code-switch towards English (highlighted in bold in the example above), all of the interaction has taken place in French. CF1 seems to sense that the word "*caution*" creates problems as she reformulates it in her next turn. Fieldwork observation suggests that this problem is signalled by one of the tourists through gestural feedback suggesting uncertainty. However, it may also be due to CF1's potential previous experience with this "false friend". In any case, CF1 adopts the pragmatic strategy of reformulation through code-switching in order to counter this apparent obstacle to communication. The reformulation is undertaken in English and prompts immediate positive feedback from the tourists. The interaction then continues in French, the problematic element having been circumvented and the common ground re-established.

41 The above example highlights the complexity and the intricacy of the accommodation process. Ultimately, the reformulation of "*caution*" into English constitutes an act of convergence as it protects the interactional common ground, allowing the speakers to successfully co-construct meaning together. However, this convergence is achieved through a fleeting divergence away from the main language of interaction (French) and into another code, which is (correctly) perceived as being shared. Once again, the use of English in this manner is unmarked, in that it is not explicitly commented upon by the speakers.

42 The two processes explored in this section – initiation of side sequences in English and reformulation through English – can be identified as manifestations of accommodation. Whilst, in both cases, speakers must diverge from the main language of interaction, this divergence allows speakers to converge pragmatically through the protection of common ground. These are clear examples of speakers making efforts to adapt, or accommodate, to each other through the use of English in interactions taking place in another language.

43 As with cases of accommodation towards English, instances of speakers accommodating through the use of English are never commented upon explicitly, never refused and never challenged. Even in situations where individuals have given no hint that English would constitute a possible linguistic resource, it would seem that the speakers in the context of the TO consider English not only to be a possible linguistic resource but also an unmarked

one – that is, unworthy of comment – when it comes to accommodating to their interlocutors. They take for granted the fact that English will provide the get-out-of-jail-free card when faced with difficulties in communication and, based on evidence from the corpus, this assumption is almost always correct. In the following section, further consideration of this observation will shed light both on the motivations underlying the accommodation processes described in the previous sections and on their repercussions.

5. Discussion: Social dynamics of accommodation towards and through English

44 The analyses presented above show that English is frequently used as a resource for accommodation between international tourists and tourist advisers at the TO. Whether this accommodation takes place through convergence towards English or through fleeting pragmatic use of English to solve communication problems in interactions in other languages, the use of English always goes unchallenged and uncommented. This unmarked status can tell us a lot about the attitudes speakers have towards English in this context. It would seem that the use of English as an accommodative tool in this situation has become normalised: if communication problems arise, it is taken for granted that speakers can converge to, or through, English. This final section discusses the underlying dynamics of this normalisation in an attempt to illustrate how it comes about and thus explain the dynamics underpinning these forms of linguistic accommodation at the TO.

45 Much work has shown how a dominant discourse exists across the world that positions English as a "global" language that is seen as being particularly effective for use in situations of language contact (see House 2003, Mufwene 2010). English is discursively presented as a language that allows communication between different linguistic groups and solves communication problems between speakers of different languages. In other words, English becomes framed as an eminent lingua franca: "a language for communication, that is, a useful instrument for making oneself understood in international encounters [...] enabling communication with others who do not speak one's own L1" (House 2003: 559). Whether English lives up to its reputation in reality is of little importance, the simple fact that English is positioned this way means it is more likely to be selected, and accepted, by speakers in reaction to communication problems in situations of language contact as the data from this study shows.

46 This discursive positioning constitutes a language ideology, that is, a set of "beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds" (Kroskrity 2004: 498). To borrow terminology originally used by Mary Bucholtz (2009) when discussing style and stance, the process that positions English as a global lingua franca may be called a "top-down" language ideology. This is due to the fact that it emanates principally from centres of authority such as media, educational and political institutions and this in myriad countries across the world. In other words, it is formed "through the workings of broader cultural ideologies" (Bucholtz 2009: 147).

47 This "top-down" ideological framing of English as a global language that is absolutely necessary in situations of international communication positions English as the accommodative tool *par excellence* for situations of intense language contact (such as tourism). This clearly places English as the most valuable resource in the linguistic

marketplace (Bourdieu 1982) of any such situation. Thus, English use in such situations becomes normative in that it is considered acceptable, correct or even desirable behaviour.

48 Therefore, the instances of accommodation explored in this article can be explained not only as individuals converging towards the (perceived and/or real) linguistic preferences of their interlocutors but also as individuals converging towards an imaginary norm. Blommaert (2010: 39) explains this phenomenon with the aid of Bakhtin's notion of "superaddressee":

> [...] whenever we communicate, in addition to our real and immediate addressees we orient towards what Bakhtin (1986) called a 'super-addressee': complexes of norms and perceived appropriateness criteria, in effect the larger social and cultural body of authority into which we insert our immediate practices vis-à-vis our immediate addressees. Blommaert (2010: 39)

49 In short, the "top-down" ideological positioning of English as a global lingua franca leads to its use being construed as laudable, or, at least, acceptable, in contexts of tourism (and other comparable multilingual situations). This process constitutes then one of the major dynamics underpinning the accommodation explored in this article. Ideology plays a part in orientating speakers' linguistic practices. In this case, the "acceptable" or "laudable" nature of English orientates speakers towards its use in situations such as the TO. Speakers accommodate towards and through English because it is seen as being the ideal resource for doing so.

50 The fact that English use goes unremarked is particularly interesting when considered in relation to this ideological positioning. Its normative status seems to be taken entirely for granted. In other words, it seems to go without saying that in a situation such as the TO, where speakers confront communication problems due to intense language contact, English will be used as a key tool for linguistic accommodation. This is reminiscent of what Bourdieu (1972) terms a "doxa": a group of societal presuppositions that seem to go without saying. The status, and use, of English, though highly ideological, would seem to be seen as natural and self-evident. Therefore, accommodating towards or through English becomes not only normative but also normalised.

51 One element which may go some way to explaining this normalised, doxa-like status of English in situations such as the TO is the simple fact that converging towards or through English always (in the case of the TO) leads to the desired effect of ensuring smooth communication. In other words, speakers orient their linguistic practices towards a certain norm and this norm produces effective communication. In this respect, the interactions in situations such as the TO constitute the "bottom-up" counterparts of "top-down" language ideologies (see Bucholtz 2009). Every time individuals enter into interaction, they have the possibility of ratifying language ideologies – by orientating to norms and communicating successfully – or refusing them – by behaving in a different manner. Simplistically put, ratification strengthens a given ideology and is likely to lead to it being reproduced, refusal leads to ideologies being questioned and potentially modified. In other words:

> [...] interactions could in this way be viewed as the small cogwheels of the broader social (and also linguistic) mechanism that interactants, through their talk, constantly grease or instead may throw sand into. (Jaspers 2013: 141)

52 At the TO, converging towards or through English is not only the result of "top-down" ideological processes but also a process which reinforces the ideological position of

English from the "bottom-up". This is then more likely to lead to such convergent behaviour being reproduced in similar situations. "Top-down" and "bottom-up" ideological formation processes come together in harmony, forming the doxa.

53 Accommodative behaviour is thus central to the formation, and strengthening, of language ideologies. When combined with the theoretical frameworks employed above, CAT provides the tools to explain how, and why, speakers converge towards (ideological) linguistic norms. It can also be shown how this convergence contributes to the creation and maintenance of linguistic norms and language ideologies. In sum, language ideologies are key to understanding the dynamics underpinning accommodation as they are both a key motivation of accommodation and one of its key repercussions.

Conclusion

54 The principal aim of this article was to explore the manifestations of accommodation in face-to-face interactions between international tourists and tourism professionals in the Tourist Office of Marseille. Taking Communication Accommodation Theory as a main conceptual basis, it was shown how English is at the heart of two key processes of accommodation. Firstly, speakers converge *towards* English as a main language of interaction. Secondly, speakers accommodate to each other *through* one-off uses of English in side sequences and pragmatic reformulation strategies when faced with communicative difficulties.

55 The second objective of this article was to examine the dynamics that underlie and motivate accommodation processes and identify the repercussions of accommodation both in terms of interpersonal relationships and wider social dynamics. The analyses presented here have shown that converging *towards* and accommodating *through* English allow speakers to establish, protect and recover common ground, overcome communicative problems and co-construct understanding. In turn, this leads to harmonious interpersonal relationships for the fleeting duration of their interactions. Finally, language ideology was shown to be a key factor in the dynamics underlying processes of accommodation in the TO. Ideologies that position English as a global lingua franca seem to contribute to orienting speakers in their accommodative practices. In turn, accommodation *towards* and *through* English that leads to successful communication in situations such as the TO strengthens these same language ideologies.

56 In conclusion, this article aimed to submit Communication Accommodation Theory to the test of a domain which has remained relatively unexplored by this paradigm: tourism. This test has shown CAT to be adept at explaining both *in situ* language practices – such as individuals' interactional moves – and overarching sociolinguistic phenomena – such as language ideologies. Above all, CAT provides a solid theoretical framework for explaining the articulations between these microscopic and macroscopic sociolinguistic dynamics. Thus, this powerful methodological paradigm can help us to better understand the myriad relationships between language and social life.

57 Finally, it seems important to highlight the critical potential of the CAT framework when applied to a situation such as tourism. The language practices and ideologies explored here clearly attribute value to one of the most dominant languages on the planet: English. In this way, they contribute to producing and maintaining a sociolinguistic regime that generates huge inequality in the value of linguistic resources. The history of

sociolinguistic study shows that any such inequality in linguistic resources is bound to be at the root of dynamics of real social inequality. This article has underlined how CAT can be used not only to show how language practices, language ideologies and their repercussions are linked but also how these links become "hidden" or taken for granted. The "self-evidence" of these linguistic practices and ideologies help the current sociolinguistic regime to go unchallenged and, ultimately, be reproduced. The first step to dismantling any such regime of inequality is to reveal its workings and CAT has been shown here to be a particularly powerful tool for doing so. It would seem of paramount importance then that future research should focus on putting other situations of tourism, as well as other comparable contexts, under the lens of CAT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alber, Jean-Luc et Bernard Py. « Vers un modèle exolingue de la communication interculturelle : interparole, coopération et conversation. » *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* 61 (1986) : 78-90.

Auer, Peter. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Blommaert, Jan. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique. Précédé de Trois études d'ethnologie kabyle*. Genève : Librairie Droz, 1972.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Ce que parler veut dire. L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris : Fayard, 1982.

Bruner, Edward M. *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Bucholtz, Mary. "From Stance to Style: Gender, Interaction, and Indexicality in Mexican Immigrant Youth Slang." In A. Jaffe (ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 146-170.

City of Marseille. *Marseille Tourism Observatory: Key Figures 2016. Marseille: City of Marseille*. URL: < *http://fr.calameo.com/read/002243401dbcd0c813eeb* >; accessed on 30/09/2017, 2016.

Coupland, Nikolas, Justine Coupland, Howard Giles and Karen Henwood. "Accommodating the Elderly: Invoking and Extending a Theory." *Language in Society* 17.1 (1988): 1-41.

Dann, Graham. *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Basingstoke: CAB International, 1996.

De Stefani, Elwys and Mondada, Lorenza. "Reorganizing Mobile Formations: When 'Guided' Participants Initiate Reorientations in Guided Tours." *Space and Culture* 17-2, (2013): 157-175.

Giles, Howard, Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland (eds.). *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Giles, Howard and Jessica Gasiorek. "Parameters of nonaccommodation: Refining and elaborating communication accommodation theory." In J. F. Forgas, J. Laszlo and V. Orsolya (eds.), *Social Cognition and Communication.* New York: Psychology Press, 2013, 155-172.

Giles, Howard, Hiroshi Ota and Megan Foley. "Tourism: An Intergroup Communication Model with Russian Inflections." *Russian Journal of Communication* 5.3 (2013): 229-243.

Gotti, Maurizio, Stefania Maci and Michele Sala (eds.). *Ways of Seeing, Ways of Being: Representing the Voices of Tourism*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2017.

Held, Gudrun. *Strategies of Adaptation in Tourist Communication*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Heller, Monica, Joan Pujolar and Alexandre Duchêne. "Linguistic Commodification in Tourism." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18.4 (2014): 539-566.

House, Juliane. "English as a Lingua Franca: A Threat to Multilingualism?" *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7-4, (2003): 556-578.

Jaspers, Jürgen. "Interactional Sociolinguistics and Discourse Analysis." In J. P. Gee and M. Handford (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2013, 135-146.

Jaworski, Adam and Crispin Thurlow. "Language and the Globalizing Habitus of Tourism: Toward A Sociolinguistics of Fleeting Relationships." In N. Coupland (ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 255-286.

Jenkins, Jennifer, Alessia Cogo and Martin Dewey. "Review of Developments in Research into English as a Lingua Franca." *Language Teaching* 44-3, (2011): 281-315.

Jones, Liz, Nicola Sheeran, Hanna Lanyon, Karina Evans and Tatjana Martincovic. "Nurses' Perceptions of Communicating with Minority Parents in a Neonatal Nursery: A Communication Accommodation Theory Approach." *Journal of Communication in Healthcare* (2018): 1-11.

Kroskrity, Paul V. "Language Ideologies." In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* . Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004, 496-517.

Mondada, Lorenza et Luci Nussbaum. *Interactions cosmopolites. L'organisation de la participation plurilingue*. Limoges : Lambert-Lucas, 2012.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. "Globalization, Global English, and World English(es): Myths and Facts'. In N. Coupland (ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 29-55.

Norén, Coco. *Reformulation et conversation : de la sémantique du topos aux fonctions Interactionnelles*. Volume 60 de Studia Romanica Upsaliensia. Uppsala : Uppsala University Library, 1999.

Pennec, Blandine. *Réajustement(s) du discours en anglais contemporain*. Londres : ISTE éditions, 2017.

Schedel, Larissa Semiramis. "Turning local bilingualism into a touristic experience." *Language Policy* 17-2, (2018): 137-155.

Stalnaker, Robert. "Common Ground." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25-5/6, (2002): 701-721.

Thurlow, Crispin and Adam Jaworski. *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

UNWTO. *UNTWO Tourism Highlights. 2017 Edition.* United Nations World Tourism Organisation, 2017. URL: < *http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/book/10.18111/978928441 9029* >; accessed on 30/09/2017.

Vion, Robert. *La communication verbale. Analyse des interactions*. Paris : Hachette, 1992.

Wilson, Adam. *Dynamiques sociolinguistiques de la globalisation : l'exemple de l'office du tourisme de Marseille*. Thèse de doctorat, Aix-Marseille Université, 2016.

Wilson, Adam. "The Local Language of Tourism in International Tourist Information Encounters: Adapting the What and the How." In G. Held (ed.), *Strategies of Adaptation in Tourist Communication*. Leiden: Brill, 2018, 123-144.

APPENDIXES

Transcription conventions

(1.1)	Pause (in seconds)
(.)	Short pause
:	Prolongation
-	False start/interruption
?	Rising intonation
[]	Overlapping speech
=	Speech in quick succession
><	Slower speech
ONE	Loud speech
//	Phonetic transcription

Note: Given that upper-case letters are used to identify loud speech, lower-case letters are used for all other speech, even where graphic conventions would require a capital letter (such as in the use of proper nouns). An effort is made to transcribe each utterance as closely as possible. Therefore, any "non-standard" or "erroneous" English constructions or forms are reproduced as uttered.

NOTES

1. Detailed information regarding the technical and ethical aspects of this interactional data collection can be found in Wilson (2016).

2. See Wilson 2016 for a more detailed discussion of this case.

3. See the appendix for a guide to the transcription conventions used throughout.

4. It is not immediately clear as to why CF8 refers to the language spoken by T4 as "Dutch". It seems unlikely, given her experience of contact with both German and Dutch, that CF8 has misidentified T4's language. It would seem more likely that CF8 has confused the English word "Dutch" with the German word "*Deutsch*".

ABSTRACTS

International tourism continues to grow and diversify exponentially, creating situations of intense language contact and giving rise to unexpected sociolinguistic dynamics and phenomena. In order to ensure successful communication and counteract the challenges linked to these dynamics, speakers in tourist contexts must be able to adapt in order to accommodate to their interlocutors. Based on ethnographic and interactional data taken from a fieldwork project, the aim of this article is to explore the manifestations of accommodation in face-to-face interactions between international tourists and tourism professionals in the Tourist Office of Marseille, France. Taking Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991) as its main conceptual basis, this article shows how English is at the heart of two key processes of accommodation. Firstly, speakers converge towards English as a main language of interaction. Secondly, speakers accommodate to each other through one-off uses of English in side sequences and pragmatic reformulation strategies in order to repair or prevent communicative difficulties. Following this, the dynamics that underpin these accommodation processes are explored and the repercussions of accommodation are discussed, both in terms of interpersonal relationships and wider social dynamics. The analyses presented here show that converging towards and accommodating through English allow speakers to establish, protect and recover "common ground" (Stalnaker 2002), overcome communicative problems and co-construct understanding. Finally, language ideology is shown to be a key factor in the dynamics underlying processes of accommodation in this particular context.

Le tourisme international ne cesse de s'accroître et se diversifier, créant une intensification des situations de contact de langues et suscitant des phénomènes et dynamiques sociolinguistiques inattendus. Afin d'assurer le bon déroulement des interactions et de surmonter les défis liés à ces nouvelles dynamiques, les locuteurs doivent faire preuve d'adaptation. À partir de données interactionnelles collectées sur le terrain, cet article vise à explorer les manifestations de l'accommodation dans les interactions en face à face, entre des touristes internationaux et des professionnels du tourisme, à l'office du tourisme de Marseille. Avec comme cadre théorique principal la théorie de l'accommodation communicative (Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991), cet article présente la façon dont l'anglais se retrouve impliqué dans deux processus d'accommodation. Tout d'abord, certains locuteurs « convergent » vers l'anglais en le sélectionnant comme langue principale d'interaction. D'autre part, les locuteurs s'accommodent entre eux à travers des usages ponctuels de l'anglais dans des séquences latérales et des stratégies pragmatiques de reformulation, afin de réparer, ou d'éviter, les obstacles à la communication. Nous exposons ensuite les dynamiques qui sous-tendent ces processus d'accommodation avant d'explorer leurs répercussions, que ce soit en termes de relations interpersonnelles ou de dynamiques sociales plus larges. Les analyses présentées ici montrent que la convergence vers l'anglais et l'accommodation par le biais de l'anglais permettent aux locuteurs d'élaborer et de protéger le « common ground » (Stalnaker 2002) d'interaction, et ainsi de dépasser les problèmes de communication et de co-construire du sens. Pour finir, l'idéologie linguistique est présentée comme un élément clé dans les dynamiques liées aux processus d'accommodation.

INDEX

Mots-clés: accommodation, anglais, interaction, tourisme, idéologie linguistique
Keywords: accommodation, English, interaction, tourism, language ideology

AUTHOR

ADAM WILSON

Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LPL, Aix-en-Provence, France
Université de Lorraine, IDEA
adam.wilson@lpl-aix.fr
adam.wilson@univ-lorraine.fr