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Medium negotiation, in or out of the power game in police institution: a case study of police check-up encounters in the An-Nan District of southern Taiwan

Abstract

Although research in bilingual studies has widely investigated language alternation in various settings, very few studies probe into bilingual conversation in specific institutional contexts, in which the power relations of speakers’ institutional roles are relatively discernible. In view of this, this dissertation undertakes the research targeting police-public interactions in police check-up encounters in the An-Nan District of southern Taiwan, in which most speakers are Mandarin-Minnanyu bilinguals. While my previous project (Lee, 2011) indicates a tendency for officers to accommodate people’s language preferences, the present research begins with the hypothesis of “power as medium negotiation,” attempting to analyse the new data of eleven recordings conducted in the same research site. In order to verify the hypothesis, analysed instances are categorised into three parts: (1) speakers’ negotiation toward a monolingual medium (2) speakers’ negotiation toward a bilingual medium (3) transitional places of medium switching.

By extensively applying Gafaranga’s (1999, 2000, 2007a, 2007b) notion of medium and making appropriate use of Auer’s (1984, 1988, 1995) sequential approach to look at the local environments of the speech turns for how medium negotiation sequences unfold, it has been found that there are no consistent results to support the hypothesis. By contrast, it is observed that both the officers and the public negotiate for their preferred codes throughout conversations. Furthermore, officers and the public propose their language preferences with different considerations, such as one’s “competence-related preference (Gafaranga, 2001:1916),” “the participant-related factor (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:7),” and “the medium switching proposal as a contextualisation cue for a topic shift” (Torras, 1998; Gumperz, 1982). For this study investigating the inter-relevance between institutional power and medium negotiation, the current results suggest that the institutional parameter of officers’ power does not permeate to the level of bilingual speaker’s medium negotiation; additionally, it is hoped that this study will indicate a researchable facet for further investigation studying bilingual conversations in other institutions.

**Keywords:** Language alternation, medium negotiation, language choice, language choice accommodation, language preference, medium switching
Chapter 1. Introduction

In a modern society where language contact vastly increases and takes place every day in almost every “non-formal” or “formal” setting (Drew & Heritage, 1992), a variety of research has explored bilingual interaction in different social contexts. While there seems to be a lack of research done for bilingual conversation in institutions which in relative terms have some power reserved, this dissertation investigates conversations taking place in a power-laden institution, the police institution, as it has been pointed out in institutional discourse studies (Yoong, 2010; Haworth, 2006; Thournborrow, 2002). The present research looks into police-public conversations in police check-up encounters. The goal is to investigate whether a possible asymmetry in institutional power would affect officers and the public’s equal right to propose different language preferences and to engage in medium negotiation.

The research site is the An-Nan district of Tainan City, Taiwan. The bilingual context of Taiwan is a long-standing one (Scott et al., 2007; Yeh et al., 2004; Sandel, 2003) in that today’s Taiwanese people are almost all bilingual speakers of Mandarin and Minnanyu (I use the term “Minnanyu” to refer to the same linguistic variety known as “Tai-gi” (Sandel, 2003:527), “Hokkien or Taiwanese” (Yeh et al.: 2004)). The sociolinguistic features of the An-Nan district is of special research interest due to socioeconomic transformation, which increases local people’s language contact and hence the regularity of speakers’ language negotiation.

This research is a continuous study from my previous project (Lee, 2011), which is also a case study done in the An-Nan District and it was found that officers accommodate people’s preferred code and the medium is established through officers’ convergence. An explanation offered for this is that officers tried to mitigate their power, and being friendly was helpful to the business that they were conducting at that particular moment. Hence, the present study proceeds from the hypothesis framed as power as medium negotiation, seeking to test again if the power relevance indeed has an effect on how officers and the public negotiate the medium. The current research is provided with the data of eleven recordings analysed for the talks in the police’s check-up encounters taking place on roads in the An-Nan District.

In order to analyse how the medium is reached, I adopt Auer’s (1984, 1988, 1995) sequential approach and from the sequential environments across speech turns to examine how speaker locally negotiate the norm for their “language-of-interaction” (Auer, 1984:30) through their convergence with or divergence from other speaker’s language preference. While it has been observed that speakers in my data often orient to Minnanyu-Mandarin alternation, the analyses in this study mainly apply Gafaranga’s (1999, 2000, 2007a, 2007b) notion of medium and I will
address officers and the public’s oriented-to code as speakers’ monolingual or bilingual medium. In this dissertation, the language negotiation sequences in Auer (1984, 1995, 2000) will be precisely identified as “medium negotiation” to more accurately make sense of officers’ and people’s Minananyu-Mandarin alternation when they orient to it as one code. In line with Gafaranga (2007a: 135-149, 2007b:301), the medium negotiation sequences in the data are then interpreted from the overall level organisation from the perspective of speakers to see how they feel the need to decide the medium and to settle on it.

In Chapter 2, the literature review for language alternation will set out a theoretical basis for the core concept of this dissertation: the notion of medium. In the same chapter, I will summarise my previous project in its importance to the present research hypothesis in this dissertation. Research questions are straightforwardly raised to request proofs for the hypothesis and to give meaningful interpretations to the results. Chapter 3 re-states my integration of two approaches, namely Auer’s (1984, 1995, 2000, etc.) sequential approach for language negotiation and Gafaranga’s (1999, 2000, 2007a, 2007b) notion of medium to detect speakers’ orientation/negotiation to any medium. Chapter 4 introduces the sociolinguistic profile of the An-Nan District to construct a picture of the linguistic and societal contexts in the community; additionally, it rationalises why the increasing language contact and socio-economic transformation there together make An-Nan District a site that is worthy of research. After the hypothesis and research questions in Chapter 2, Chapter 5 makes clear the methodology of the present research. Chapter 6 consists of detailed analyses of extracts, and it is the central section of this dissertation. Extracts are shown in this chapter to verify the validity of the research hypothesis. Three sub-sections categorised into speakers’ negotiation toward different mediums and how they switch from one medium to another will prove that the current hypothesis is not supported by the data. That is, the analyses will point out that the presumption of officers’ power being practised and its affecting medium negotiation is an unsatisfactory statement to make. The last chapter, a summary of the results will reassure that the hypothesis cannot be significant, and I will provide plausible reasons for this as the conclusion to this dissertation.
Chapter 2. Literature review

2.1. Language alternation as an orderly social act in bilingual conversation

Long before language alternation in bilingual conversation was probed into with the consideration of orderliness, the phenomenon was regarded as bilingual speakers merely expressing themselves in a random and disorderly manner. Nevertheless, the discussion of language/medium negotiation will not be possible without the notion of “social norm”, for how it indeed resides in the mind of bilingual speakers. Focusing on a speaker’s perspective of social norm, the recurrent debate of “base language” (Auer, 1984; Torras, 1999, Gafaranga & Torras, 2001) starts to feel the need to know which code in language alternation requires extra interpretation for instance which turn out to be a normative or a deviant case (Gafaranga & Torras 2001:196). That is, with the concept of social norm which normalises and marks a difference for certain language choices, language negotiation (Auer, 1984; medium negotiation in Torras, 1999) is found in bilingual conversation because speakers look at the norm as something they negotiate for. Without a social norm, medium negotiation sequences can carry on forever due to a lack of common ground shared by speakers regarding which code to settle on.

Garfinkel brings the analysis of speaker’s “taken-for-granted social experience” (Heritage & Clayman, 2010:10; Sharrock & Anderson, 1986: 93) into bilingualism research for that since language choice is of an essential part in bilingual conversation and talk itself is “an instance of social action, it must be assumed to be orderly because, if it were not, it would not occur” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001:198). In this regard, the methods of reasoning (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage & Clayman, 2010:11) enable speakers themselves to make sense of the produced action and to produce actions based on the scheme of interpretation (Garfinkel, 1967:120). This notion of norm enlightens bilingual research in the paradigm of “socio-functional perspective” (as opposed to the “grammatical perspective”, e.g. Myers-Scotton (1993) and Poplock & Meechan (1995)). Within this “socio-functional perspective,” there are two divisions which explain the orderliness of language alternation differently: the symbolic dimension and the practical dimension (Gafaranga, 1999:201). This conceptual breakthrough in that language alternation is studied as an orderly social norm is crucial for how bilingual speakers conceive of the idea of medium, and it also explains why speakers engage in medium negotiations due to the existence of the norm for language choice.

2.2. In the eyes of speakers themselves: the notion of medium

While Gumperz’s (1982) we-code and they-code as well as Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model (1983, 1988, 1993) point to sociocultural values in association with different codes and the
speaker’s language choice is reciprocally indexical to the value system, Auer’s (1984) sequential approach is situated on a micro-level of language choice as speaker’s practical action. Hence, the study of bilingualism needs to be focused on speakers’ actual behaviour as what they actually do instead of “something inside speakers’ heads” (Auer 1984:6-7). In other words, the theoretical difference between these two perspectives lies in how/what the reality is presented to speakers: whether sociocultural parameters should come into explanation in a presupposition that symbolism of languages is indeed a speaker’s motivation for code-switching (Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993), or for Auer, on the other hand, examination should focus on a speaker’s actual language choice to see which language, in the eyes of speakers themselves, allows one to communicate practically.

In principles that conceive of interactional orderliness, different terminological names are given to categorise a speaker’s usage of multiple linguistic varieties. A cursory overview identifies Gumperz’s (1982) allocation of metaphorical code-switching from situational code-switching while Myers-Scotton (1993) terms the latter situation as sequential unmarked code-switching as opposed to marked code-switching. In Auer (1984), it is further categorised into four possibilities of discourse/participant-related code-switching or transfer. I will cease to pursue an exhaustive explanation of paradigmatic differences and give more space to the distinction of “language and communicative code” in Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998). It is a discussion worth having as the possibility of multiple languages as seen in one communicative code sets a benchmark for the very crucial notion that this dissertation builds on - “Preference for Same Medium Talk” in Gafaranga and Torras’ (2001, 2002a, 2002b) medium negotiation.

Before properly introducing the notion of medium, I should begin from the concept of “communicative code” (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998) and the “language-of-interaction” as similarly defined in Auer (1984:30). Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998) points out that what speakers use to conduct conversation is the “communicative code,” which functions similarly to other prosodic or kinetic signals. This concept given pivotal weight to a speaker’s own perspective is echoed in Gumperz (1982:99) for a speaker’s notion of language is not as delineated by grammarians of language separateness as it is seen in grammatical differences; yet, it is the “speaker’s own notion.” For analysts to temporarily put on “a pair of speaker-owned-glasses” and become “language-blind” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:4), Gafaranga (2007a:145-146 and elsewhere) suggests that Auer’s principle of “preference for same language talk” is not completely language-blind because for situations when speakers treat language alternation itself as one code, Auer (1984:9) speaks of the “new code” as if there are two codes, speakers making a departure from the original code. Gafaranga (2007a:145-146) marks this problem, arguing that “under this (Auer’s) principle, it is
impossible for language alternation itself to occur as the preferred choice.” Alternatively, the notion of *medium* is proposed by Gafaranga (1999, 2000, 2007a, 2007b, 2010) and Torras (1998, 1999) as a complementary model to the ongoing debate of “base language versus base code.” Being the fundamental theory applied in this dissertation, medium defined as “the actually oriented-to-linguistic code” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001:196) can attend to my data indicating speaker’s consistent language alternation as a social norm. Building on the idea that medium is different and independent from the idea of language, the result section will show that there is not only monolingual medium but also bilingual medium that speakers orient to.

### 2.3. The hypothesis of “power as medium negotiation”

This research extends from my previous project (Lee, 2011), in which I investigated language negotiation between police officers and people in the community of An-Nan District (the details of methodology, results, etc. are mentioned in Chapter 5). In the project, I presupposed that officers interact with the public from a higher position as the representative of the institution. That is, because of this hypothetical hierarchy in institutional roles, officers would determine the code, and the public would accommodate. Accordingly, the medium being adopted would turn out to be the officers’ language preferences rather than people’s.

Nonetheless, the result shows a tendency of police accommodating to people’s preferred medium, and this direction of accommodation is recurrently found, especially in the opening sequence where the interactional episode “Check-up Request” was seen (see Figure 1 for the structure of check-up encounter, p. 19). Put another way, it is usually the conversation beginners, officers, who use more than one code in the first turn. After listening to which particular code people use in turn 2, officers then speak in the code that was proposed by people, and they then converged to the same code in the following turn.

That is to say, there is a contrast between my hypothesis and the actual result regarding which side in the police institution accommodates to the other party’s language choice. In my (Lee, 2011) supposition, the public would defer to police’s language choice when they are questioned. However, my previous data indicate that officers did most of the accommodation work. One explanation (Lee, 2011:15) given to officer’s accommodation work is that their code deferences “create certain solidarity” (Lee, 2011:15), and this friendliness helps officers to carry out check-up procedures. On the basis of previous results, I formulate the hypothesis for the current research: power as medium negotiation. In the course of this research, I endeavour to find out whether officers and people’s medium negotiation is the site where officers exercise or mitigate power. Alternatively, it may be
possible that medium negotiation is independent from how officers demonstrate power as they do in other aspects.

2.4. A gap is found for a cross-disciplinary link on the issue of “power”

After the project (Lee, 2011) show a reversed result from my previous assumption, I started to search in the literature for bilingual communication in institutional settings and in which the issue of “power” is particularly addressed. For the institutional setting this dissertation targets, there are some examples: for instance, Torras’ (1998, 1999) Catalan-Castilian (or, alternatively English) language contact in service encounters based in Barcelona, Heller’s (1982, 1985) Montreal-based French-English interactions of settings ranging from a government bureau or hospital to a company environment, and Goldstein’s (1997) research of Portuguese-English language choice among workers in a Portuguese factory in Toronto (Goldstein, 1997) and so on.

For the hypothesis positioning at bilingual contact in the police institution, it is necessary to begin a search in literature making a cross-disciplinary link between discourse analysis, bilingual communication studies, or preferably, power as the research subject in bilingual studies. Nevertheless, there is no similar study which specifically draws upon medium negotiation as power (or not) within institutional settings in these two fields. While there is no insight to be directly taken from corresponding research, my research hypothesis is indeed propelled by police discourse research, which indicates that the police’s power and institutional identity are demonstrated in their speech. Certain aspects of police discourse features such as topic control (Yoong, 2010; Thournborrow, 2002; Haworth, 2006), question design (Haworth, 2006), question and answer sequence (Haworth, 2006; Thournborrow, 2002) are thought to be the police’s strategy, shaped by the institution as well as shaping the institution so as to enable the force to have “direct power over the interviewee” (Haworth, 2006:740).

These remarks drive my curiosity particularly towards one speculation: how would two sets of identities in that individuals are respectively being bilingual speakers as well as having the respective roles of police and people be borne and carried on about during their conversation. Moreover, which identity do speakers themselves influentially take in during medium negotiation sequences. If the power relation in discourse is permeable even to bilingual speakers’ medium negotiation and the current research result can point to a tendency of one side (police or people) accommodating to the other side’s code(s)/medium preference, then the notion hypothetically framed as “power as medium negotiation” could prove significant.
Roberts (2007) has already noticed this cross-disciplinary gap. As she (2007:414) reminds, “the multilingual workplace is an important and underresearched strategic site” and it falls short of seeing a body of literature developing. Bearing this remark in mind, the stated goal of this dissertation is to be supplemental to the totality of bilingual communication studies with the added-on examination of whether the institution-related power has a possible influence on a speaker’s language choice.

2.5. Research questions

As mentioned, my previous project’s result (Lee, 2011) has indicated that officers’ language choice is subjected to people’s preference. On the contrary, researchers doing discourse studies on police-public interaction have pointed out that police effectively demonstrate their power by utilising discourse elements such as Q-A sequence (Yoong, 2010; Thornborrow, 2002:46-48), question formulation (Tracy and Robles, 2009:134), topic control (Thornborrow, 2002:57) and so on. Combining my previous findings and what is discussed in the literature of police-public discourse, a contrast exists between two dimensions: on the one hand, police exercise power on the discourse level; yet on the other hand, this power lessens when officers are found to accommodate to people’s language choice on the level of medium negotiation. As this contrast becomes noticeable and there is a gap in the literature addressing the issue of power for how it may (or may not) be influential to a bilingual’s language choice, research questions are generated as below:

(1) Considering the gap in the literature that there is no research specifically addressing the power relation in a bilingual’s language choice, whether the presumption of “power as medium negotiation” can obtain from the present data?

(2) From the studies of institutional discourse illustrating that police exercise power in discourse, whether the aspect of bilingual speakers’ language choice is affected by a possible power relation in check-up talks?

(3) For the dual-identity of speakers’ behaviour of doing being “officers and people” as well as doing being “bilingual speakers,” which task in these two identities is of primary importance that speakers attend to in the data: the medium negotiation for the “communicative norm in bilingual conversation,” or, the carried-out “interactional norm of police-public talk” (e.g. institutional role and duty)?
Chapter 3. Theoretical framework

For the methodological approaches adopted to address my research questions, two approaches are respectively Auer’s (1984) sequential approach and Gafaranga and Torras’ (2001, 2002a, 2002b) notion of medium applied in the medium negotiation phenomenon. Instead of preference for the same language talk proposed in Auer (1984), I specifically use the notion of preference for the same medium talk co-challenged by Gafaranga and Torras (2001, 2002a, 2002b) based on the concept that “monolingual bias” as still seen in Auer’s analysis (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:2) is felt to be inappropriate in accounting for speakers’ orientation if language alternation itself is one code to speakers. In simple words pointed out by Gafaranga (2007b:303), “the preference for same language talk does not always obtain.” I examine my language alternation data from the angle of “the overall level organisation of bilingual conversation.” I will not make further comparison and contrast between Auer’s model and Gafaranga’s respecification here for my simple attempt is to rationalise why the notion of medium suits my analysis more sensibly.

The reason for choosing Gafaranga and Torras’ medium concept instead of Auer’s idea of same language preference is based on the result from my project (Lee, 2011). In the previous result, I found that speakers tend to orient to language alternation as one code. Since my current research aims to continue the issue in the same site of research, I will use the medium concept because language alternation found in the previous data (as well as the current data) reflects a similarity as Gafaranga’s Kinyarwanda-French and Torras’ Catalan-Castilian examples (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001) in that speakers orient to their own language choice as one code. In the situation that Taiwanese speakers, as observed in the data, can stay in language alternation itself as one code and carry out the oriented-to code (it may consist of multiple languages) as one entity, I find the most suitability in integrating largely from Gafaranga’s (1999, 2007a, 2007b) method of the “overall level organisation of bilingual conversation.”

However, this research also benefits from Auer’s sequential approach which interprets from the level of “turn-by-turn basis” (Gafaranga, 2007a:125) in local turns where “functional or repairable deviant instances of language alternation” (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:12) take place. In addition, the functional language alternation categorised as “interactional otherness” in Gafaranga and Torras (2002a:12) has had the idea taken from the organisation of interactional/institutional episodes for a possibility of medium being re-negotiated for a different interactional episode (Torras, 1998; Gafaranga, 1999). In order to verify my research hypothesis of “power as medium negotiation,” it is necessary to examine how check-up talks are organised for an overall
organisation as well as down to the local level for how the scheme of interpretation is maintained or proposed for a shift.

Last but not the least, the choice of the practical perspective instead of the symbolic one is basically due to an unfitness in the nature of my data. Whereas Myers-Scotton (1983, 1988, 1993) collected her data in stable communities between members of the same community where sociocultural values interrelate speaker’s language choices, my data is based on an outward developing community (see Chapter 4 for the sociolinguistic background) with police-public conversations reflecting individuals who are all strangers to each other and it is the “first-time encounter” as Torras (1998, 1999) indicates for her instances from service encounters. For this distinctiveness, I cannot presume any marked or unmarked framework for a speaker’s language choice.

**Chapter 4. The sociolinguistic background of the An-Nan District**

An-Nan District has several sociolinguistic phenomenon as observed in the setting, and features in the community and the socioeconomic change that community is undergoing are all worth mentioning to build up a sociolinguistic picture and to help analyse people-public interaction in this community. The first feature is that local residents have increasing language contact with new-comers because of the change in the local industry. This socio-economic reformation took place from the year 1995. The establishment of Tainan Technology Industrial Park (TTIP) was projected by the government and its scale has been developing until today (Tainan Technology Industrial Park official website). A variety of companies from navigation engineering to software development can all be found (Tainan Technology Industrial Park official website and Annan District Office website). Due to the demand for a huge increase in labour, it has influenced the population structure along with the influx of workers (including foreign workers from Thailand, Vietnam and the Philippines) and new residents. I have mentioned that “this factor opens the door for language contact with new comers or visitors from other communities” in my previous project (Lee, 2001:4). In other words, the industrial reformation that An-Nan District is undergoing makes this community fit appropriately into a bilingual context. In short, speakers in this community would have a great chance to talk to people from other communities; thus, the possibility for speakers to negotiate the medium is comparatively higher because in a hypothetical sense, speakers do not have previous experience to draw on as regards which medium they are supposed to use; therefore, they locally negotiate the language choice.
The second feature about the An-Nan District is that it is changing toward an outward-developing community compared to how it used to be in the past. In the old days, the traditional industries were fish-breeding and salt manufacturing (Annan District Office website). However, for the TTIP which is developing in the community, there are 115 factories in total demanding around 14,000 workers coming in and out every day (TTIP official website). These numbers reveal that An-Nan District is becoming a more outward-developing community while in-comers are flooding in. Compared to the past, occupational information (indicated in Annan District Office website) reveals a change in residents’ jobs and it is significant to show that today’s An-Nan District is becoming less likely as a stable community.

There is no official number regarding language varieties used in the An-Nan District. For the foreign workers work in TTIP, they use their naive languages among peers of same nationality, but English as the mutually intelligible language is used for cross-national conversations just like their conversations with officers (e.g. see extract (2)). In terms of intermarriages, statistics from the Household Registration Office show that in total, there are 33 intermarriage cases of spouses from southeastern Asia up to the year 2010 (Household Registration Office website). Although varieties may be spoken, Minnanyu and Mandarin are the two main languages as the basics in almost every speaker’s linguistic repertoire. Information provided here will correspond to the result section in that most language alternation is conducted in Minnanyu-Mandarin alternation.

Chapter 5. Methodology

Analysed exchanges throughout this dissertation (as well as my previous project) come from the data retrieved in An-Nan District. The headquarter of the police institution in An-Nan District is the Third Branch Precinct of Tainan City, and there are nine branches belonging to it (Tainan City Police Department official website). Being one of these nine local branches, the Hsian-Gong Branch offers the data for the present research. Enormous appreciation should be given to the officer, Shang-Ju Lee (Lee), who works as the chief in Hsian-Gong Branch. In the previous project, I (Lee, 2011) only collected recordings that Lee was presented in the check-up events. In the current research, however, I received permission from Lee and the other seven officers in the station to record their check-up cases. With the hope of clearly checking if there is an institutional norm for police-public interaction, I not only collect encounters in Lee’s presence but also the other half of the recordings of the check-up tasks led by Lee’s colleagues, where Lee may or may not have been
there. Hence, it prevents the current research becoming an individual’s case study as it may turn out to be in the project, and enables us to look at the institutional scale, as I intend to survey.

The check-ups took place on roads. Each recording began from the moment when officers suspected a person, and ended when officers considered the situation/person to be ok. The consent issue is dealt with after exchanges are completed, that is, questioned people did not know that they were being recorded until police revealed it right after their conversations. Officers handed them consent forms (see appendix I) stating purposes and confidentiality guarantee. However, due to the fact that this research touches upon police-people interactions, personal incidents such as job loss, divorce or details of why people break regulations could be talked about. Hence, it inevitably results in a number of people rejected from participation. Recordings without consent forms are deleted right away.

In total, fifteen recordings are valid with consent forms. Nevertheless, due to the constraint of time, I am only able to transcribe and work with eleven of the recordings I have collected and the transcripts are attached in the appendix. Recordings are transcribed in accordance with two spellings systems, which are respectively the Tongyong Pinyin for the Mandarin utterances of the spelling system chart cited from the official website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2011) as well as the Taigi Tongyong Pinyin by Dang’s (2006) dictionary for the Minnanyu utterances.

It should be noted that police-people interaction does not simply occur for the research. It is an institutional business which already exists with reoccurrence and most importantly, the legitimacy is recognised by people when they automatically react as individuals being questioned and cooperatively provide as much information as possible when their answers become somewhat explanations proving innocence. Therefore, despite the fact that my personal presence in An-Nan District was not possible, empirical data occurring recurrently in an institution-based setting is still attainable because the police’s check-up conduct is an existing event. The choice of data (a day-to-day business in police institutional settings) and the aspects I look into (An-Nan District’s community feature, bilingual conversation for any medium adopted/negotiated locally) all enable this research to investigate bilingual communication in an institutional setting.

Chapter 6. From medium negotiation sequences to test the accountability of “power as medium negotiation”

6.1. Speakers’ medium negotiation toward a monolingual medium
Again, although what language(s) being components in the medium is a different concept from the “base language” discussion (Auer, 2000) for it centres on speaker’s own perspective, likewise, medium negotiation sequence (Torras, 1998, 1999) or the language negotiation sequence as Auer calls it (1984, 1991, 1995, 1998), enables analysts to see from which point a medium becomes a normative code to speakers themselves (Gafaranga 2007a:142).

This section includes extracts of speakers’ medium negotiation toward a “monolingual medium.” From these conversations taking place in the check-up encounter (an institutional context), it is even important to note that cases below illustrate that questioned people alter to another code first, and then officers converge to people’s choice in the following turn. After police accommodation, the medium forms. This situation as seen in extract (1) below corresponds to most of my findings in my previous project (Lee, 2011), which becomes the basis to formulate the hypothesis of this research - power as medium negotiation (or not).

Although this subsection’s title is about “monolingual medium,” it does mean that for all cases categorised here, there is not solely one code that speakers use. Since the medium is as an interactional norm, to put it in a simile, it is like a “place” where co-parties head to. They may not (and need not to) arrive at that place in the very beginning. Hence, even if the medium turns out to be a monolingual medium after the negotiation, bilingual speakers may speak in different languages in their previous turn(s).

Extracts (1) will make clear how medium stands as a bilingual’s oriented code from two aspects: (1) participants may speak in different codes as their language preferences and these preferences are as the medium proposals so as to make their preferred language being the medium of communication (2) when a current medium is maintained, participants do not depart from it for a period of time.

**Extract (1)** - *for the complete transcript, see Recording 4 in appendix II*

Exchange occurred involving police officer A, men B and C. The situation was that B and C ran through the red light and insisted that the reason was due to the broken traffic light. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1 A: Sian-sheng pai-se (.) gen ni kan yi sia jheng-jian ho?
   ‘Excuse me, mister (.) may I take a look at your ID?’
2 B: Wa hon din ze din mo gua dio a (.) he a mo a.
   ‘I didn’t see whether it was a red or a green like (.) didn’t see it.’
3 A: He bin gue lai mo ma?
   ‘Did you come from that side?’
4 B: Mo (.) de si mo a.
   ‘No (.) I didn’t see it.’
C: Mo a (.) li due hia kua (.) a mo za-hon-din la (.) [di hia si e si e.]
   ‘No (.) you have to see from that side (.) there is no traffic light (.) [the light just went on and off.]’
B: [Mo a.]
   ‘[No.]’
A: Oh (.) e si (.) si e si e o.
   ‘Oh (.) so the traffic light was (.) going on and off.’

The medium negotiation sequence emerges from turn (1) to (3). Monolingual Minnanyu medium is held for subsequent turns. Officer A initiated the conversation with languages alternated between Mandarin and Minnanyu in his first turn whereas B used only Minnanyu for a response. Consequently, officer A showed a code deference in that he changed to only use Minnanyu, and he (as well as B) continued to use Minnanyu. In Auer’s (1984:20-21) viewpoint, for a language negotiation to be observed, there needs to be a divergence in the first place. In this instance, the divergence is found in the difference of officer A and man B’s preferred code in turn (1) and (2). For the talk to continue in a particular medium, officer A made a convergence to man B’s language choice. Extract (1) shows bilingual speakers’ preference for the same medium talk (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, 2002a), which is reasoned as the preference for the same language talk in Auer (1984:23).

As talks in institutional settings are hoped to be considered significant, extract (1) reveals that it is the police side (officer A) of his preferred code being negotiated. A similar but rather interesting medium negotiation is found in extract (2).

Extract (2) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 8 in appendix II

This part of excerpt involves police officer A and a filipino man (speaker B), who did not wear the helmet. The man was stopped for a check-up because of this. (Mandarin, English)

A: Hi (.) ni hao (.) hello (.) ke yi kan yi sia ni de jheng-jian ma?
   ‘Hi (.) hi there (.) hello (.) may I take a look at your ID?’
B: Ni na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’
A: Ni shih na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’
B: ((silence))
A: Ni shih na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’
B: ((silence))
A: Ni (.). na yi ge guo-jia?
   ‘You (.). which country?’
B: ((silence))
A: You na ge (.). jyu-liou-jheng ma (.).ARC?
   ‘Do you have (.). Alien Resident Certificate (.). ARC?’
A: Where are you from?
B: (question mark)
A: Na ge guo-jia (. ) country (. ) which country?
B: Philippines.
A: Philippines.
B: (laughter) I don’t know.
A: Ni de na ge (. ) an-cyuan-mao ne?
B: An cuan (. ) I don’t know.
A: You hat.
B: Hat?
A: Helmet.
B: (no response)
A: You ride bicycle- you ride motorcycle (. ) and you have to wear this right?
B: Yes yes yes.
A: [English]
B: [English]

Extract (2) again, shows that before any medium appears as visible, individual speakers may have different language preferences. This instance, however, points to the individualistic factor of language competency and language negotiation’s result being affected by this “competence-related preference” (Gafaranga, 2001:1916). As extract (1), officer A has shown his language choice and medium proposal at the very beginning of the conversation. Yet, when it collided with man B’s preference for a conversation in English, the officer’s proposal was rejected. It is noticeable that man B has a problem with understanding Mandarin from his silence after every Mandarin question asked. In other words, B’s language preference in English is very apparent to officer A because only the questions reformulated in English were responded to. Under these circumstances, the officer’s language preference in Mandarin as clearly shown from turns (2) to (8) has encountered a communication problem. Consequently, this reason made him converge to B’s language preference in English. Therefore in this instance, the monolingual English medium after negotiation is due to man B’s obvious “competence-related preference” (Gafaranga, 2001:1916), which if the officer insisted on sticking to his Mandarin language preference, it would make the exchange impossible to continue.
6.2. Speakers’ medium negotiation toward a bilingual medium

This section now turns to present another medium type that has not been clearly exemplified, the *bilingual medium* (Gafaranga, 1999, 2000, 2007a; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001, 2002a, 2002b). The bilingual medium is explained in the following words:

Speakers may either adopt “monolingual talk” or they may adopt “bilingual talk” (Gafaranga, 1998). That is, speakers may choose to use one language as the medium of their interaction just as they may choose to use both languages. (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001:208)

A speaker’s adoption of a bilingual medium may not reveal anything interesting for the discussion of language choice accommodation or help to test anything about the hypothesis. The reason for this is because if it is a bilingual medium, language alternation itself is utilised as one code by bilingual speakers and it is unnecessary for speakers to converge to the other’s language choice. That is to say, it is insignificant to figure out if police exercise or mitigate power simply because there is no need for either party to converge. Nevertheless, this subsection intends to present a more extensive negotiation sequence for how a bilingual medium is obtained and how the negotiation sequence unfolds before it. The following extract (3) is an example of how speakers negotiate their medium from originally a monolingual one to settling at a later stage on a bilingual one.

**Extract (3) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 7 in appendix II**

The exchange took place involving police officers A and C inquiring of man B as to his changing of the exhaust pipe and front light of his motorbike. (Minnanyu, **Mandarin**)

1 A: Li wu ga-ziao wo mo a?
   ‘Do you have your driving license?’
2 B: Wu a.
   ‘Yes.’
3 A: Ha?
   ‘What?’
→ 4 B: You a.
    ‘Yeah.’
5 A: Wu ho?
   ‘You do, right?’
6 C: He (.) dio (.) de-gi.
   ‘Yeah, right (.) address.’
→ 7 B: Siang jhe ge (.) ni men huei cyu (.) ke-yi ma-shang jiong chu-li diao jhe yang (.) mei ban fa zai gei yicih ji-huei?
‘Like this (.) after you are back (.) you will deal with this right away (.) and can’t really give a second chance?’

‘Well (.) after we are done, we can go to Motor Vehicles Institutions (.) Office of Motor Vehicles (.) to have the car examined, and then you will proceed to the (.) step of paying the fine.’

9 B: O.
‘Oh.’

10 C: Yin-wei jiou ge shih (.) jhen de shih (.) dang sia (.) jing fang zai zuo cyu-di de gong-zuo (.) jiou ge shih jhen de (.) yin-wei-
‘Because this is (.) this is really (.) at that moment (.) police are doing the job of citing the irregularity (.) and this is really (.) because.’

11 B: Jiao-du de guan-si.
‘Because of the angle.’

→ 12 C: He a (.) dian-shih shang bao cheng na ge yang zih (.) ran hou (.) ru guo (.) siang shuo (.) ni bu cyu-di (.) ran hou dao-shih-hou ci ta min-jhong ye kan (.) you shih hou (.) yi sie a-gong a-ma dou huei wun a (.) wun shuo (.) a I lin (.) hi le (.) lin mo kua hi le (.) gao-si-lin-a (.) chai gai a ne (.) a long le (.) en-dong-gong le ching-en (.) long e di ga wa pun dio.
‘Yeah (.) like how it is being reported on the TV (.) and then (.) if (.) let’s say (.) if you don’t cite this (.) and if other people see it (.) sometimes (.) there are some old people ask us (.) ask that (.) oh you (.) that (.) you didn’t see that (.) those bad kids (.) they reform their cars like that (.) their exhaust pipe all produce waste gas (.) and I’ve got the gas spurted on my face all the time.

13 B: En.
‘Yeah.’

‘Didn’t TV reports say that police will take care of this? Why don’t you do something about it? Instead, there are more voices like that we have heard.’

Obviously, there is a medium change from monolingual Minnanyu to monolingual Mandarin from turns (1)-(6) to turns (7)-(12). In fact, man B proposed a change early in turn (4). Nevertheless, his suggestion did not lead to any effect until turn (8). After his second proposal in turn (7), officer C changed into Mandarin as well and had the following sequence changed into the monolingual Mandarin medium. The complexity continues. In turn (12), officer C switched between Mandarin and Minnayu. Notably, no trouble was signalled in man B’s answering turns. That is, from turn (12) onwards, speakers could recognise that they could settle on a bilingual medium after officer C’s negotiation for adding Minnanyu into the option list, no impediment to this proposal being observed.

This extract is resourceful in two ways. First, it is not compulsory for speakers to hold conversation in one medium throughout the talk. Medium can be negotiated and switched because bilingual speakers consistently adjust their “normative code” according to co-participants’ reactions,
which is reflexively shown in speakers’ language choice in response to others. In Gafaranga and Torras, it has been pointed out that:

> While participants may choose to conduct their conversation either monolingually or bilingually, they need not stick to that choice for the whole of the conversation. Rather, they may shift from it in a variety of ways. (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:5)

This viewpoint links in to the second aspect: in this instance, which side of the institution (officers or people) proposes a medium change and thus alter an existing medium? To resolve my research questions, it is essential to find proof for whether medium negotiation is affected by the institution-related factor of power demonstration or mitigation. In the above extract, man A revealed a change in his Mandarin turn (turn 7), which can be seen as a deviance if the monolingual Minnanyu medium has been established. Officer B converged to A’s language choice and it contributes to a medium switching (see the detailed explanations of “medium-switching” in Gafaranga (2007a: 146)). However, for the bilingual medium which is later observed, it is officer C initiating his bilingual medium proposal in turn (12).

That is, even if findings in my previous project (Lee, 2011; also see the section 2.3.) and several places in the current data have detected that officers tend to accommodate to people’s language preference in the opening sequence, this instance points out that the officer also proposed a switch of the medium and co-participants acknowledged the officer’s proposal. Therefore, this instance reveals an unfavourable result to the hypothesis by showing an inconsistent result; there is no particular party (either the officers or people) regardlessly proposing their preferred language, in addition, both the officers and people are found to converge to other’s language choice.

**6.3. From transitional places of medium switching to see the medium (re)-negotiation**

Like all talk types, bilingual conversation is also composed of different episodes of interactional sequences (Torras, 1998; Gafaranga, 1999). Additionally, what “scheme of interpretation” is meant in the notion of medium as “the medium of an interactional episode” (Gafaranga, 1999:21). That is, bilingual speakers may settle in different mediums for different episodes. To combine with the idea of medium switching (Gafaranga 2007a:146-147; Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:17) and speakers’ changing mediums for different episodes (Torras, 1998), we can find the turns that I particularly name as the “transitional place of medium
switching,” where one speaker reveals a medium switching proposal, the medium re-negotiation unfolds, and the next speaker certifies such a request of having the original medium switched. That is, “transitional place of medium switching” is a particular spot where one reveals a request of medium switching and where such a request is acknowledged by the next speakers. Significantly, for the turns in this environment, an interactional episode is usually close to an end and it will soon be led to a new episode (Torras, 1998). Looking at these transitional places is important because, in order to verify whether it is usually officers or the public proposing medium-switching first and which side of them converges afterwards during medium re-negotiation sequences, it is necessary to examine these places and talk about its relevance to the episode shift at the same time.

Following the idea of “speaker’s episode management” in Torras (1998) and her adoption of “the generic structure of service encounter” outlined by Halliday and Hasan (1989:64, see Torras, 1998:6), I follow the same path of thinking and eleven recordings I have worked with suggest a structure as below.

In the figure, brackets indicate optional activities, yet activities without brackets are mundane and are found in all recordings. The above categorisation will be especially resourceful for the analysis now closely looking at the organisation of interactional episodes, which gives the accountability for medium switching. In the previous section, I touched upon Torras’ (1998:7) idea in that besides routine episodes, participants manage not-yet-fixed episodes and bilingual speakers at times use language alternation as a “contextualisation cue” (Gumperz, 1982) to signal a transit to another episode. Gafaranga says (2007b:302), “code-switching is a conversational strategy” and in this sense, bilingual speakers are able to switch to another medium to mark a boundary between episodes. Thus, medium-switchings are seen to be functional on the level of conversational

| i. Check-up Request |
| ii. Identity Inquiry |
| iii. General Information Check |
| iv. (Chat) |
| v. (Irregularity/Illegality Check) |
| vi. (Argument) |
| vii. (Report) |
| viii. Closure |

**Figure 1: The structure of police check-up encounter**
organisation, and I adopt this concept as an analytical tool for the following analyses. This section is separated into two sub-parts. In the first section, data point out the police’s accommodation to people’s medium-switching proposal whereas their own proposals are objected. On the other hand, the second section consists of instances where the police’s proposals are acknowledged too.

6.3.1. When the officers accommodate to people’s medium proposal whereas their proposals are rejected

In extract (4), after speaker C entered the conversation, two transitional places (indicated by arrows) are shown from a potential monolingual Minnanyu medium to a monolingual Mandarin medium after a period of medium negotiation from turns (5)-(11).

Extract (4) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 1 in appendix II

Exchange took place involving police officer A inquiring of man B and woman C. The reason for the officer’s inquiries was because he found this couple parked the car inside a park and stayed inside the car in the middle of the night. (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

1 A: Sian-sheng (.) pai-se (.) ga li kua gi lia gin-gia ho mo (.) in-wi gia (.) gia ka (.) ka gio ran lai la.
   ‘Mister (.) excuse me (.) can I take a look at your ID? Because here (.) there are not many (.) not many people come here.’

2 B: Ka gio ran di gia.
   ‘Not so many people come here.’

3 A: A li lai gia cho-gua ni?
   ‘So you’re here for the karaoke?’

4 B: N.
   ‘Yes.’

→ 5 C: Zen yang ma?
   ‘What’s happening?’

→ 6 A: Hanh (.) mei-guan-si (.) a wo ye gen ni kan yi sia jheng jian (.) jiou shih (.) jian dan kan yi sia (.) ho gia wo si zun (.) ho gong-hm ka gio ran (.) a don-ran-sua wu si zun-
   ‘Hanh (.) It’s all cool (.) I will have to look at your ID (.) just (.) to take a quick look.
   Sometimes here (.) not many people would be here in the park (.) and sometimes the-

7 C: Jhe-bian shih gong-yuan?
   ‘Here is a park?’

8 A: Zah-a e lai bia a ne.
   ‘There will be thieves to steal.’

9 C: Kan bu chu shih gong-yuan ye ((laughter)).
   ‘I can’t see that it’s a park.’

10 A: Hanh?
    ‘Sorry?’

→ 11 C: Kan bu chu jhe-bian shih gong-yuan ye ((laughter)).
    ‘I can’t tell that here’s a park.’

→ 12 A: Oh ((laughter)) jhe shih suan jhong-jian de lyu-dai la.
Oh it’s actually the green zone in the middle.’

Judging from turns (1)-(4), if one says that a monolingual medium has been settled after officer A’s accommodation to man B’s code preference, nothing convincing can account for the following situation: C spoke Mandarin only, A talked in Mandarin-Minnanyu alternation as well as B’s Mandarin usage after turn (14) while in the meantime, none of them flagged any problem by showing “trouble markers” such as hesitation or pauses (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002a:7; Gafaranga, 2000:335) to require a medium repair. After lady C entered the conversation, interestingly, the negotiation sequence began. In turn (6), the officer’s acknowledgement for C’s medium switching proposal to Mandarin is reflexively shown in his Mandarin-Minnanyu alternation in that he took in Mandarin as one option provided by C. Nevertheless, C did not stop to use Mandarin and her consistent Mandarin use led to the officer’s convergence finally in turn (12).

To connect this instance with the episode structure (Torras, 1998; Gafaranga, 1999), lady C’s arrival in the talk brought the conversation into another interactional episode. Departing from the mundane episode of “Identity Inquiry,” C’s insistence in talking about the surroundings led the conversation into her self-managed episode of “Chat.” Significantly, there is also a medium change occurring together with this episode change.

As noted, two transitional places are found in the turns (5)-(6) and turns (12)-(13). It is exactly in these transitional places that medium negotiation become more apparent for analysis, and then can we identify whose language choice has been accommodated or objected to. For the language negotiation table as it is possibly influenced by the police’s power, the officer in this instance firstly converged to man B’s preference for Minnanyu, and other similar accommodations took place in turns (6) and (12) in that the officer’s own language preference was affected and finally negotiated.

Looking at the transitional place of medium switching as an event-happening spot where one’s proposed medium would be certified by the next speaker, extract (5) again, shows that while the medium or in other words, the scheme of interpretation (Garfinkel, 1967; Gafaranga, 1999, 2000, 2007a) of language choice is expressed with a different preference, people object to the officer’s proposal and still hold up the previously conducted code(s) (the existing medium) as if they are gatekeepers to maintaining an orderly language choice.
This exchange involved police officers A and D making inquiries of man B and woman C. Officers stopped man B and woman C’s car first. After a while, police were concerned with the big antenna at the back of the car because it could be used as a wireless set, which street racers use to connect their gangs. (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

1. A: Sian-sheng (.) ni hao (.) bu hao yi sih (.) gen ni kan yi sia jheng-jian hao ma?
   ‘Mister (.) hi there (.) excuse me (.) could I take a look at your ID?’
2. A: Sian-sheng ni jhe ge (.) ho mian jhe ge tian-sian (.) shih zai zuo she-mo zuo yong de a (.) huh?
   ‘Mister, the one you have (.) the antenna at the back (.) what is that for (.) huh?’
   ‘Stereo.’
4. A: She-mo?
   ‘What?’
5. B: Yin-siang.
   ‘Stereo.’
6. A: [Mandarin]
7. B: [Mandarin]
8. A: [Mandarin]
9. B: [Mandarin]
10. A: [Mandarin]
11. B: [Mandarin]
12. A: Li wei due me dun ki?
    ‘Where did you drive from home?’
13. B: Wo?
    ‘Me?’
    ‘Yeah.’
15. B: Cong na ge An-Ping a.
    ‘From An-Ping.’
16. A: A (.) zen mo huei zou jhe bian yao huei jia?
    ‘Well (.) why do you want to drive from here to get home?’

Compared to other examples, officers A and D in extract (5) were both active in normalising their preferred code into the medium. Yet, two of the three proposals from officers got rejected. The first proposal officer A raised is in turn (12) where he conducted a turn in complete Minnanyu in spite of the Mandarin monolingual medium being established previously. In response, man B’s “Wo” still in Mandarin conveyed that the officer’s sudden change did not pass unnoticed when this “Wo (ENG: Me?)” functioned as a “dispreference marker” (Pomerantz, 1984) or a “trouble marker” (Gafaranga, 2000) where “navigational problems” (Ryave & Schenkein, 1974) appear to speakers. It is also a reconfirmation checker that consists of B’s concern in two aspects. First, B rejected Minnanyu being one of the codes into their medium by answering in Mandarin. Secondly, a problem of not clearly getting the officer required officer A to either repeat or reformulate the
confusing parts. Officer A’s second proposal in turn (14) was declined by B’s Mandarin turn and led to A’s deference in this negotiation sequence. It can be said that A’s conduct of Minnanyu in turn (12) and (14) are deviant utterances since a normative orientation of code has been co-carried in monolingual Mandarin already.

In this example, there is no successful medium switching, hence, no transitional places of medium switching are found. However, I feel the need to include this extract in order to underline the concept of interactional episode with its relevance to a possible medium switching. As mentioned, if medium switching happens when an episode transition is seen, it is a functional switching in that such a change in language alternation along with the episode shift functions as speaker’s “contextualisation cue” as Torras (1998:7) points out. In this example, the reason why there is no transitional place of medium switching is possibly because on the organisational level, this part of the talk is still under the same episode “Check-up Request.” In these circumstances, the officer’s sudden switch from the medium is similar to a misplaced object being shelved with other tidily sorted items, and due to the existence of a social norm, it will be moved away.

To recapitulate how the above extracts may or may not support the hypothesis, two extracts above present that in the cases that the questioned people reveal their code preferences or to propose a medium switching, officer A converged to their orientation as already exemplified in extract (4). Conversely, if like in extract (5), another officer proposes a switch of medium, the questioned people turn down this possibility in that they take the officer’s language choice as deviant conduct. For the switched-from medium, it links backwards to the first point: in these two examples, mediums sustained after the negotiation is both found to be the people’s preference of a particular code instead of the code that the officers originally proposed. For my hypothesis formulated on that power relation is influential to the medium negotiation, perhaps so far a small scale of tendency points out that the police’s power does “not” sustain in medium negotiation; or rather, a power mitigation is shown when officers accommodated to people’s preference. As opposed to what happened on the discourse level (the police’s interrogative questions for topic control (Thornborrow, 2002:57) and the police’s self-decision for opening and closing a talk (Haworth, 2006:744 & 752)), the above instances indicate that officers do not actively exercise their institutionally reserved power to impose their medium preferences. While this interpretation here seems to be plausible, the next section will show counter results and leave this analysis unsatisfactory.
6.3.2. When the officers’ proposals are confirmed/converged by people

This section will look at interactions revealing a different direction of code accommodation: how officers, on the other hand, bring in their proposals and their suggestions are equally acknowledged by the people.

Extract(6) : excerpted from the same recording with extract (5)
Speakers: police officer A and D; men B and woman C (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

[...]
26  D:  Shou-yin-ji de shih bu?
    ‘Is it for the radio FM?’
27  B:  En.
    ‘Hm.’
→ 28  D:  O (.) a in ze en do shou-shih zo ho (.) hia ni dua gi.
    ‘Oh (.) so I guess it must has an excellent connection (.) such a huge antenna.’
→ 29  B:  Zun mei mai la.
    ‘Not too bad.’
→ 30  A:  Siao-jie bu hao yi sih (.) ni de sing-min jiao she mo?
    ‘Miss excuse me (.) what is your name?’
→ 31  C:  XXX.
32  A:  Na sheng-rih?
    ‘Birthday?’
33  C:  XXX.
34  A:  Na jhu jhih?
    ‘Address?’
35  C:  [Mandarin]
36  A:  [Mandarin]
37  C:  [Mandarin]
38  A:  [Mandarin]
    ((Conversation ended))

In turn (28) of this instance, officer D mixed a Mandarin term in his utterance. His proposal of a medium switching to Minnanyu-Mandarin alternation can be treated as a repairable deviance because there seemed to be no function for this switch and the talk was still under the same episode of “Irregularity/Illegality Check” of questions related to the antenna in the car. However, no trouble markers are found. Man B approved Minnanyu being another code for the medium in turn (29), where he himself produced a turn completely in Minnanyu. Therefore, the first transitional places of medium-switching are found in turns (28)-(29), and it is also where the “new alignment at the level of language choice is established” (Gafaranga 2007a:147).

Nevertheless, ensuing turns display a short stretch in monolingual Mandarin medium. One common question asked by speakers and looked into by conversational analysts is: why that now
What can account for the second transitional place of medium switching for returning to a monolingual medium since a bilingual medium has been accepted? One reasonable answer is the participant-related factor. For the persons involved in the conversation, it is noteworthy that from turn (30) onwards, the addressed-to person has become lady C. This intriguing aspect of the co-occurrence of the change in participants involved and medium switching has also been found in Gafaranga and Torras (2002a:6) in that Castilian is used in customers’ interaction with the bar attendant while it is English among the friend group itself. Different as literature may interpret this situation (“situational code-switching” in Gumperz (1982); “sequential unmarked code-switching” in Myers-Scotton (1993) or “participant-related code-switching in Auer (1984), references cited from Gafaranga and Torras (2002a:6)), it simply refers to the fact that the change of speakers who are momentarily involved would possibly bring about a medium switching. Accordingly, turns (31)-(38) form an inserted episode “Identity Inquiry.” While this episode is re-opened due to this change of involved participants, officer A was able to use a different code as another medium proposal. Particularly for this inserted episode, the second transitional place of medium switching is found in turns (30)-(31). In his inquiry of lady C, officer A initially used Mandarin as a proposal of making it to be the switched-to medium. Woman C accepted the proposal and they reached agreement of making Mandarin be the medium.

**Extract (7) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 5 in appendix II**

This exchange was between police officer A and two men (B and C). After briefly asking for information, officers B and C talked a while on the issue of street racers and how difficult it is for police to catch them. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: A si lin yo due?
   ‘Where did you guys say that you will meet each other?’
2. C: Wan (.) yo di (.) he le Seven.
   ‘We (.) said that to meet (.) at Seven.
→ 3. A: Ni yue zai jhe ge Seven (.) a ni jhao de dao o?
   ‘You met up at this Seven (.) and you can find it?”
   ‘He has been here before.’
5. A: O hao (.).
   ‘Oh alright (.)’
   ‘Yeah.’
7. A: Hao (. ) Pai-se (. ) gen ni men kan yi sia (. ) yin wei (. ) sian zai jhen de hen shao (. ) jhe ge shih duan la.
   ‘Yeah (.) sorry (.) I have to take a look at it (.) because (.) there are not many (.) in this hour of time.’
8. C: Wo jhih dao jhe ge shih duan hen shao ren.
   ‘I know that there would not be many people here during this hour of a day.’
9. A: [Mandarin]
10. C: [Mandarin]
11. A: [Mandarin]
12. B: [Mandarin]
13. B: [Mandarin]
14. C: [Mandarin]
→ 15. A: Bu huei (.) er cie (.) ci shih (.) ru guo shih gu lyu na ge de hua (.) fan er (.) li si gon (.)
   shih cyu na bian de biao-che-zu do shih na jhong ci ji-che de a (.) ran hou hai huei
   na gun-bang.
   ‘No (.) and (.) in fact (.) if that is what we concern (.) instead (.) if for example (.) for example
   the street racers in downtown, they all ride motorbikes (.) and they carry big bats.’
16. B: [Mandarin]
17. A: [Mandarin]
18. C: [Mandarin]
19. A: [Mandarin]
20. C: [Mandarin]
21. A: Jhe jhong biao-che-zu ke neng shih (.) gai jhuang che (.) ci-che (.) ji jie (.) ran hou
   jiou shih (.) you shih hou (.) jyu-ji zai yi ci jiou siang (.) che duei (.) zai jyu-ji jhe yang
   → (.) ran hou dan shih (.) muei gong- bu huei shuo siang shih-cyu de na mo ke wu la (.)
   shih cyu jhen de hen bai-mu ye (.) you-mei-you (.) na gun bang (.) kan dou lu ren
   jiou da (.) jhe ge jhen de gen ke wu nie.
   ‘This kind of street racers, they might (.) illegally reform their cars (.) cars (.) and then
   gather a group (.) and then they will (.) sometimes (.) gather together like (.) a car group
   (.) to group together (.) and then but (.) they are not- not as annoying as those you see in
downtown (.) those you see in downtown are really detestable (.) right (.) they take bats (.)
hit pedestrians whenever they see one (.) this behaviour is really detestable.’

Before negotiation sequences are discussed, I shall firstly make clear about the English
passages in turns (2) and (3). As a matter of fact, I would not consider proper names as a case of
language alternation and hence they are excluded from my language alternation investigation.

When turn (3) is put in a piece of transcription paper, it immediately becomes noticeable
because the turns that precede it are all conducted in Minnanyu whereas the following turns are all
in Mandarin. The officer’s attempt to orient to Mandarin in turn (3) has been taken up, in which C
answered in Mandarin in turn (4). Hence, turns (3)-(4) is the location where the transitional place of
medium switching is possibly situated. However, medium negotiation does not end there. If the
negotiation result is sustainable, man C would not deviate his utterance back in Minnanyu in turn
(6). However, the officer still held Mandarin as a preferred choice in turn (7), which may be due to
the Mandarin medium just being held. Officer A’s sticking to Mandarin (in spite of a short insertion
of a Minnanyu term) in the following turn and C’s convergence afterwards made it impossible for
another transitional place of medium switching to emerge.
To further support that speaker’s perspective to medium is as an orderly interactional norm, officer A’s self-repairs in turns (15) and (21) are proof from his orientation to the monolingual Mandarin medium. In ethnomethodology and conversational analysis, one’s reformulation of language choice informs speakers themselves as well as analysts the inner working of a specific social order regulating the language choice (Gafaranga, 2000:345). When A noticed and self-cut his Minnanyu “slip” (this term owes insight from “slip of tongue” studies in the psycholinguistic realm (e.g. Nooteboom, 1973)), his self-repair notifies that the Minnanyu part is misconduct if (and indeed) to be conformed with the medium established. In turn (15), officer spoke of “li si gon” (ENG: if, for example) in Minnanyu and quickly reiterated the same phrase in Mandarin. Similarly, the officer self-corrected himself for the Minnanyu part “muei gong” (ENG: they are not) in turn (21). According to the preference framework of repair in Conversation Analysis (Schegloff et al., 1977:374; Sidnell, 2010:113), it is the preferable situation of “self-repair” rather than “other-initiated repair” found in this instance.

To note, this part of talk is all under the episode of “Chat” and no attempt for an episode shift is found. That is to say, the monolingual Mandarin medium is the communicative norm for this episode, and it may explain why the officer declined man C’s medium switching proposal to Minnanyu in turn (6) as well as the fact the officer self-repaired his Minnanyu slips.

For my research questions asking it is usually the officers or the people has their code/medium preference being negotiated and thus accommodate to the other party’s language preference, the transitional place of medium switching in turns (3)-(4) of the above extract displays that the language choice proposed by the officer is equally assessed by other speakers. Also view extracts (8) and (9) below.

**Extract (8) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 6 in appendix II**

The exchange involved police officers A and C in conversation with men B and D. It began with the police’ feeling of B and D as suspicious because they made a quick reverse as soon as they saw the police. (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

1. A:  A li do a di giao ka hia?  
   ‘Were you at somewhere under the bridge?’
2. B:  He a.  
   ‘Yeah.’
3. A:  A na go se tao?  
   ‘Why did you reverse?’
4. B:  Mo a (.) wa siong gong hia sio an a.  
   ‘Well no (.) I thought that it was too dark there.’

27
11. C: Cha-zu gang li bun ran?
    ‘Are you the car owner yourself?’
    ‘Yes.’
→ 13. C: E (. ) sian-sheng (. ) wo (. ) jheng-jian gen ni kan yi sia hao bu hao?
    ‘Mister (. ) I (. ) let me take a look at your ID, ok?’
    ‘I didn’t bring it.’
15. C: Mei dai o.
    ‘Didn’t bring it.’
    ‘You can check.’
17. C: Lai (. ) shen-fen-jheng zih hao.
    ‘Alright (. ) your ID number.

[...]

The first transitional place of medium switching

    ‘Where do you live?’
→ 25. D: Gong kuan a (. ) XX lo (. ) di wan dao au-bia nia.
    ‘The same (. ) XX Road (. ) his place is just right behind mine.’
26. A: Zo bin a mue?
    ‘Finished the military service yet?’
27. D: A mue.
    ‘Not yet.’

Extract (7) is an explicit instance in which the officer initiated the medium switching proposal along with an episode shift. Before turn (13), the previous turns are all in Minnanyu for the institutional episode “Check-up Request.” When the police asked to check the questioned people’s ID, the talk shifted to the mundane episode “Identity Inquiry,” in which a medium switching is possible and can be proposed as a “contextualisation cue” (Gumperz, 1982; Torras, 1998). In turn (13), officer C proposed Mandarin as the language choice and it was taken up by man B for the following turns. Therefore, the first transitional place of medium switching is located at turns (13)-(14), where a medium proposal was revealed and then certified. After the ID check was finished, officer A’s Minnanyu utterance in turn (24) signalled an end to the current episode and made a move to the new episode of “General Information Check.” Another language was proposed for an organisational boundary. The officer’s proposal was recognised by man D from his response in Minnanyu. In the two transitional places of medium switching observed in this extract, it is noteworthy that officers were active in proposing medium changes too, and as extracts (7) and (8) show, their proposals were accepted. Now consider the last example.
Extract (9) - for the complete transcript, see Recording 2 in appendix II

This exchange involves police officer A interviewing men B and C. The officer saw these two teenagers in front of a convenience store and approached them to ask questions. (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

[...]
88. A: Duei a (. ) a ni men zao dian siou-si a.
   ‘Yeah (. ) you two should have an early rest.’
89. C: Ni bu yao zou, ni bu yao zou (. ) sa-hen-da.
   ‘Don’t go, don’t go (. ) Sa-Hen-Da.’
90. A: Ga di liou chu lai zih-ji siao sin ne (. ) hao bu hao?
   ‘You need to be careful since you got out secretly (. ) ok?’
91. B: Ho la.
   ‘Okay.’
   → 92 A: A ni you mei you chih bin-lang?
      ‘Do you eat betel coconut?’
   → 93. B: Mei you.
      ‘No.’
94. A: Jhih you ni chih o?
      ‘Only you take it?’
95. C: I mo (. ) i lai gia gia ge-bai.
      ‘He doesn’t (. ) he is just here for the fried chicken fillet.’
96. A: A (. ) you mei you chou yan?
      ‘Well (. ) you smoke?’
97. B: Mei you.
      ‘No.’
98. A: Mei you (. ) a ni le?
      ‘No (. ) what about you?’
99. C: You (. ) a ke-shih wo bi kiao shao chou.
      ‘I do (. ) but I smoke less cigarettes recently.’
100. A: [Mandarin]
101. B: [Mandarin]
102. A: [Mandarin]
103. B: [Mandarin]
104. A: [Mandarin]
105. C: [Mandarin]
   ((Conversation ended))

In this extract, a Minnanyu-Mandarin bilingual medium was adopted before turn (75). However, as the talk seemed to proceed to a closure in that as mostly found in the data, officers attempted to close check-up talks by reminding people of their safety again, officers A in turn (88) and (90) reminded man B and C’s of their safety and it seemed that a closure would arrive soon. Nevertheless, officer “moved out of the closing” (Button, 1987; Liddicoat, 2011) by getting on to another “Chat” episode. Liddicoat (2011:307-308) shows that speakers’ tying of each others’ utterance “okay” is a typical closing sequence, similarly, officer A has uttered “okay” to “provides a
slot for another participant to do the same” (Liddicoat, 2011:307). Although man B’s “okay” could
be “the second pre-closing component” (Liddicoat, 2011:307) and the talk could be terminated after
it, officer A moved out from a possible closing spot. Along with this move, officer proposed another
language choice to clearly signal that he still had something to ask. Thus, the last transitional place
of medium switching is found in turns (92)-(93). Man B firstly accepted officer’s proposal, and man
C switched to speak in Mandarin as well after turn (99).

As mentioned, bilingual speakers recognise their talk with the concept of interactional
episode and they organise conversation as well as negotiate for language choice at the same time
particular talk type are contributive to speakers because through this step-by-step interaction,
speakers can fulfill their goal in completing relative institutional tasks. In the police and public
check-up encounter, examples have presented that the officers’ goal is to clear their suspicion about
the questioned people and the latter need to prove their innocence. Throughout the episodes to
fulfill this task, medium re-negotiations are likely to be observed from transitional places of
medium switching and at the spots where the episode is about to shift. From above two subsections
respectively show people’s as well as officers’ medium proposal and their accommodation works,
enough examples can now lead to the discussion section to summarise the result for the research
hypothesis.

Chapter 7. Discussion and Conclusion

7.1. Police’s institutional power as independent from medium negotiation: power is “not”
seen in medium negotiation

This complication of how institutional power may have an effect on a bilingual’s medium
negotiation starts to become noticeable from my previous project (Lee, 2011). This possible
interrelation of police power and a bilingual’s medium negotiation as observed in my previous
project (Lee, 2011) leads me to formulate the hypothesis in this dissertation: power as medium
negotiation. That is, whether medium negotiation sequences may or may not be the site for police to
exercise or rather, to mitigate power.

In order to test the validity of my hypothesis, I look at three places. The first two places are
medium negotiations of the results orienting to either monoilingual medium or bilingual medium.
Furthermore, I include the concept of episode structure and speakers- possible medium switching
along with an episode shift (Torras, 1998). Therefore, I look at more extensive medium negotiation
sequences; for the proof of my hypothesis, the third place I look into is the transitional place of
medium switching, where speakers propose a different preferred code and such proposals are
accepted and become the medium for following turns.
For the monolingual medium where speakers settle in for a period of time, instances (1), (2) and elsewhere in my data have presented that in the opening sequence of the mundane episode of “Check-up Request,” officers are always the initiators of conversation and noteworthy, they frequently accommodate to people’s language choice in that opening sequence. That is, a monolingual medium is usually settled in the beginning sequence through the police’s accommodation. Significantly, the data suggests that accommodation work may be done from speaker’s different concerns. Extract (1) gives a typical example of the officer’s accommodation to the questioned person’s language choice. Differently, extract (2) shows that the Filipino man’s “competence-related preference” (Gafaranga, 2001:1916) led to the officer’s accommodation. Language negotiation as Auer (1984:20-21) understands, “begins with a disagreement between two or more parties about which language to use for interaction, and ends as soon as one of them ‘give in’ to the other preferred language.” Given this fact, in the situation that mediums are established after officers’ accommodation, it can be said that officers “gave in” in relation to their language preference. At this stage, the hypothesis “power as medium negotiation” can perhaps obtain in that it seems that officers tried to mitigate their power and be deferent in the aspect of language choice.

The second place to detect the hypothesis is speakers’ language negotiation toward a bilingual medium. An unsupported result to the hypothesis has been found here. Although the opening sequence is mostly found to be maintained in a monolingual medium through the police’s accommodation, instances from extract (3) onwards present that the agreed medium does not need to be carried all the way through like a contract that speakers sign. Rather, medium switching can take place as a functional switch (Gafaranga, 2007a:146). Most importantly, data shows that both officers and people proposed medium switching. Extract (3) shows that the bilingual medium as it was later established was actually not the medium adopted in the beginning. Following that, two meaningful points are worth mentioning: (1) bilingual speakers’ conversation need not stay in one medium throughout, that is, any medium as it appears to speakers at a particular moment can be a switched-to medium (2) of its importance to the hypothesis, this case shows that the officer also expressed his language preference, proposed it, and his language choice was accepted by the people and led to the medium.

The third site for proving the hypothesis is extended to longer extracts where transitional places of medium switching are indicated. As mentioned, these places are very important for the examined issue because in those turns where medium switching was about to occur, it can be noted down whether it was the officers or the people initiating a medium re-negotiation sequence and which side of them accommodated to such proposals of medium switching. Because of this, it helps to scrutinise if there is any asymmetrical power affecting a speaker’s language choice. For the two subsections I clearly divided matters into “when the officers accommodate to people’s medium proposal whereas their proposals are rejected” and “when the police’s proposals are confirmed/ converged on by people,” extracts indicate that the research hypothesis cannot be sustained. This is simply because results have revealed that a speaker’s proposal for medium switching and subsequent accommodation works are not found in any one-way direction of one particular party regardlessly proposing his/her language preference to constrain other speakers’ proposals. Thus, my
presupposition of power as medium negotiation and the police’s powers permeating to a bilingual’s language choice does not prevail in the data.

The current data shows that the hypothesis generated from my previous project cannot be sustained inasmuch as the police’s as well as people’s medium-switching proposals are equally taken into regard by speakers themselves. Moreover, the salient power relation as described in the literature of police-public discourse (e.g. Thurnsborrow, 2002:) does not have the same kind of police force brought into the aspect of officers’ and people’s language choice. When there are no direct links found for any power-related hierarchy affecting how officers and people deal with their language negotiation sequences, bilingual speakers’ medium negotiation is rather “independent” from the power relation in the police institution, and most importantly, power is “not” seen in medium negotiation.

7.2. Medium negotiation: accommodation occurs at the level of negotiation itself

Given that medium negotiation is the central issue this dissertation looks into, one essential aspect needs to be noted, it is that accommodation occurs at the level of negotiation itself. When bilingual speakers negotiate for a medium that they can commonly orient to, two possibilities will occur: either one’s medium proposal is accommodated or disagreed with. As Auer says (1984:20-21), the medium negotiation sequence begins from a divergence in speakers’ language preference, but once speakers have adopted the medium, there is no negotiation. The medium maintains until speakers re-negotiate for a medium change. Speaker’s proposals casting the request of medium re-negotiation are initially brought into conversation as a departing act from the medium. However, many places in extracts have presented that speakers locally decide whether a specific deviance needs repairing (e.g. the self-repair in extract 7) or it can be a functional switch that for instance, speakers use medium switching as a conversational strategy to shift to another episode (e.g. extracts 4, 6, 8 and 9). What these facts about medium negotiation suggest to the research hypothesis is that while bilingual speakers face the need to negotiate and decide their “language-of-interaction” (Auer, 1984:30), accommodation work naturally occurs as one resolution to conclude a negotiation sequence and thus speakers can reach the same medium.

Having considered this feature, it is not markedly uncommon for either officers or the public to converge with or diverge from the other party’s language preference since they are all in a decision-making spot to negotiate for a medium, and their accommodation to the other’s language choice is one of the strategies to have a negotiation result. Therefore, a one-to-one mapping between the police’s given force and the same force upheld into medium negotiation cannot obtain in reality. Extracts have yielded instances equally found for officers’ accommodation to people’s language preference as well as the questioned people converged to officers’ medium proposal. Considering that accommodation occurs on the level of negotiation itself, it is inevitable to see accommodation either done by the officers or people because as bilingual speakers engaged in a medium negotiation sequence, accommodation work is deployed by speakers so as to resolve a language choice dilemma.
In an institutional context, if language choice accommodation is affected completely by one specific party, the “asymmetry” as usually talked about in discourse studies of institutional settings (e.g. courtrooms (Atkinson et al., 1979), news interviews (Heritage et al., 2010) or classroom interactions (McHoul, 1978)) and specifically police institution settings (Haworth, 2006; Thournborrow, 2002) would indeed affect a bilingual speaker’s right because when he/she is situated in an institutional setting like this, there will be an issue regarding whose medium proposal needs to be taken into consideration first. In my previous project (Lee, 2011:15), the great tendency of the police’s language accommodation is explained as officers’ acting to level down their institutional autoritativeness and thus officers are able to mitigate an identity-related separateness. This dissertation in contrast, rather finds that the concept of medium negotiation being the site intervened by power is not and cannot be empirically justified by the current data. In line with Auer (1984, 1995) and Gafaranga (1999:21), speaker’s language choice is a “practical social action” and any medium established after negotiation sequences is the “speakers' own achievement” (Gafaranga & Torras 2001:210); therefore, accommodation work can be enacted by every speaker is one of the resolutions to conclude a language negotiation sequence and reach the medium. Considering accommodation as a negotiation strategy, now this idea could probably explain why the institutional parameter does not come in to affect whether officers or the public ought to accommodate the other party’s language choice in all conditions.

7.3. Two social norms in two sets of identities

The third research questions can now be answered properly. The question is shown below for the reader’s ease.

(3) For the dual-identity of speakers’ behaviour of doing being “officers and people” as well as doing being “bilingual speakers,” which task in these two identities is of primary importance that speakers attend to in the data: the medium negotiation for the “communicative norm in bilingual conversation,” or, the carried-out “interactional norm of police-public talk” (e.g. institutional role and duty)?

Although my presumption “power as medium negotiation” is not supported by the current research, the results are rather significant for a concept reconstruction. That is, in asking whether there is a level of priority difference in participants to do as “being bilingual speakers” or “being police vs. the public” and how this priority difference possibly affects speakers’ interaction considering the other identity they have, extracts above have all shown that speakers do not particularly orient to or neglect any of these two identities. Moreover, as bilingual speakers in check-up encounters, participants have the goal that they talk and interact into the being of the context (the check-up encounter) as well as who they are in the context (officers vs. the public and bilingual speakers to bilingual speakers), and the investigated speakers can all cope with these tasks at the same time.
To take Garfinkel’s (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984) ethnomethodological insight in that human interactions are according to social norms, presented in an orderly manner to speakers and Gafaranga and Torras’ (2001, 2002a) emphasis of the orderliness in language choice, as a matter of fact, the examined case of speakers’ interaction in check-up events has revealed that there are two different social norms co-managed by participants at the same time. These two social norms are respectively interactional norms in “police-public talk in the police institution setting” and “bilingual speakers’ language choice negotiation.” From the results, it is important to note that these two norms do not impede speakers’ involvement and fulfillment into realising their different identities.

In the first set of interactional norm (police-public talk in police institution setting), the officers and questioned people carry out the institutional business as illustrated in Figure 1. Also, speakers’ institutional identities are performed and then acquired through their way of talking toward the norm of police-public interaction (e.g. Q-A sequence: police ask questions to clear suspicion whereas people answer and wait for police’s judgement if they have violated anything against the regulation). To consider this institution-related social norm, conversational analysis has offered the concept of “context-renewing” (Heritage & Clayman, 2010:32), which highlights participants’ own behaviour of their talking into the being in the institution, and their way of talking to lead to the accomplishment of institutional tasks and identities. Similarly to what is observed in the data, participants’ talking locally constructs every check-up talk and they direct their speech according to the social norm of police-public interaction in mind. In the meantime, speakers also engage in their pursuit of the second norm - the social norm in bilinguals’ negotiation of language choice and the medium search. Clearly pointed out in the notion of medium (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, 2002a), after a medium is adopted as the norm for language-of-interaction, bilingual speakers can differentiate deviant language choice from normative conducts. Taking the idea of Heritage’s (1988) deviant cases analysis and the studies of speaker’s repair in conversation analysis (Schegloff et al., 1977), the officer’s self-repair in extract (7) has clearly displayed that language choice is another social norm.

At this point, the third research question I posited early in this dissertation should be able to find an answer. On the basis of current research results, it is improper to decide a degree of difference for which of these two social norms and different identities are more crucial and affect how participants act differently. Results show that these two sets of social norms are sought and realised by speakers who also establish their identities as “officers vs. the public” and “bilingual speaker to bilingual speaker” at the same time. To answer the research question, this research does not find speakers showing any level of priority difference for which social norm or identity are to be attended to first. Moreover, participants’ talk fit into roles either as police/the public or bilingual speakers in two parallelly existent interactional norms.

7.4. Concluding remark

This dissertation starts with the research hypothesis “power as medium negotiation.” The goal of this research has been to prove that whether the institution-related factor will be influential or not
to affect a bilingual speaker’s right in equally proposing their own language preferences when he/ she is respectively taking the role of being the officer or the questioned people. I divide the findings into three subsections with respect to different scales of medium negotiation. From the smallest scale of negotiation to the most extensive one, my inspection is carried out step by step from: (1) speakers’ negotiation toward a monolingual medium (2) speakers’ negotiation toward a bilingual medium (3) transitional places of medium switching. Throughout instances from these three sections, the hypothesis is not supported. There is no consistent results to point out any tendency of either officers or the public “giving in” in terms of their language preference and converging to others’ language choice in all conditions. What is significantly presented from the data is that a speaker’s language choice convergence is not unidirectional; there is no particular party entirely converging to others’ medium proposal all the time. Just as speakers can accept a language choice proposal, speakers can also decline such requests.

During the proof finding process, several phenomena regarding medium negotiation explain why speakers’ institutional identities and context cannot have an overwhelming impact on a speaker’s language choice. There are other considerations that still make speakers feel the need to negotiate for the medium. The first consideration is one’s lack of competency in the language that the other proposes. This is already exemplified in the extract of officer’s convergence owing to the filipino man’s “competence-related preference” (Gafaranga, 2001:1916). In line with Gafaranga and Torras’ (2001, 2002a) medium concept in that bilingual speakers have their own social norm regulating each other’s language choice, extracts revealing one’s self-repair as well as how one’s proposal of medium switching got rejected all embody that there is a norm of language choice (the medium) that officers and people orient to. Lastly, both officers and the public are found to re-negotiate another medium while they were about to transit to another episode. Therefore, it echoes what Torras (1998) says about speakers’ switch of code(s)/medium as a “contextualisation cue” (Gumperz, 1982; Auer, 1984, 1995) to signal an episode shift. In the data, this contextualisation cue was used by both the officers and people. Because this kind of medium change is functional for signaling an episode shift, the medium switching as talked about in Gafaranga (2007a:146) occurs in the findings too.

In this dissertation, I have examined the issue involving the interplay between a bilingual’s language preference, their medium negotiation and how all these are presented in police check-up encounters. The findings have allowed me to disprove the presumption. Furthermore, the research results summarise that the institutional parameter does not come in to affect officers’ and people’s medium negotiation. In fact, it has been observed that officers and people orient to two sets of social norms and they not only talk into the being of the institutional roles as “police vs. the public” but also into the being of “bilingual speakers” from medium negotiation sequences. That is, while the check-up event is in essence goal-oriented and speakers perform specific institutional tasks, in the meantime, they also locally negotiate their language-of-interaction as bilingual speakers do.

In answering research questions, this dissertation has, it is to be hoped, contributed to a cross-disciplinary investigation on the issue of institutional power/identity and its relevance to bilingual speakers’ rights in medium negotiation. While there seems to be a lack of comprehensive discussion addressing this topic in the literature, this case study offers results and implies that medium
negotiation is a matter rather independent from institution-related considerations, such as speakers performing their talk into acquiring their institutional roles and their talk into making the context institutional. To recall this dissertation’s title where a question is asked, at this stage, I may be able to answer that medium negotiation is out of the power game in the police institution on the basis of the findings I collected from Hsian-Gong Branch. Hence, my research indicates a start for a route of investigation and invites more research with larger scale data from different regions of Taiwan to confirm my current conclusion. Meanwhile, this research needs to wait for similar research done in other countries for a compare and contrast, should there be any cross-national distinctiveness in how officers deploy power differently.

Transcription conventions

The below transcript symbols are used in the transcription to indicate details of speakers’ utterances. These symbols have been widely adopted in conversation analysis and they are largely developed from Jefferson (1984) in spite of certain variations across studies.

Minnanyu The plain font stands for the segment of utterance in Minnanyu.
Mandarin The boldface stands for the segment of utterance in Mandarin.
English The italic font stands for the segment of utterance in English.
→ The arrow symbol indicated in front of the number of the turn means that special attention should be given to this particular turn for it contains discussion-worthy elements.
( ) Stands for a short pause of approximately 0.5 seconds.
(( )) Stands for the extralinguistic information.
{?} Means that a particular part in the talk is not clearly recorded and thus it is not intelligible and cannot be transcribed.
- The dash marked right after the word means speaker’s sudden cut-off of what he/she just said.
[ The left bracket refers to the onset of a particular overlapped segment.
] The right bracket refers to the ending point where the overlapped part terminates.
[...] Marks that a segment of talk has not been included in the main text for the analysis.
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Appendices

I. 1. The informed consent form (English translation)

Informed Consent Form

RESEARCH TITLE: Medium negotiation, in or out of the power game in police institution: a case study of police check-up encounters in the An-Nan District of southern Taiwan

INVESTIGATOR: Wan-Hsuan Olive Lee

I am currently a Master’s student in the programme of Applied Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh. At the moment, I am working on my dissertation on the topic of language choice in a bilingual background. For the conversation you just had with the police officers, the talk was being tape recorded. I will give a close look to the language choice that you used for communication whilst talking with the police. This research focuses on language and social interaction in police’s interaction with people, and your response helps me to have a better understanding of it.

Within the conversation, it may include unpleasant matters such as job loss or the general wellbeing. However, you have every right to decline the track to be used by the investigator, and the recording will then be eliminated in a minute. If you are willing to have your recording studied, you are hereafter to confirm your consent of participation and contribution.

Your recording will be stored only by the investigator for purely academic purpose. This is a completely anonymous collection process, so please feel totally assured that your name will not be cited.

After your name is being signed, it represents that you are now a participant who knows the voluntariness of your participation. You have been informed the potential risk that this check-up conversation may invade your private matters, but to compensate, the confidentiality of subject’s personal information is doubtlessly guaranteed. You have also been suggested to keep researcher’s contact information should you have any questions.

Person who acquires the consent form (signature)

_________________________

Witness Signature (if any) ____________________

Participant(s) Signature(s) ____________________

Date ____________________

Contact information
For questions about the research, you may call (+44) 7586-500-344 or email olive7402@gmail.com
I. 2. The informed consent form (The Chinese version for actual use)

受访者同意書／錄音使用同意書

論文題目：探討語種媒介之協調與特定機構背景下的權限力施展之相互關連: 針對台灣台南市安南區警察同仁盤查民眾場景之個案研究

調查者：李宛璇 (英國愛丁堡大學，應用語言學碩士研究生)

你好，研究者(我)本身目前為英國愛丁堡大學應用語言學的碩士研究生，目前正在為畢業論文進行研究，其研究內容旨於探討在多語環境下每個人的語言選擇。您剛剛與警察同仁的對話已被錄下。在錄下的對話內容中，我將會針對您選擇使用的語言來進行詳細分析。此研究重點為觀察警察與民眾間的語言互動還有社會性關係互動。而您的錄音將會助益我在這方面的有進展性的了解。
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II. Recording transcripts

RECORDING (1)

Exchange took place involving police officer A inquiring of man B and woman C. The reason for the officer’s inquiries was because he found this couple parked the car inside a park and stayed inside the car in the middle of the night. (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

1. A: **Sian-sheng** (.) pai-se (.) ga li kua gi lia gin-gia ho mo (.) in-wi gia (.) gia ka (.) ka gio ran lai la.
   ‘Mister (.) excuse me (.) can I take a look at your ID? Because here (.) there are not many (.) not many people come here.’
2. B: Ka gio ran di gia.
   ‘Not so many people come here.’
3. A: A li lai gia cho-gua ni?
   ‘So you’re here for the karaoke?’
4. B: N.
   ‘Yes.’
5. C: **Zen yang ma?**
   ‘What’s happening?’
6. A: Huh (.) **mei-guan-si** (.) a wo ye gen ni kan yi sia jheng jian (.) jiou shih (.) jian dan kan yi sia (.) ho gia wo si zun (.) ho gong-hm ka gio ran (.) a don-ran-sua wu si zun-
   ‘Huh? It’s all cool (.) well (.) I will have to look at your ID (.) just (.) to take a quick look. Sometimes here (.) not many people would be here in the park (.) and sometimes the XXX (.)’
7. C: **Jhe-bian shih gong-yuan?**
   ‘Here is a park?’
8. A: Zah-a e lai bia a ne.
   ‘There will be thieves to steal.’
9. C: **Kan bu chu shih gong-yuan ye** ((laughter))
   ‘I can’t see that it’s a park.’
10. A: Huh?
    ‘Sorry?’
11. C: **Kan bu chu jhe-bian shih gong-yuan ye** ((laughter))
    ‘I can’t tell that here’s a park.’
    ‘Oh. It’s actually the green zone in the middle.’
13. C: **Wo siang shuo huh (.) jhe-bain shih gong-yuan (.) kan bu chu lai** ((laughter))
    ‘I was thinking (.) what (.) it’s a park (.) I can’t tell that.’
14. B: **Kan bu chu.**
    ‘Can’t tell it.’
15. C: **Zih-ji ye jyue de hen huai-yi shih bu shih gong-yuan a.**
    ‘I also doubt that it is a park.’
16. A: **Guei gua la (.) ta guei gua shih jhe yang-**
    ‘It is about the plan (.) that is how it is planned-
17. B: **Lyu di la.**
    ‘The green zone.’
18. A: **Duei lyu di la ( ) jhong-jian de lyu di ( ) jhe yang.**
   ‘Yeah the green zone ( ) the green zone in the middle ( ) that’s how it is.’

19. C: **A ke-shih yo mei yo rang siao-peng-yo wan de di fang.**
   ‘But there is no place for kids to play.’

20. B: **Su-o yi jhu-yao ran e tao mang dien-rang.**
   ‘So usually there are thieves to take the wire away.’

21. A: **Duei a ( ) wu si zun e tao mang dien-sua.**
   ‘Yeah ( ) sometimes they take the wire away.’

22. C: **Dian-lan ( ) dian-lan shih na li a?**
   ‘The wire ( ) where is the wire?’

23. B: A ( ) **dian ( ) he lai-dei de dien-rang he e ga ga a.**
   ‘Ah ( ) the wi- ( ) the wire is inside of it and can be cut.’

24. A: He a ( ) li a kua ( ) he wu si zun he ( ) chu he wu si zun ( ) li le kua ( ) hi gi dien hue die ho ( ) diong-en e-ka hia ( ) **ji-zuo na bian ( ) shih-bu-shih yo yi kuai ( ) ni kan dao kong kong de ( ) a na-ge ( ) ci-shih jheng chang de hua ( ) ta ying-gai shih sang-main do yao yo gai-zih ( ) a ke-neng ( ) yo ke-neng shih shih-gong la ( ) ma gong mei dia ( ) a wu si zun ma ko ning si-**‘Yeah ( ) look at there ( ) sometimes that ( ) sometimes ( ) look at there ( ) look at that streetlamp ( ) in the middle or down the part of it, near the lamp’s base ( ) isn’t there a box ( ) you see the hollow part of it ( ) as for that ( ) if in the normal condition ( ) it should come with a lid covered on the top of it ( ) there is supposed to be a iron lid to be put above it ( ) but maybe ( ) it could be under construction ( ) you never know ( ) but sometimes it could be.’

25. C: A so i lai-day de si dien-sua.
   ‘So the wire is in it’

26. A: **Duei ( ) dien-sian ( ) a li de dui lai-de ga dng ( ) a ran-ho ( ) gi ma lai-de dng a ( ) tong a ( ) yu ( ) ho ge e kuan ( ) a ( ) gio gu-la le bia.**
   ‘Yeah ( ) the wire ( ) and they will cut out from the inside ( ) and then ( ) the copper material in it ( ) the copper material ( ) if the market price goes high ( ) and ( ) they would do it rather frequently.’

27. B: Dng gi gong-ging lnm-bah-ong.
   ‘The price of copper per kg is probably 250 NTD.’

28. A: A lin si du a me chong-gua hai-shih?
   ‘So you guys are just going to the karaoke or?’

   ‘Yeah.’

30. A: Me li mi?
   ‘Going in?’

   ‘Yes.’

32. A: He ( ) ging ( ) ging ( ) mo bao-sio ma?
   ‘That ( ) now ( ) now ( ) there is no private room for now?’

33. B: Wu la.
   ‘There are.’

34. A: Wu la ho.
   ‘Ok, there are.’

35. B: Dam ran le.
   ‘Waiting for somebody.’
36. **A:** Dam ran (. hong (. ho ho ho.
   ‘Waiting for somebody. Okay (. alright alright alright.’

37. **C:** **Deng-ren a.**
   ‘We wait for somebody.’

38. **A:** Na zih -ji siao sin ne (. yin-wei (. do a he (. gi si (. i si guei hua gong gi le cha de (. suan shih (. jhih yo dam-sing-dao jhe bian.
   ‘Then you guys take care of yourselves (. because (. here this lane (. actually (. it is regulated that (. this lane is (. one-direction only.’

39. **C:** A? Sia mi? Gua mo.
   ‘Ah? What? We could not tell.’

40. **A:** **Bu guo (. gia ka gio ran zai la (. a li-cha ze mo ying-siang jiao-tong de long hai hao la (. he a (. a jhih shih ting zai jhe-bian bi jiao tu-wu yi dian la.
   ‘But (. not so many people know this about here (. and it is alright since it does not affect the traffic (. yeah (. but it is kind of weird to park your car here.’

41. **C:** **O hao (. duei-bu-ci duei-bu-ci.
   ‘Oh okay (. sorry sorry.’

42. **A:** **Bu huei bu huei (. a ni-men zih ji siao-sin jiou hao le (. sie sie.
   ‘Not really not really (. just take care of yourselves (. thank you.’
This exchange involves police officer A interviewing men B and C. The officer saw these two teenagers in front of a convenience store and approached them to ask questions. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: A lin (.) due ran?
   ‘Where do you come from?’
2. B: Huh {?}
   ‘Huh? {?’}
3. A: Lin gon due lai?
   ‘You said that where you are from?’
4. B: Zia hu-gin nia
   ‘Just somewhere nearby.’
5. A: Huh?
   ‘What?’
   ‘Just somewhere nearby.’
7. A: Hu-gin si due?
   ‘Where is that nearby place?’
8. B: XX
   ‘XX.’
9. A: De-gi le (.) a li de-gi dua due (.) gan wu dua gin-gia?
   ‘What about address (.) what is your address (.) do you bring your ID?’
10. B: Wa ma n-zai me en nua gon.
    ‘I don’t know how to describe it.’
11. A: Mo li (.) li gui hue?
    ‘So you (.) how old are you?’
    ‘{?} high school.’
13. A: Gao-jhong a oh (.) a li ta due gi ging (.) lin zer-hue ta gao-jhong e ni?
    ‘Oh you are in high school (.) which school do you go to (.) you two go to the same school?’
14. C: Wa zu lai me min-gia zia nia.
    ‘I just went out to grab something to eat.’
15. A: Li due due zu lai me min-gia zia? Ke-Cheng o? A si due?
    ‘Where did you get out to get food? From XX? Or?’
    ‘From XX.’
17. A: A lin (.) sun due gi gin go- gao-jhong?
    ‘So for you two, which hi- which high school is it?’
    ‘XX.’
19. A: Tiam-Ran Gong Shang (.) a lin gin e dun zu lai o?
    ‘XX high school (.) and you two can go out from school now?’
20. B: Mo a (.) [wan di-gia zu lai.]
    ‘No (.) [we just got out.]’
21. C: [Tao zao zu lau.]
"[Went out secretly.]

22. A:  Huh?
     ‘What?’

23. B:  [Wan zao zu lai me min-gia zia e.]
     ‘[We got out secretly just to get some food.]’

24. C:  [Tao zao zu lai me min-gia zia e.]
     ‘[We got out secretly just to get some food.]’

25. A:  Lin (.) lin (.) a gin a li si kin (.) si (.) san-bu jia (.) a si de-
     ‘You (.) you (.) you two have got a leave permit for (.) that (.) leave permit for a strolling
     (.) or you-’

26. B:  Tao zao zu lai e.
     ‘Went out secretly.’

27. A:  Huh?
     ‘What?’

28. B:  Tao zao zu lai.
     ‘Went out secretly.’

29. C:  Tao zao zu lai.
     ‘Went out secretly.’

30. A:  A (.) n si wu jiao-guan ma?
     ‘Well (.) aren’t there drillmasters?’

31. B:  Mm (.) wan de si tao zao zu lai a.
     ‘Yeah (.) but we just went out secretly.’

32. C:  A (.) wan de zao zu lai a.
     ‘Well (.) we just went out.’

33. A:  A jiao-guan le zong sa?
     ‘What did the drillmasters do?”

34. B:  Wan kua (.) dio a (.) wan kua dio a i di hia zun a.
     ‘We saw (.) yeah (.) he was doing his patrol there.’

35. A:  A lin de (.) ma zu lai me min-gia zia nia.
     ‘So you just (.) went out to buy some food.’

     ‘Yeah.’

37. C:  Ba-do iou mei.
     ‘We are hungry.’

38. A:  Ba-do iou nia (.) a (.) ai bin-an dun ki nie.
     ‘We are just hungry (.) well (.) you have got to get back safely.’

39. B:  Huh (.) e la.
     ‘What (.) yeah we will.’

40. A:  Mon mon gia la (.) gia hia gin (.) diou-a se hia ze go gia ge-bai.
     ‘Eat it slowly (.) you eat that fast (.) you have got that many pimples and you are having
     a fried chicken fillet.’

41. B:  ((laughter)) Gia li chong ki a.
     ‘I am afraid that you will take it from me.’

42. A:  Gia wa chong ki (.) mue la (.) sho ho e (.) ging-za sho ho e.
     ‘Afraid that I will take it (.) no I won’t (.) are the best (.) officers are the best.’

43. C:  Li lai sun-lo o?
     ‘You are here for patrolling?’

44. A:  Huh?
45. C: Li lai sun-lo o?
   ‘You’re here for patrolling?’
46. A: Duei a (.) kan shuo (.) zen mo siao-peng-you zai jhe bian.
   ‘Yeah (.) I was thinking (. . .) how come there are teenagers here.’
47. B: ((laughter))
48. C: ((laughter))
49. A: Li zui hong hong li si gia sa (.) bin-lnn ni (.) a gia sa?
   ‘What are you eating? You’re mouth is kind of red (. . .) Eating the betel nut? (. . .) or?’
50. C: Bin-lnn (.) a en go tu diou a.
   ‘The betel nut (. . .) but I have thrown it away.’
51. A: A gui hui li de le gia bin-lnn (.) li due ran?
   ‘You are still that young and you eat betel nuts now (. . .) where are you from?’
52. C: XX.
   ‘XX’
53. A: Huh (. . .) XX.
   ‘What (. . .) XX.’
54. C: An-Din hi bin a.
   ‘It is near XX.’
55. A: An-Din oh (. . .) a du Tian-Ren (. . .) Tian-Ren bu shih zai (. . .) zai na li a?
   ‘XX (. . .) and you go to the school of XX (. . .) isn’t XX in (. . .) where is it?’
56. C: Hi le (.) Syue-Jia.
   ‘It’s in (. . .) XX.’
57. A: Duei a (. . .) yo yi dian yuan ye.
   ‘Yeah (. . .) so that is a bit far.’
58. C: Ze hou-chia.
   ‘We take school bus.’
59. B: Hou-chia.
   ‘School bus.’
60. A: Ze hou-chia gue o.
   ‘Go to school by school bus.’
61. C: Wa gin-ma so-ha dua hia a (. . .) a gin si tou-za zue (. . .) zue hi zong iou-lan chia-gue hi zong.
   ‘I now live in the dorm there (. . .) and now in the morning, we have to take (. . .) take a kind of tour bus to.’
62. A: Gue Yong-Kang e Ke-Cheng shong-bun la ho?
   ‘To the XX in Yong-Kang for work?’
63. B: Shong-bun.
   ‘For work.’
64. C: Ki hia shong-bun.
   ‘To work here.’
65. A: Snn shong-bun la ho?
   ‘It’s like working, right?’
   ‘Yeah.’
67. C: Wan di hia ze DJ (. . .) DJ DJ.
   ‘I work there (. . .) as a DJ (.) DJ DJ.’
68. B: ((laughter))
69. C: (laughter)
70. A: A gin-ma si a nia (.) dio-gou o?
   ‘So what is it that you are doing right now? (. ) going nuts?’
71. C: DJ a (.) ai tiou-mou (.) DJ DJ.
   ‘A DJ (. ) needs to dance (. ) DJ DJ.’
72. A: Bun gua e ni?
   ‘You play the music?’
73. B: Mo la (. ) he si chi-bua he a.
   ‘No (. ) we are there to clean the disc.’
74. C: ((Singing - lyrics: ru-guo wo shih DJ ni huei ai wo ma?)
   ‘- lyrics: If I were a DJ, would you fall in love with me?’
75. A: O li si le chi-bua-a o (. ) sha mi bua-a?
   Dian zih yi ci o?
   ‘Oh you are there to clean the disk (. ) what kind of disc (. ) for the technical machines?’
76. B: En zai (. ) wa en zai he sa.
   ‘No idea (. ) I don’t know what that is.’
77. C: Zun gi-hai e la.
   ‘It should be machines’ coverages.’
78. A: Gi-hai o.
   ‘Coverages for machines.’
79. B: En, si la (. ) de (. ) hi zun he (. ) ing-ing he (. ) kou be (. ) wa en zai ia sa (. ) lu a lu (. ) lu lu lu (. ) a lu chon ki (. ) a de ga he (. ) dun gue (. ) a iou go sua gue (. ) a iou go (. ) lu lu lu lu lu.
   ‘Yeah right (. ) it is (. ) it is that (. ) the one in a circular shape (. ) hell (. ) I don’t know what that is (. ) we just (. ) clean it and clean it (. ) to clean it (. ) and we will (. ) turn it around (. ) and to turn it around again (. ) and we will (. ) continue to clean it.’
80. A: Zai huan die jhe yang (. ) zai gua die jhe yang (. ) ni de gong-zuo jiong shih zai gua die {?} a lin n de gai za de ai ki lai a ba.
   ‘Oh so you change the disk (. ) and clean it (. ) so your job is about cleaning disk {?} I suppose that in this case you two have to wake up early.’
81. C: Wan (. ) tao za he (. ) mo iou gin la (. ) wan de hiia zo dio ho a.
   ‘We (. ) yeah in the morning (. ) that is fine (. ) we just need to do that work there.’
82. B: Beh dian e.
   ‘At eight o’clock’
83. C: De (. ) lin Bai-Ma Ma-Li-Hang dio ho a ((laughter)).
   ‘Well (. ) we can just take Bai-Ma Ma-Li-Hang.’
84. A: Yao-Yao o?
   ‘Are you Yao-Yao?’
85. C: Mo la. ((laughter))
   ‘No.’
86. A: Huh?
   ‘What.’
87. C: Bu ran de ben sa-hen-da a.
   ‘Otherwise I would have sa-hen-da.’
88. A: Duei a (.) a ni men zao dian siou-si a.
   ‘Yeah (. ) you two should have an early rest.’
89. C: Ni bu yao zou, ni bu yao zou (. ) sa-hen-da.
   ‘Don’t go, don’t go (. ) Sa-Hen-Da.’
90. A: Ga di liou chu lai yao zih-jii siao sin ne (. ) hao bu hao?
‘You need to be careful since you got out secretly (.) ok?’

91. B: Ho la.
    ‘Okay.’

92. A: A ni you mei you chih bin-lang?
    ‘Do you eat betel coconut?’

93. B: Mei you.
    ‘No.’

94. A: Jhih you ni chih o?
    ‘Only you take it?’

95. C: I mo (.) i lai gia gia ge-bai.
    ‘He doesn’t (.) he is just here for the fried chicken fillet.’

96. A: A (.) you mei you chou yan?
    ‘Well (.) you smoke?’

97. B: Mei you.
    ‘No.’

98. A: Mei you (.) a ni le?
    ‘No (.) what about you?’

99. C: You (.) [a ke-shih wo bi kiao shao chou.]
    ‘I do (.) [but I smoke less cigarettes recently.]’

100. A: [Chou duo da] (.) bi jiao shao chou o.
    ‘[How often do you smoke] (.) oh smoke less cigarettes recently.’

101. B: Duei la.
    ‘Yes.’

102. A: Hao la (.) zih-ji siao sin la (.) ho?’
    ‘Alright then (.) you take care of yourselves (.) ok?’

103. B: Sie-sie.
    ‘Thanks.’

104. A: Bu huei.
    ‘No problem.’

105. C: Sie-sie.
    ‘Thanks.’
This exchange involved police officers A and D making inquiries of man B and woman C. Officers stopped man B and woman C’s car first. After a while, police were concerned with the big antenna at the back of the car because it could be used as a wireless set, which street racers use to connect their gangs. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: Sian-sheng (. ) ni hao (. ) bu hao yi sih (. ) gen ni kan yi sia jheng-jian hao ma? ‘Mister (. ) hi there (. ) excuse me (. ) could I take a look at your ID?’

((The music played in the car was quite hearable from the outside, and it continues to play throughout the conversation))

2. A: Sian-sheng ni jhe ge (. ) ho mian jhe ge tian-sian (. ) shih zai zuo she-mo zuo yong de a (. ) huh? ‘Mister, the one you have (. ) the antenna at the back (. ) what is that for (. ) huh?’

3. B: Yin-siang. ‘Stereo.’

4. A: She-mo? ‘What?’

5. B: Yin-siang. ‘Stereo.’

6. A: Yin-siang de tian-sian o (. ) jie shou FM de o? ‘The antenna for stereo (. ) oh for the radio FM?’

7. B: Due a. ‘Yeah.’

8. A: Ni shih (. ) ni you mei you shen ti bu shu fu a? ‘You’re (. ) are you feeling sick?’


10. A: Ni you mei you shen ti bu shu fu a? ‘Are you feeling sick?’

11. B: Mei you (. ) gan jhe huei jia er yi. ‘No (. ) I am just in a hurry to get home.’

12. A: Li wei due me dun ki? ‘Where did you drive from home?’

13. B: Wo? ‘Me?’

14. A: He. ‘Yeah.’

15. B: Cong na ge An-Ping a. ‘From An-Ping.’

16. A: A (. ) zen mo huei zou jhe bian yao huei jia? ‘Well (. ) why do you want to drive from here to get home?’

17. B: Wo yi cian jhu An-Ping a. ‘I used to live in An-Ping.’

18. A: A li gin ma le (. ) li gong (. ) li dua due me dun ki An-Bin?
‘What about now (. ) you said (. ) where did you drive from to get to An-Ping?’

19. B: **Na ge (. ) XX Road a.**
   ‘That (. ) XX Road.’

20. A: **XX Road o (. ) siao jie (. ) ni jheng-jian wo gen ni kan yi sia hao bu hao?**
   ‘XX Road (. ) Miss (. ) may I look at your ID also?’

21. B: **Tai me you dai ye.**
   ‘She doesn’t bring it.’

22. A: **Siao jie (. ) ni shen-fen-jheng wo gen ni cyue ren yi sia hao bu hao?**
   ‘Miss, let me check your ID number, ok?’

23. C: D2xxxxx

24. A: **Na ge bu shih wu-sian-dian la ho (. ) jhiih shih dian-tai er yi.**
   ‘That is not the wireless set (. ) it’s just for the FM.

25. B: **Em.**
   ‘Yeah.’

26. D: **Shou-yin-ji de shih bu?**
   ‘Is it for the radio FM?’

27. B: **En (. ) FM de.**
   ‘Hm, for the FM.’

28. D: O (. ) a in ze en do **shou shih zo ho (. ) hia ni dua gi.**
   ‘Oh (. ) so I guess it must has an excellent connection (. ) such a huge antenna.’

29. B: Zun mei mai la.
   ‘Not too bad.’

30. A: **Siao-jie bu hao yi sih ni de sing-min jiao she mo?**
   ‘Miss, excuse me, what is your name?’

31. C: **XXX.**

32. A: **Na sheng-rih?**
   ‘Birthday?’

33. C: **XXX.**

34. A: **Na jhu jhih?**
   ‘Address?’

35. C: **XXXXX.**

36. A: **Ba shih ji?**
   ‘Eight what?

37. C: **Ba shih wu**
   ‘Eighty five.’

38. A: **Ba shih wu hao ho (. ) hao (. ) na lu shang siao sin.**
   ‘Is it eighty five (. ) okay (. ) then be careful while driving.’
Exchange occurred involving police officer A, men B and C. The situation was that B and C ran through the red light and insisted that the reason was due to the broken traffic light. After B and C’s acceptable persuasion, officer A did not report or fine them in this matter.

(Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: Sian-sheng pai-se (.) gen ni kan yi sia jheng-jian ho?
   ‘Excuse me, mister. May I take a look at your ID?’
2. B: Wa hon din ze din mo gua dio a (.) he a mo a.
   ‘I didn’t see whether it was a red or a green like (.) didn’t see it.’
3. A: He bin gue lai mo ma?
   ‘Did you come from that side?’
4. B: Mo (.) de si mo a.
   ‘No (.) I didn’t see it.’
5. C: Mo a (.) li due hia kua (.) a mo za-hon-din la (.) [di hia si e si e.]
   ‘No (.) you have to see from that side (.) there is no traffic light (.) [the light just went on
   and off.]’
6. B: [Mo a.]
   ‘[No.]’
7. A: Oh (.) e si (.) si e si e o.
   ‘Oh (.) so the traffic light was (.) going on and off.’
8. B: Mo si (.) do si mo si a.
   ‘There wasn’t (.) there was no light.’
   ‘Yeah.’
    ‘Ok (.) alright.’
11. B: A zua en ma don zo mo (.) wa en a ga kui gue lai.
    ‘So I took it as no traffic light (.) and I drove pass it.’
12. C: He a (.) wa mo kui man man a nia.
    ‘Yeah (.) and I drove slowly.’
13. B: Mo wa kui man man wa e zn hon-ding? ((laughter))
    ‘Otherwise how would I ran through the red light if I drove slowly?’
14. C: Li a ki hi-bin kua (?).
    ‘If you see from that side {?}.
15. A: A mo (.) wi-sha-mi gin-ma cha long don le long zai ia me dong le a?
    ‘Well (.) then why do these drivers know to stop cars here?’
16. B: A en zai (.) e hi le (.) he ko-ling ran kui guan-sin (.) wan gio gu en man le kui gia (.) wan
    sio gong-
    ‘Don’t know (.) well that (.) maybe they drive pass here regularly (.) and we haven’t driven
    pass here for a long time (.) and we thought-’
17. C: Tao-zing hia le zo-lo (.) wan na kui gi diao.
    ‘There is a road construction in the front (.) so then we drove on this path.’
18. B: He a (.) mo wan a en-ma le kui gi diao li mai.
    ‘Yeah (.) otherwise we don’t drive from this road.’
19. C: He a (.) wa kua e (.) si le si le.
    ‘Yeah (.) we saw the light flashing.’
   ‘That (.) the light’s base is almost broken.

21. B: Kui zo man man e (.) wa na kui zo gin (.) li gong wa zue hon-ding (.) wa gi le a lo dio
gue a.
   ‘I drove quite slowly (.) if I drove fast (.) and you said that I ran through the red light (.) I
would have run through it quickly.

22. A: A (.) jia-jhao wo gen ni cyue-ren yi sia hao bu hao?
   ‘Well (.) can I check your ID?’

23. A: A me ki due?
   ‘Where are you going to?’

   ‘To go to work.’

25. A: Me ki due zo?
   ‘Where do you work?

   ‘XX.’

27. C: XX.
   ‘XX.’

28. D: Le XX hia zo o.
   ‘Oh you work in XX.’

29. C: XX a (.) duei a (.) a de (.) tao-ging le zo lo ma (.) wan na wa di gi zua li lai a.
   ‘Yeah, in XX. (.) and it was just that there is a construction ahead (.) so we turned to this
road here.’

30. B: Wan i-di long zao duei wa-kao.
   ‘We always drive from that side.’

31. A: Hao (.) wo men deng-sia guo cyu kan yi sia (.) ying gai (.) jiou siang (.) jiou shih ying
gai (.) ke neng ni ji Jiang de (.) ru guo (.) ni Jiang jhe yang jiou siang-sin ni la (.) hao bu
hao (.) duei a (.) a wo jhii shih siang shuo-
   ‘Alright (.) we will go check it later (.) it should be (.) like (.) just like (.) what you said (.)
if (.) you said so, we believe in you (.) ok (.) yeah (.) and I was just thinking–’

32. C: E he (.) si le si le.
   ‘The light was (.) flashing.’

33. A: Siang shuo (.) a gi guai (.) ing-wi (.) wan de ting di hia (.) a wan de lyu deng a (.) [a
siang bi chuei-jhii de yi ding shih hong-deng a] (.) a wan cha ting di hia (.) a lin a ne
gue (.) wa.
   ‘Thinking that (.) it is weird (.) because (.) we halted our car there (.) and we had a green
light at that time (.) [so it must be a red light you had on the vertical side] (.) we had our
car halted there (.) and you drove pass it (.) wow.’

34. B: [Dio a (.) wan ma kua dio li di bi-a hia].
   ‘[Yeah (.) we also saw you.]’

35. B: A li hiong-hiong a ne gue (.) ni na gong (.) den-hue wo le si a (.) a ne dio zai (.) a i hi gi
liong me mo (.) hi gi pai ki a.
   ‘If you drive pass it suddenly (.) if (.) the light was functioning (.) you would know (.) but
that light was almost off (.) that one is broken.’

36. A: Hao (.) na siao-sin yi dian jiou hao le la ho (.)
   ‘Ok (.) then take care of yourselves .’

37. C: [Hao la (.) sie-sie la].
   ‘[Alright (.) thank you.]’
38. B: [Sie-sie.]
   ‘[Thank you.]’
   ‘Ok (.) thanks.’
This exchange was between police officer A and two men (B and C). After briefly asking for information, officers B and C talked a while on the issue of street racers and how difficult it is for police to catch them. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: Lin an due lai?
   ‘Where do you come from?’
2. B: Huh?
   ‘Huh?’
3. A: Lin an due lai?
   ‘Where do you come from?’
4. B: Due hia lai e.
   ‘From there.’
5. A: Hia (.) lin dua due?
   ‘There (.) where do you live?’
   ‘I live in An-Nan District.’
7. A: An-Lan ku due?
   ‘Which part of An-Nan District?’
8. B: He le (.) {?} li gan zai?
   ‘That (.) {?} do you know?’
9. A: {?} a (.) due gi diao lo?
   ‘{?} which road?’
10. B: He le (.) XX Lu a.
    ‘That (.) XX Road.’
11. A: XX Road (.) gui dua?
    ‘XX Road (.) which section?’
12. B: Cha bu do (.) wo dua.
    ‘It’s around the fifth section.’
13. A: A na e lai gia?
    ‘Why do you come here?’
    ‘To find somebody.’
    ‘To find my friend.’
16. C: Zue i zu lai (.) {?}
    ‘To find my friend (.) {?}
17. A: Oh a ran hou rao dao jhe bian lai.
    ‘Oh, and so you rode to here.’
    ‘Yeah.’
    ‘Yeah.’
20. A: A gia lo-chao li gan wo sho?
    ‘Are you familiar with the road here?’
    ‘I am familiar with it.’
‘You are familiar with it.’

23. C: Wa wo sho a (.) Gia Ke Hong Cyu a.
‘Yeah (.) familiar (.) here is the Technology and Industry Park.’

24. A: Li di gia sho ban ni?
‘Do you work here?’

25. B: Mo a.
‘No.’

26. A: Mo (.) ok (.) wo gen ni kan yi sia jheng jian.
‘No (.) ok (.) yeah (.) let me have a look at your ID.’

27. C: I en si dua gia e (.) wa si dua gia e.
‘He doesn’t live here (.) I live here.’

28. A: A mo li dua due?
‘Where do you live?’

29. C: I dua [Ing-Kong e].
‘He lives in [Yong-Kang].’

30. B: [Ing-Kong].
‘[Yong-Kang].’

31. A: O (.) hao.
‘Oh (.) okay.’

32. A: A lin wi lin dao hia guai o?
‘Did you ride from your home?’

33. C: Dio a.
‘Yes.’

34. A: A si lin yo due?
‘Where did you guys say that you will meet each other?’

35. C: Wan (.) yo di (.). he le Seven.
‘We (.) said that to meet (.) at Seven.

36. A: Ni yue zai jhe Seven (.) a ni jhao de dao o?
‘You met up at this Seven (.) and you can find it?”

37. C: A ta jhih-cian you lai guo a.
‘He has been here before.’

38. A: O hao (.) ok.
‘Oh alright (.) ok.’

‘Yeah.’

40. A: Hao (.) Pai-se (.) gen ni men kan yo sia (.) yin wei (.) sian zai jhen de hen shao (.) jhe ge shih duan la.
‘Yeah (.) sorry (.) I have to take a look at it (.) because (.) there are not many (.) in this hour of time.’

41. C: Wo jhih dao jhe ge shih duan hen shao ren.
‘I know that there would not be many people here in this hour of time.’

42. A: Duei (.) [suo yi]
‘Yeah (.) [so]’

43. C: [Suo yi cai] pao lai jhe bian (.) bi jiao bu huei na mo chao.
‘[That’s why] we went here (.) so that it would not be that noisy.’

44. A: Ho.
‘Okay.’
45. B: Duei a. ‘Yeah.’
46. B: Biao-che-zu ying gai bu huei jhih you yi tai (.) dou you [hao tai]. ‘Usually there won’t be just one car for the street racing group (.) there will be [many cars].’
47. C: [Ding duo you liang tai]. ‘[At least there will be two cars].’
48. A: Bu huei (.) er cie (.) ci shih (.) ru guo shih gu lyu na ge de hua (.) fan er (.) li si gon (.) shih cyu na bian de biao-che-zu do shih na jhong ci ji-che de a (.) ran hou hai huei na gun-bang. ‘No (.) and (.) in fact (.) if that is what we concern (.) instead (.) you see (.) the street racers in downtown, they all ride motorbikes (.) and they carry big bats.’
49. B: Duei a. ‘Yeah.’
50. A: You shih hou bi jiao ke wu la. ‘Sometimes they are really detestable.’
51. C: Wo men ye shih hen pa yu dao na jhong. ‘We are indeed scared if we bump into those kind of racers.’
52. A: Deui (.) a ru-guo fan er shih zai (.) zai (.) siang jhe ge di fan (.) huo shih zai Shih-Cao (.) cian mian na ge Shih-Cao Da Dao (.) huei yo biao-che-zu (.) ke shih.’ ‘Yeah (.) if it is instead in (.) in (.) in a place like this (.) or on the Shih Cao Bridge in front of us (.) there will be street racers (.) but.’
53. C: Shih-Cao Da Dao you o? ‘Oh there are street racers on the Shih Cao Bridge?’
54. A: Jhe jhong biao-che-zu ke neng shih (.) gai jhuang che (.) ci-che (.) ji jie (.) ran hou jiou shih (.) you shih hou (.) jyu ji zai yi ci jiou siang (.) che deuei (.) zai jyu ji jhe yang (.) ran hou dan shih (.) muei gong- bu huei shuo siang shih-cyu de na mo ke wu la (.) shih cyu jhen de hen bai-mu ye (.) you-mei-you (.) na gun bang (.) kan dou lu ren jiou da (.) jhe ge jhen de gen ke wu nie. ‘This kind of street racers, they might (.) illegally reform their cars (.) cars (.) and then gather a group (.) and then that will (.) sometimes (.) gather together like (.) a car group (.) to group together (.) and this behaviour is really detestable.’
55. C: Shang cih bu shih hai da dao jing-chih ma? ‘Didn’t they hit police last time?’
56. A: Zai (.) duei a (.) zai bei cyu a. ‘It’s in (.) yeah (.) the north area.’
57. C: Duei a. ‘Yeah.’
58. A: Duei a (.) jhen de shih sha-bu-long-dong de (.) a (.) a (.) ni kan jhe ge jhen de hen siao-jhang (.) ran hou wo men ye bu gan (.) wo men ye (.) bu gan (.) jheng-mian gen ta men chong-tu (.) yin wei (.) sian zai jhen de min yi gao jhang (.) ran-hou yo jhao li-wei (.) ran hou you Da-Hua Sin Wun (.) she mo (.) dian-shih (.) jheng-lun-jie-mu you kai shih (.) you kai shih (.) wa (.) yî-jhîh zai jian-shih (.) wo men de (.) wo men de sing-wei (.) jhe yang. ‘Yeah (.) it’s really silly of them (.) well (.) well (.) you see, it’s really outrageous that (.) and we dare not to (.) we dare not to (.) to pick up a fight with them directly (.) because now the public’s opinion is getting greater now (.) and then they will find a member of people’s representative (.) and political Da-Hua News (.) and the TV shows (.) political
TV shows they will start (.) to start (.) wow (.) to again and again reexamine our (.) our behaviour.’

59. C: **Duei duei.**
   ‘Yeah yeah.’

60. A: **Suo-yi wo men jiou shih (.) jiou shih bei-dong de jiou shih.**
   ‘So we are all(.) in a passive way.’

   ‘It’s hard to do.’

62. A: **Duei (.) cyu sou-jheng jhe yang (.) siang wo men ke neng (?) kiou huei kai jhe (.) hao (.) mei-guan-si a (.) ni jiou pao (.) jiou gei ni pao (.) wo men ye bu gen ni jhuei.**
   ‘Yeah(.) to get the proof(.) like we will have (?) open(.) allright it’s okay(.) you run (.). I let you run(.) and we don’t run behind you.’

63. C: **Wo jhih-dao a.**
   ‘I know.’

64. A: **Jiou shih (.) cyu-san (.) a lu siai (.) ran-hau jhih-hou wo men zai-.**
   ‘Just to(.) disperse them(.) and we have it recorded(.) afterwards, we will-’

65. C: **Zai jhua jiou hao.**
   ‘To catch them later.’

66. A: **Yi ge yi ge lai chu li (.) a jhih shih shuo dang sia you-ke-neng min-jhong (.) jiou shih jyue-de wo men zen mo dou jhe mo siao-ji bei-dong (.) a jhih shih (.) wo men (.) ye bu shih.**
   ‘To deal with them one by one(.) but it’s just that sometimes people at that time(.) feel that why we are all that passive all the time(.) but we(.) we are not.’

67. B: **Bi jiao nan zuo (.) yin wei yao- nan zuo de di fan.**
   ‘It’s hard to do(.) because you will have to do(.) the hard part.’

68. A: ((laughter)) **Gan-ga de di fan (.) yin wei (.) ye bu shih shuo (.) bu gan (.). dan-siao she mo de (.) bu shih a (.) jhen de shih yin wei-)**
   ‘The embarrassing part is(.) because(.) it is not that(.) we are afraid(.) we are coward
   or what(.) it is not(.) it is really because-.’

69. B: **Jhih yao duei-fan chu shih cing le (.) lai zai ni shen shang.**
   ‘If there is something happen to them, they will blame it on you.’

70. A: **Shih a (.) a ren jia sian zai (.) fa-lyu hao siang mei you te bie bao-hu wo men jhe yi kuai (.) suo-yi wo men dang ran [jiou shih-]**
   ‘Yes(.) and now(.) it seems that the law does not especially protect us regarding this
   (.). so of course we [just-]’

71. C: **[Dan shih ni jhua] yi-ding hen duo ren zan-cheng.**
   ‘[But if you catch them] I think a lot of people will support this.’

72. A: **Ha?**
   ‘What?’

73. B: **[Hen duo ren zan-cheng].**
   ‘[Many people will support].’

74. C: **[Ying-gai hen duo ren zan-cheng].**
   ‘[They should be lots of people support this].’

75. A: **Duei (.). [dan shih dan shih]**
   ‘Yeah [but but].’

76. C: **[Bu huei you yi-jian, bu huei you yi-jian].**
   ‘[They won’t have any opinion, they won’t have any opinion].’

77. A: **Ke shih ru-guo chu shih de hua (.) jiou shih-**
‘But if something happen (.) it will just-

78.  **B:**  Ta (.) ta men jia jia-shu fan-duei er yi (.) [ci-ta bu huei you yi jian].
‘The (.) only their familier will disagree against this (.) [others will have no opinion about this].’

79.  **C:**  [Mei you (.) chu shih (.) chu shih jing-cha huei sih].
‘[No (.) if something happens (.) police will be in troubles].’

80.  **A:**  Duei a (.) wa (.) ran-hou wo (.) ru-kuo wo (.) ru-kuo (.) jia shuo huan zuo shih ni (.) ran-hou yin wei jhe yang (.) wa (.) shih hou ke neng (.) jiou suan zheng ge guo-cheng (.) liou-cheng (.) hai shih sih-fa-cheng-syu sia lai (.) ni dou shih duei de (.) jiou shih ni dou (.) dou mei cuo (.) ke shih (.) wa (.) wu-sing zheng jhe guo-cheng de jian-ao a (.) ci shih (.) ye huei jhen de hen nan jiang a.
‘Yeah (.) wow (.) and then (.) if I (.) let’s say if you were in our position (.) and because of this (.) maybe after this (.) although after all the legal procedures (.) you are proven to be innocent (.) that you are all right in every way (.) that you are all (.) right (.) but (.) in the invisible suffering throughout this process (.) in fact is (.) really hard to say.’

81.  **B:**  ‘Yeah.’

82.  **A:**  Suo yi (.) wo men ye jhih neng yong jhejhong bi-jiao bei-dong de fan-shih lai (.) zuo jhe sie cyu-di gen gao-fa la.
‘So (.) we can only do this is a more passive way (.) to fine them and report them.’

83.  **C:**  En.
‘Hmm.’

84.  **A:**  Hao (.) na ni men ye shih zih-jie-siao-sin la (.) ying gai (.) ying gai (.) mei shih la (.) yin wei wo gang-gang you zai jhe bian duo rao ji cyuan (.) dou man ping-jing de.
‘Ok (.) so you take care of yourselves (.) it should be (.) should be (.) no problem (.) because I drove around this area for several times just now (.) and it is quite allright.’

85.  **C:**  O.
‘Oh.’

86.  **A:**  Er-cie you sia-yu le (.) ni men kan (.) gan-kuai.
‘And it rains now (.) you probably have to (.) quickly’

87.  **C:**  Jhih-dao la.
‘I know.’

88.  **A:**  Zih-ji jhao ge yu bi ba.
‘Find a place to stay from the rain.’

89.  **B:**  Jhou kan (.) zai sia-yu (.) yao-bu-yao zou le (.) jiou (.) chu-lai liao-liao-tian er yi.
‘We were thinking that (.) it is raining (.) and if we should go (.) we just (.) hard out to chat.’

90.  **A:**  En (.) hao hao hao (.) zih-ji siao-sin la ho (.) [hao hao].
‘Hm (.) alright alright (.) take care of yourselves (.) [alright alright].’

91.  **C:**  [Ok la] (.) bye bye.
‘[Ok] (.) bye bye.’

92.  **A:**  Bu yao ni-siang. ((laughter))
‘Don’t drive in the reverse direction.’

93.  **B:**  Wang na bian zou (.) wang cian zou.
‘We go from that side (.) drive to the front.’

94.  **A:**  Ok, hao.
‘Ok (.) alright.’
The exchange involved police officers A and C in conversation with men B and D. It began with the police’ feeling of B and D as suspicious because they made a quick reverse as soon as they saw the police. After a short while, the conversation then was on the topic of the irregular reformation of man B and D’s motorcycle. (Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: A li do a di giao ka hia?
   ‘Were you at somewhere under the bridge?’
2. B: He a.
   ‘Yeah.’
3. A: A na go se tao?
   ‘Why did you reverse?’
4. B: Mo a (.) wa siong gong hia sio an a.
   ‘Well no (.) I thought that it was too dark there.’
   ‘Too dark.’
6. B: He a (.) me zue wan di-di (.) hia ze ze le (.) a sio ang dn-lai a.
   ‘Yeah (.) we are here to see my brother (.) to visit him (.) and come back too late.’
7. A: A (.) dua due a?
   ‘Well (.) where do you live?’
8. B: XX lo.
   ‘XX Road.’
9. A: XX lo o (.) a wu gin-gia mo?
   ‘XX Road (.) do you have your ID with you?’
    ‘Yeah.’
11. C: Cha-zu gang li bun ran?
    ‘Are you the car owner yourself?’
    ‘Yes.’
13. C: E (.) sian-sheng (.) wo (.) jheng-jian gen ni kan yi sia hao bu hao?
    ‘Mister (.) I (.) let me take a look at your ID, ok?’
    ‘I didn’t bring it.’
15. C: Mei dai o.
    ‘Didn’t bring it.’
    ‘You can check.’
17. C: Lai (.) shen-fen-jheng zih hao.
    ‘Alright (.) your ID number.’
18. B: D.
    ‘Yeah.’
20. B: E.
    ‘Yeah.’
22. B: San ge er.
23. C: **XX XXX.**
   ‘XX XXX.’
   ‘Where do you live?’
25. D: Gong kuan a (.) XX lo (.) di wan dao au-bia nia.
   ‘The same (.) XX Road (.) his place is just right behind mine.’
26. A: Zo bin a mue?
   ‘Finished the military service yet?’
27. D: A mue.
   ‘Not yet.’
28. A: Gui ni zu a?
   ‘Which year did you born?’
29. D: **Ci shih ci.**
   ‘Seventy seven.’
30. A: **Ci shih ci o (.) a li le?**
   ‘Oh seventy seven (.) what about you?’
31. B: Wa o (.) zo bin zo liao a.
   ‘Me (.) I have finished the military service.’
32. A: Gui ni zu?
   ‘Which year did you born?’
33. B: Chi za buei.
   ‘Seventy eight.’
34. A: Chi za buei (.) {?}.
   ‘Seventy eight (.) {?}.’
   ‘And he (.) he goes to college, he (.) he goes to college.’
36. B: A mue (.) a mue bi-ia.
   ‘Not yet (.) I have not graduated.’
37. A: Wa sio gong (.) lin na e (.) na e di (.) dua di hia se tao.
   ‘I thought (.) how come you two were there (.) to make a reverse there.’
38. B & D: (laughter)
39. C: Dio (.) a (.) siang shuo (.) zen mo (.) zen mo (.) kan dao jing-shih-deng jiou (.) se tao a ne.
   ‘Yeah (.) well (.) thinking that how come (.) how come (.) you saw (.) saw the police light and you (.) then reversed.’
40. B: **Tai an le a.**
   ‘It was too dark.’
41. C: **Tai an le ho.**
   ‘Yeah too dark.’
42. B: **Duei a (.) siang shuo yao guo cue na-bian zuo zuo.**
   ‘Yes (.) we were thinking to sit for a while there.’
43. C: A (.) jhe ge zen mo huei siang-yao gai a?
   ‘Well (.) why would you want to change this?’
44. B: **En?**
   ‘Yeah?’
45. C: **Jiou ge pai-ci-guan zen mo huei siang-yao gai a?**
   ‘Why do you want to change the exhaust pipe?’
46. B: **Jiou ge o (.) yuan-chang de huai-diao le.**
   ‘Oh this (.) the original one was broken.’

47. C: **Yuan-chang de huai-diao le.**
   ‘The original one was broken.’

48. B: **En (.) a mai bu ci yuan-chang de.**
   ‘Yeah (.) well (.) can’t afford the one of original brand.’

49. C: **A (.) ni jhih-dao jiou ge jiao-du (.) jiao-du de (.) jiao-du jiou ge shih huei (.) ying-siang dao ci ta yong-lu-ren.**
   ‘Well (.) you know this an- angle (.) this angle will (.) affect other road users.’

50. B: **O (.) huei cyu-**
   ‘Oh (.) when I am back-’

51. C: **A ran-hou ni de che-tou-deng (.) hou siang (.) jiou yang ye tai liang (.) ru guo duei siang lai che de hua (.) you shih hou (.) a-gong a-ma.**
   ‘And the front light (.) it seems (.) that it is too bright (.) if there are cars coming from the other side (.) sometimes (.) there would be old people.’

52. B: **En.**
   ‘Yeah.’

53. C: **A ne (.) yi sia zih bei jhao dao (.) yan-jing lai bu ji fan-ying de hua ye shih man wei-sian de.**
   ‘In this case (.) all of a sudden, their eyes are shone by this (.) and eyes can’t get to react this well, it is quite dangerous too.’

54. B: **Ok (.) hao.**
   ‘Ok (.) alright.’

55. C: **Yin-wei wo men chang chang chu-li jiou yang de cha-huo an-jian.**
   ‘Because we often deal with this kind of accident.’

56. B: **Ok (.) hao.**
   ‘Ok (.) alright.’

57. C: **Suo yi na wo man yi (.) Dao Lu Tiao Li An gen ni gao-fa (.) ni you mei you she mo yi-jian?**
   ‘So we will base on (.) the Regulation of Road Traffic Safety to report you (.) you have any opinion on that?’

58. B: **Hao.**
   ‘Ok.’

59. C: **Jiou shih jhen duei pai-ci-gian (.) hai you ni de che-tou-deng (.) pai-ci-guan (.) wo men jhen duei pai-ci-guan de bu-fen (.) gen ni zuo (.) zuo gao-fa ni you mei you she mo yi-jian?**
   ‘To report the exhaust pipe (.) and your car light (.) for the exhaust pipe (.) we will target on the exhaust pipe (.) to (.) to report you (.) any opinion?’

60. B: **O (.) hao.**
   ‘Oh (.) ok.’

61. A: **Li (.) hua gi le (.) hua gi le.**
   ‘You (.) start the bike (.) start the bike.’

62. C: **You mei you kan dao?**
   ‘Did you see that?’

63. A: **Bu yong kia (.) bu yong kia la.**
   ‘Don’t have to ride (.) don’t have to ride.’

64. C: **Kan (.) li chu kung (.) lai (.) sien-sheng (.) you mei you (.) {?} (.) zai jiou bian you mei you (.) you la ho (.) jiou yang hao siang shuo bu tai guo cue o (.) ni jiou yang yi ding**
jhen de huei ying-siang dao ci ta ren.
‘Look (.). put you hand (.). hey mister (.). isn’t it (.). {?} (.). it is here, isn’t it (.). it is, right? It seems to be totally not ok (.). in your case (.). you really will affect other people.’

65. A: A li hin-ziao wu mo?
‘Do you have your driving permit?’

‘I only bring my ID.’

67. A: Cha-zu gan li bun ran ma?
‘Are you the car owner yourself?’

68. B: He a.
‘Yes.’

‘The same address, yeah? Well, mister X.’

70. B: En.
‘Yes.’

71. A: Wa ga li gong ho (.). li (.). hi le (.). li e (.). en-dang-gong (.). ren yi gai jhuang (.). ho (.). yi fa ga li gao-fa ho (.). li wu i-gen mo?
‘Let me tell you (.). you (.). that (.). your (.). exhaust pipe (.). you change it at will (.). yeah (.). we will report you according the law (.). do you have any opinion?’

72. B: Mo.
‘Mo.’

73. A: Mo i-gen la ho?
‘You have no opinion, yeah?’

((Officer was taking pictures of B’s motorcycle))

74. A: Cha zu i bun ran ho?
‘He is the car owner, right?’

75. C: {?}.

76. A: Chong e a?
‘Boss?’

77. C: He (.). dio.
‘Yeah (.). right.’
RECORDING (7)

The exchange took place involving police officers A and C inquiring of man B as to his changing of the exhaust pipe and front light of his motorbike. The conversation continued as police kept explaining the seriousness of the problem and B tried to reason for himself.

(Minnanyu, Mandarin, English)

1. A: Li wu ga-ziao wo mo a?
   ‘Do you have your driving license?’

2. B: Wu a.
   ‘Yes.’

3. A: Ha?
   ‘What?’

   ‘Yeah.’

5. A: Wu ho?
   ‘You do?’

6. C: He (.) dio (.) de-gi.
   ‘Yeah, right (.) address.’

7. B: Siang jhe ge (.) ni men huei cyu (.) ke-yi ma-shang jiou chu-li diao jhe yang (.) mei ban fa zai gei yicih ji-huei?
   ‘Like this (.) after you are back (.) you will deal with this right away (.) and can’t really give a second chance?’

   ‘Well (.) after we are done, we can go to Motor Vehicles Institutions (.) Office of Motor Vehicles (.) to have the car examined, and then you will proceed to the (.) step of paying the fine.’

9. B: O.
   ‘Oh.’

10. C: Yin-wei jiou ge shih (.) jhen de shih (.) dang sia (.) jing fang zai zuo cyu-di de gong-zuo (.) jiou ge shih jhen de (.) yin-wei-
    ‘Because this is (.) this is really (.) at that moment (.) police are doing the job of citing the illegality (.) and this is really (.) because-’

    ‘Because of the angle.’

12. C: He a (.) dian-shih shang bao cheng na ge yang zih (.) ran hou (.) ru guo (.) siang shuo (.) ni bu cyu-di (.) ran hou dao-shih-hou ci ta min-jhong ye kan (.) you shih hou (.) yi sie a-gong a-ma dou hui wun a (.) wun shuo (.) a l lin (.) hi le (.) lin mo kua hi le (.) gao-si-lin-a (.) cha gai a ne (.) a long le (.) en-dong-gong le ching-en (.) long e di ga wa pun dio.
    ‘Yeah (.) like how it is being reported on the TV (.) and then (.) if (.) let’s say (.) if you don’t cite this (.) and if other people see it (.) sometimes (.) there are some old people ask us (.) ask that (.) oh you (.) that (.) you didn’t see that (.) those bad kids (.) they reform their cars like that (.) their exhaust pipe all produce waste gas (.) and I’ve got the gas spurted on my face all the time.

    ‘Yeah.’
   ‘Didn’t TV reports say that police will take care of this? Why don’t you do something about it? Instead, there are more voices like that we have heard.’

15. B:  A jiou ge yao fa duo shao?
   ‘So how much is this fine going to be?’

16. C:  Jhou shih fan er wo men ting dao bi-jiao duo de shih jhou yang zih de sheng-yin la.
   ‘Didn’t TV reports say that police will take care of this? Why don’t you do something about it? Instead, there are more voices like that we have heard.’

17. B:  A dang-ran (.) jhou shih (.) yin-wei you sie shih zai hung na ge (.) yi ge kong na yang zih.
   ‘Oh of course (.) it is (.) because some of those, you need to solder (.) another aperture.’

18. C:  Jhou yang jhou hao hen duo le a (.) Jhou yang (.) Jhou yang (.) Jhou yang (.) Jhou yang jhou bu huei wei-guei le a (.) ni jhou yang jhou bu huei pen dao bie-ren le a.
   ‘That way it will be so much better (.) that way (.) that way (.) that way you will not break the regulation (.) and you will not let the exhaust pipe’s gas spurted on others.’

   ‘Oh.’

   ‘And people will not complain (.) you will not [affect others].’

   ‘[The main thing is that I should not let spurt others.’

22. C:  Jhen de (.) Jhen de shih Jhou yang a (.) yi-kai-shih ta jhe ge (.) siang-mu de li-fa de (.) yi-jhih jhou shih jhou yang.
   ‘True (.) it is truly like that (.) and in this beginning this (.) regulation entry’s constitution is (.) the rationale for its constitution is really based on this.’

23. B:  En en en.
   ‘Yeah yeah yeah.’

24. C:  Siang jhe tai ta (.) suei-ran ye shih (.) sheng-yin bi-jiao da sheng yi dian (.) ke shih (.) jhih shao ren-jia (.) ta de tou jhou shih [ping de].
   ‘Take this car for example (.) although it also (.) makes a bit of louder sound (.) but (.) at least its (.) its head is [flat].’

25. B:  [Ping de].
   ‘[Flat].’

   ‘Yeah.’

27. B:  Jhe ge (.) ben lai da suan yao huan diao le (.) a mei you cian huan diao ((laughter)).
   ‘This (.) I was planning to change it (.) but I don’t have enough money to do that.’

28. C:  Na (.) jhou shih jhe cih yi ci huan yi huan ba.
   ‘Well (.) and this time you can change it.’

29. B:  Hao (.) yin-wei jhe ge guan ye hui diao la (.) wo siang shuo yao huan diao le.
   ‘Ok (.) because this pipe is also broken (.) I was thinking to change it.’

30. C:  Ni gai jhou yang (.) che da deng (.) gai duo shao?
   ‘You reform the car like this (.) the front light (.) how much does it approximately cost?’

31. B:  Da-gai yi cian duo er-yi ba.
   ‘Around a thousand.’

32. C:  Kan yi sia hao bu hao?
   ‘Is it ok to take a look?’

33. C:  Ni jhou yang shih jhen-de man liang de la ho?
34. B: **Men liang de.**
   ‘Quite bright.’

35. C: **Duei a () shih jhen-de.**
   ‘Yeah () it is really-’

36. B: **Yin-wei wo ma na-bian gong-sih () yin-wei () mei you lu-deng () ran hou () yi jihh gou chong chu lai () jhuang dao che-huo () le zan () a suo-yi (?) gia ga me si () na () na shih hou ta lian-**
   ‘Because around my mom’s company () because () there is no street light () and it is because there was no street light last time () and then () a dog suddenly ran out () hit the motorbike and caused an accident () and the rider hit the ground () well so {} and we are really afraid of that () at that () at that time he (she?) even-’

37. C: **Ru-guo () dio la () jhen de shih () jhen de () jhen de ye () ye () ye shih jhe yang () ke shih () jiao shih () wo men () dang ran () ke neng () ni huei gai jhe yang () shih you () ni () ni you ni de () ni you ni de () ni you ni de () ni you ni de-yi-kai-shih gai jhe yang de li-you-**
   ‘If () yeah () it is really () really () really also () also ()also because of this () but () well () we () of course () maybe () you change your motorbike like this () you do () you () you do have your reason in the first place.’

38. B: **A ru-guo wo ba ta gai cheng-**
   ‘If I change it into-’

39. C: **A ru-guo shih siang wo men () yin-wei wo men chu-li de fan-er shih () chu-li dao bi-jiao yan-jhong de an-jian () pi-ru shuo () jhen de yin-wei gai jhe yang () ran hou () cyu bu-siao-sin gen ci ta de () lao a gong lao a ma () cyu yin-wei jhe yang zih () ran hou hai () dao-jhiih ta men mei you ban-fa () yi sia zih jiou shih () fan-ying bu guo lai () ran hou () chan sheng che-huo shih-gu de shih hou jhe shih hou wo men cai huei chu sian () suo-yi wo men zai chang chang chu-li jhe yang de an-jian () suo-yi cai huei shuo.**
   ‘Like us () we () because what we deal with are instead () deal with more serious cases () for example () it is really because of this kind of reformation of vehicles () and then () accidentally hit other grandpa and grandmom () because of this () and then make them () make them unable to immediately () can’t react to it () then () we appear when there are car accident () so we usually handle this kind of cases () that’s why I said’

40. B: **Ru-guo.**
   ‘If’

41. C: **Ta de yan-jhong-sing zai na bian.**
   ‘The dangerous part is right there.’

42. B: **Ru-guo wo ba ta () jiou shih () tiao cheng di yi dian () ke-yi ma?**
   ‘If I make it () just () readjust it making it a bit lower () is it ok?’

   ‘Conventionally () it is still not ok () because () for the brightness level like this () it is already not from the original brand () in fact they are not ok () but if () I believe that () sometimes () maybe () like today I do not especially target at this to () to fine you () because I feel that this is more serious.’
44. B: O.
   ‘Oh.’
   ‘And if for this ok, of course I would suggest that you get your front light (.) [adjusted to a lower position] (.) comparatively it will not directly shine other road users.’
46. A: [Lai (.) jiao-du wun-ti la ho?]
   ‘[Ok (.) the problem of the angle, yeah?]’
47. C: Jhe (.) ni (.) ni bu-you shuo a-gong a-ma o (.) you shih hou (.) ke-neng siang wo men de jhe wei tong-shih (.) ke-neng nian-ji zai nian-jhang ge jí sui (.) ta you shih hou (.) you shih hou yan-jing (.) yu dao jhe ge (.) ran hou (.) yao-shih ta you shan-guang de na ge (.) sian-siang (.) ta yan-jing you shan-guang de sian-siang de hua (.) yi jhao dao (.) jhen de fan-ying bu guo lai (.) hen wei-sian.
   ‘Well (.) it (.) it does not have to be grandpa or grandmom (.) sometimes (.) maybe compare to my co-worker (.) maybe somebody slightly older (.) sometimes they (.) sometimes his (her?) eyes (.) see this (.) and then (.) or probably he (she?) has glaucoma (.) for that symptom (.) if his (her?) eyes have that glaucoma symptom (.) and are shone by this (.) they really cannot react to it well (.) it is really dangerous.’
48. A: He le (.) e ho (.) ai ki (.) wa en-dang-gong (.) wa wan-lai e.
   ‘That (.) for him (.) he needs to (.) to change the exhaust pipe back to original brand.’
49. B: He.
   ‘Yeah.’
   ‘Yeah? And then (.) to have your motorbike examined in Office of Motor Vehicles.’
51. B: Ho.
   ‘Ok.’
52. A: Ho?
   ‘Yeah?’
53. B: Ho.
   ‘Ok.’
54. A: Li mai-dun you- you-iyu hua-bo a.
   ‘Don’t go to po-post office to pay the money.’
55. B: Ho.
   ‘Ok.’
   ‘As for your motorbike (.) change it back (.) change it back (.) change it back.’
57. B: O (.) ho.
   ‘Oh (.) ok.’
58. A: A ne kua- a li tia wu ho?
   ‘And you see- you do understand, yeah?’
59. B: Tia wu.
   ‘I understand.’
60. A: Ho a.
   ‘Ok.’
Examine occurred involving police officers A and C and a filipino man (speaker B) who did not wear the helmet, and the man was stopped for a check-up because of this. (Mandarin, English, Minnanyu)

1 A: Hi (. ) ni hao (. ) hello (. ) ke yi kan yi sia ni de jheng-jian ma?
   ‘Hi (. ) hi there (. ) hello (. ) may I take a look at your ID?’

2 A: Ni na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’

3 B: ((silence))

4 A: Ni shih na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’

5 B: ((silence))

6 A: Ni shih na yi guo ren?
   ‘Which country are you from?’

7 B: ((silence))

8 A: Ni (. ) na yi ke guo jia?
   ‘You (. ) which country?’

9 B: ((silence))

10 A: You na ge (. ) iyu-liou-jheng ma (. )ARC?
    ‘Do you have (. ) Alien Resident Certificate (. ) ARC?’

11 B: ARC.

12 A: Yup.

13 A: Where are you from?

14 B: {?}

15 A: Na ge guo jia (. ) country (. ) which country?
    ‘Which country (. )’

16 B: Philippines.

17 A: Philippines.

18 B: ((laughter)) I don’t know.

19 A: Ni de na ge (. ) an-cyuan-mao ne?
    ‘Where is your (. ) helmet?’

20 B: An-cyuan (. ) I don’t know.
    ‘Hel- (. ) I don’t know.’

21 A: You hat.

22 B: Hat?

23 A: Helmet.

24 A: Ni de an-cyuan mao (. ) an-cyuan-mao.
‘Your helmet (. ) helmet.’

25 B: ((silence))

26 A: You ride bicycle- you ride motorcycle (. ) and you have to wear this right?

27 B: Yes yes yes.

28 A: And?

29 B: Yes yes yes.

30 A: And (. ) I didn’t see it (. ) before.

31 B: Yes I know I know (. ) but.

32 A: But you didn’t [wear it.]

33 B: [Helmet (. ) helmet.]

34 A: Helmet?

35 B: You you you you you.

‘Yes yes yes yes yes.’

36 A: But you didn’t wear it right?

37 B: I wear a.

38 A: You didn’t (. ) you just ride this (. ) through through our car (. ) and go here to park your (. ) to park your motorcycle but you didn’t wear it.

39 B: I (. ) em (. )

40 A: You didn’t right?

41 B: I (. ) I have (. )

42 A: Do you really have the helmet?

43 B: I (. ) I (. )

44 A: Sia cih yao dai hao ma (. ) sia cih yao dai.

‘Do wear it next time ok (. ) wear it next time.’

45 B: {?}

46 A: Ni lai Tai-wan duo jiou?

‘How long have you been in Taiwan?’

47 B: {?}

48 A: How many years you come (. ) you come to Taiwan?

49 B: Six.

50 A: Six years.

51 A: Na (. ) Chinese is not ok?

‘And’

52 B: Understand (. ) a little.

53 A: But six (. ) six years you stay here (. ) you have stayed here for six years (. ) and you can’t understand [still?]

54 B: [A little] a little.

55 A: Just a little.
I use a little.

Ok. I just check your motorcycle. so just wait for a second ok?

(The officer A is pressing the registry number of the motorcycle on his machine)

So most most people. I also know some Philippines they was in XXX right? XXX.

XXX yes.

Also Philippines.

Also also.

Also, right?

Yeah.

But most of them they speak Chinese is- is [ok. and they also understand] they even they don't stay for so long time like you.

[((laughter))]

But they still [understand.]


So your co-workers is all [Philippines?]

All all.

Most of them.

More of. more of. most of.

How many times you work here. you work Taiwan. you come to Taiwan to work how many times?

Em. twice.

This is the second time.

Second time yes.

Oh so. when you will back. Philippines? When? When you back-

Eh. March. this coming March.

Next March. huh. pardon?

This coming March.

Oh this coming. March?

Yes.

March.

March March. ok. March three.

March three.

Yeah.

Ze si sia mi i su?
‘What does this mean?’

87  C:  ‘kan shih she mo jhong-gu-che hai shih she mo?’
     ‘have to check if it is a used car or something?’

88  A:  Dio a.
     ‘Yes.’

89  A:  Do you know this got some problem?
90  B:  What?
91  A:  But just be careful next time ok? This one () this number is not work now.
92  B:  Oh () [how long?]
93  A:  [Call] () I don’t know () but () em () it seems maybe () you don’t pay the tax.
94  B:  Tax.
95  A:  Tax. You have to pay the money to the () government.
96  B:  Em.
97  A:  But () I think this [one]
98  B:  [How] () how much () how much money?
99  A:  I don’t know () I don’t know. Every year, every motorcycle () is [different.]
100  B:  [This] motorcycle is the Chinese man’s.
101  A:  I know () ne- near the train station right?
102  B:  Yes.
103  A:  Train station.
104  B:  Train station.
105  A:  Tainan train station. Station?
106  B:  Oh yes yes yes yes yes.
107  A:  Near there [right?]?
108  B:  [I know I know] I know I know.
109  A:  Yes () I I think the () owner is a Chinese () is a Taiwanese () [but] () it seems that he
doesn’t pay the tax to the government.
110  B:  [Taiwanese man.]
111  A:  [So], this one is not work now.
112  B:  [Oh.]
113  B:  It’s it’s () never () never ()
114  A:  You have to () use
115  B:  Use
116  A:  If you use this again, you will () get the tacket-ticket.
117  B:  ([laughter])
118  A:  So () but this time is ok () so you just [be careful] () and the next time if I see you ride
the bicycle- the motorcycle () you have to wear the helmet.
119  B:  [Ok.]
120 A:  Ok.
121 B:  Ok.
122 B:  Ok (.) pai-se la.
       ‘sorry.’
123 A:  ((laughter)) sorry?
124 B:  ((laughter)) er sorry {?}
125 A:  You said (.) you said pai-se ((laughter))
       ‘sorry’
126 B:  I thought the Taiwanese man is sorry, so (.) pai-se.
       ‘sorry.’
127 A:  Em pai-se.
       ‘sorry.’
128 B:  Pai-se.
       ‘Sorry.’
129 A:  Yeah, that’s right.
130 B:  So (.) many pai-se.
       ‘sorry.’
131 B:  So (.) I (.) I mean
132 A:  Your Chinese is no problem.
133 B:  Yes yes.
134 A:  Yes, no problem.
135 B:  Three, Taiwan government give threes.
136 A:  That’s great.
137 B:  It’s (.) it’s very good.
138 A:  Yes, it’s good.
139 B:  Yeah.
140 B:  I ride motorcycle (.) you can’t ride motorcycle without this? Ok?
141 A:  Yes sure. It’s driver licence.
142 B:  Driver licence.
143 B:  But the motorcycle is not {?}
144 A:  But you just have to be careful it’s good for you.
145 B:  Oh.
146 A:  You just wear (.) just like you have to wear the [helmet.]
147 B:  [Wear the helmet.]
148 B:  Ok (.) ok sie sie.
       ‘thanks.’
149 A:  Bu ke- welcome ((laughter)) bye-bye.
       ‘You’re wel-’
RECORDING (9)

Exchange took place involving police officer A and C during a check-up with man B. The situation was that officers heard a car’s siren ringing and saw man B beside the car. Thus, police suspected that man B may not be the car’s owner and possibly a car thief (Minnanyu, Mandarin)

1 A: Cha zu li ma?
   ‘You’re the car owner?’
2 B: He a. Wa zue mo (.) zue mo (.) hi le
   ‘Yeah. I can’t find (.) can’t find (.) that
3 A: Cha zu li an na?
   ‘Are you the car owner?’
4 B: Hen?
   ‘Huh?’
5 C: Che jhu.
   ‘The car owner.’
6 B: Wa a.
   ‘Me.’
7 A: A li zin-gia (.) wa gua mai.
   ‘Your licence (.) show me.’
8 B: A, pai-se.
   ‘Ah, sorry.’
   ‘Show me your driving permit by the way.’
10 B: Mo (.) wa zue mo hi le {?} wa gie ran kui
    ‘Na, I can’t find that {?} I have to have someone open it
11 A: A li hin-zior le?
    ‘Where is your driving permit?’
12 B: Hin-zior oh (.) go ai zue le (.) di cha din e kuan (.) kao-iou (.) mo a (.) hi lo (.) so-sin pai
    hi a.
    ‘Oh driving permit (.) I need to find it (.) I think it’s in the car (.) hell (.) well (.) that (.)
    the key is broken’
13 A: Cha sin ga (.) bak ki lai ma.
    ‘Just to let the car (.) stop first’
14 B: He a (.) wa le zue (.) wa le zue (.) hi le (.) ta ha (.) ho.
    ‘Yeah (.) I am finding (.) I am finding (.) that (.) so that I can (.) oh my’
15 A: Gan hi diao?
    ‘Is it that one?’
16 B: In gai si gi diao la (.) la bak sok {?}
    ‘It should be this one, I guess (.) the cylindrical lock {?}’
17 A: Lai (.) lin (.) hin-zior sin kua gi le
    ‘Come on (.) you (.) show your driving permit first’
18 B: Ho (.) hin-zior oh.
    ‘Oh, the driving permit.’
19 A: Dio a (.) ga li cyue-ren yi sia la, hao-bu-hao?
    ‘Yeah. Just to check that with you first, ok?’
20 B: Ho (.) pai-se pai-se (.) di (.) cha din.
‘ok, sorry sorry. It’s in the car.’

21 A: Lai hin-zior ga kay gi le hin-zior.
‘Hey, come to take his driving permit the driving permit.’

22 A: La lai gia kua la.
‘Hey, come here to have a look at it.’

23 B: Ho heh.
‘Okay.’

24 C: Cha zu gan li bun ran?
‘Are you the car owner?’

25 B: He dio.
‘Yes, I am.’

26 A: Lai.
‘Here.’

27 B: He.
‘Yeah?’

28 C: Wei due lai e?
‘Where do you come from?’

29 B: XX lo.
‘XX road.’

30 C: Oh, XX lo o.
‘Oh, XX road.’

31 A: Kua gan si li bun ran in wui gian lai bia-cha e
‘Let see if you are the car owner because we’re afraid that you are here to street race with the car’

32 C: ((laughter))

33 B: Mo la mo la mo la hio mo la mai ki teh min gia a do a de i-di gio a.
‘No no no yeah no I was going to take something and then all of a sudden the siren kept ringing.’

34 C: Hao na jhe gei ni sie-sie.
‘Alright, so take this back. Thank you.’

35 A: Ho a hon?
‘Are we all done?’

36 B: Ho, pai-se pai-se.
‘Ok, sorry sorry.’

37 C: Hao, bu-huei bu-huei.
‘Oh yeah, not a problem’

38 B: Ho ho ho, bu hao yi sih.
‘Okay, sorry for bothering.’

39 C: Hao na ni mang la ho ((laughter)) ni mang la.
‘Alright, so I will leave you here being busy busy for this business’

40 B: {?}

41 C: Wa de n si su-li cha e.
‘I am not the car fixer’

42 B: Mo la.
‘Well, no’

43 C: He.
‘Yeah.’

44 B: {?}
C: Wa ma? Ka ze lo dau-sa-gan wu-den nia.
   ‘Me? Sometimes we help people to
B: Si oh(.) Wa gu mo(.) wu-den oh(.) wu-den wa wu la.
   ‘Oh yeah? I haven’t(.) As for xxx(.) I’ve got XX.’
C: He a.
   ‘Yeah.’
B: Si gon(.) zue mo hi diau.
   ‘It’s just(.) I can’t find that stuff.’
C: A-ne(.) ze(.) ze won de mo-hua-do a.
   ‘Well(.) as for that(.) we can’t contribute any help.’
B: Oh(.) si a ne ni.
   ‘Okay, if that is so.’
C: Li kua li mo-hua-do wa na wu hua-do?
   ‘Since you can’t do anything about it, how can we?’
B: Si a-ne ni(.) pai-se.
   ‘Yeah yeah, sorry.’
C: He a(.) he na e dau-sa-gan wa de ga li dau-sa-gan a.
   ‘Yeah, if we can help, we would have helped you.’
B: Wa zue mo hi diau(.) mang e(.) kao-iou(.) so-sin pai ki.
   ‘I can’t find that stuff(.) that one that I can take out stuff(.) hell(.) the key is broken.’
C: Ho la. Wan sin lai la ho.
   ‘Oh yeah. We will have to leave first.’
B: Pai-se pai-se.
   ‘Sorry, sorry.’
C: A na ging-gia wu sia mi su-iau ka gong la ho(.) hao(.) sie-sie.
   ‘If you do have any problem, let us know. Ok, thanks.’
Exchange took place involving police officers (speaker A and C) and a Filipino man (speaker B). The situation was that officers saw foreign workers drinking outside of a convenience store and thus they approached to one of them to ask questions. (Mandarin, English, Minnanyu)

   ‘Do you have your ID with you? ID.’
2. B: ((silence))
3. A: ARC.
4. A: Kan yi sia hao bu hao?
   ‘May I take a look?’
5. B: Huh?
   ‘Take a look.’
7. B: Kan yi sia.
   ‘Take a look.’
8. B: {?}
9. A: Ha?
   ‘Huh?’
10. B: {?}
    ‘The Philippines.’
    ‘The Philippines.’
    ‘The Philippines.’
14. B: Duei a (.) ni jhih dao wo kan dao ni a.
    ‘Yeah (.) you know that I saw you.’
15. A: En.
    ‘Yeah.’
16. B: Ba-yue ok la (.) yi ci la.
    ‘August is ok (.) the seventeenth.’
17. A: Ha?
    ‘Huh?’
18. B: Ba-yue.
    ‘August.’
19. A: Ba-yue o.
    ‘Oh August.’
Duei.
‘Yeah.’

A: Sia ge yue.
‘The next month.’

B: Jhe ge (. duei duei (. shen ge a.
‘This (. yeah yeah (. the next.’

(The man B was having a trouble of pronouncing the word “next” in Mandarin properly and the officer was confused by that mispronunciation)

A: Ha?
‘Huh?’

B: Shen ge yue a.
‘The next month.’

A: San (. ba-yue nei.
‘Three- it’s the August.’

B: Ba-yue (. wo ho a.
‘August (. the fifth.’

A: Ba-yue wu hao?
‘August the fifth.’

B: {?} Fei-lyu-bin.
‘The Philippines.’

A: Yao huei Fei-lyu-bin?
‘Going back to the Philippines?’

B: Duei.
‘Yes.’

A: Ok.

B: ((laughter)) Wo kan dao ni a.
‘I saw you.’

A: Ni kan dao wo la ho?
‘You saw me yeah?’

B: Duei la.
‘Yes.’

A: A ni peng-you le?
‘Well where is your friend?’

B: Huh?

A: Ni peng-you le?
‘Where is your friend?’
38 B: ((silence))
39 A: Peng-you le?
   ‘Your friend?’
40 B: {?} deng sia huei cyu a.
   ‘we will go back later.’
41 A: Yao huei cyu le?
   ‘You going back?’
42 B: Duei.
   ‘Yeah.’
43 A: Su-she?
   ‘To the dorm?’
44 B: {?}
45 B: {?} wei she mo?
   ‘why?’
46 A: Mei you la (. ) kan yi sia (. ) duei a (. ) jheng chang de (. ) jheng chang de.
   ‘Well nothing (. ) just take a look (. ) yeah (. ) the regular check (. ) the regular check.’
47 B: Jheng chang de.
48 A: Duty job.
49 B: Eh?
50 A: Just duty job.
51 B: Just-
52 A: Just (. ) duty.
53 B: Duty.
54 A: Du- daily duty.
55 B: Oh.
56 A: Deng sia he wan yao gen ren jia shou yi sia.
   ‘You need to clean here after you finish drinking.’
57 A: Wo shuo you gen ren jia shou (. ) clean.
   ‘I said that you have to clean here (. )’
58 B: Clean (. ) duei duei.
   ‘yeah yeah.’
59 A: Duei a (. ) hao bu hao (. ) a ni peng-you le? Kan yi sia ta de jheng jian hao bu hao?
   ‘Yeah (. ) alright (. ) so where is your friends? Is it ok to take a look at his ID?’
60 C: Mei you mei you.
   ‘No no.’
61 A: A jhe mei guan si o?
   ‘Oh this is alright?’
62 C: {?} na ge {?} ni peng-you le?
‘{?} well that {?} where is your friend?’

63 B: **Duei duei duei.**
‘Yeah yeah yeah.’

64 A: **Zai na li?**
‘Where is he?’

65 B: {?}

66 A: **Wo shuo gang gang (.) ni de (.) zuo zai jhe bian de na ge le?**
‘I said that just now (.) your (.) where is the person who sat here?’

67 B: **Duei.**
‘Yeah.’

68 A: **Huei cyu le?**
‘He is back?’

69 B: **Yin wei ta (.) [ta-]**
‘Because he (.) [he-]

70 A: **[Yi jing huei cyu le?]**
‘[He has already got back?]’

71 B: **Deng sia (.) wo wo {?} huei cyu le.**
‘Wait (.) I I {?} he's back.’

72 A: **Ta yi jing huei cyu le?**
‘He got back already?’

73 B: **Duei a (.) huei cyu la.**
‘Yeah (.) he went back.’

74 A: **Na mei [shih la.]**
‘Then it’s [alright.]’

75 B: **[Huei cyu la.]**
‘Went back.’

76 A: **Mo mo mo.**
‘No no no.’

77 B: ((laughter))

78 A: **Ni gang chai shuo she mo?**
‘What did you just say?’

79 B: **Ha?**
‘Huh?’

80 A: **Ni gang chai shuo she mo?**
‘What did you just say?’

81 B: **Wo?**
‘Me?’

82 A: He.
’Yes.’
83 A: **Ni gang chai shuo she mo**? Pai se o?
    ‘What did you just say? Did you say sorry?’
84 B: Pai- pai se pai se.
    ‘So- sorry sorry.’
85 A: Pai se ((laughter)) **she mo yi sih**?
    ‘Sorry ((laughter)) what does it mean?’
86 B: Eh (.) tia mo.
    ‘Eh (.) I don’t understand.’
87 A: Tia mo ((laughter))
    ‘Don’t understand’
88 B: ((laughter))
89 A: **Hao la hao la**.
    ‘Ok ok.’
90 B: **Hao la**.
    ‘Ok.’
91 A: **You gen ren jia shou yi sia**.
    ‘You need to clean here.’
92 B: **Hao (.) sie sie a**.
    ‘Ok (.) thanks.’
93 A: **Bu huei bu huei (.) byebye**.
    ‘No problem no problem’
94 B: Bye-bye.
Exchange took place involving police officers (speaker A and C) and man B, who sat on his motorcycle outside of a restaurant. After the conversation took place for a short while, officer A and man B recognised that they have known each other before and they started to chat some more about man B’s current life. (Mandarin, English, Minnanyu)

1. A: Wo za gin-gia mo?
   ‘Do you have your ID with you?’
2. B: Mo za.
   ‘No.’
3. A: A li si le lia sa? Bian-se-long o?
   ‘What is it that you are touching? Chameleon?’
4. B: He a (.) si-yi.
   ‘Yeah (.) a lizard.’
5. A: Si-yi o.
   ‘Oh a lizard.’
6. B: He.
   ‘Yeah.’
7. C: O (.) ka zia pia ne (.) ku o.
   ‘Oh (.) it is the back (.) that is cool.’
8. A: Gui e? Ln e o?
   ‘How many people? Two people?’
9. B: Mo.
   ‘No.’
10. A: Go gi le le?
    ‘Where is the other person?’
11. B: A (.) gi le (.) i le siong ban (.) Wa le dan i ha ban.
    ‘Well (.) that person (.) is working (.) and I am waiting for her to get off from work.’
12. A: O {?} a na mo za gin-gia?
    ‘Oh {?} and why didn’t you have the ID?’
13. B: A mo chiou ho (.) zai i (.) zun bi [{?]}
    ‘Well we didn’t sort it out well (.) I pick her up (.) and we will [{?]}
14. A: [Cia za ran e?]
    ‘[Who is the car owner?]’
15. B: He chong wan lu-bing-you e.
    ‘It’s my girl friend’s.’
16. A: Dua duei a?
    ‘Where do you live?’
17 B: XX Lo.
‘XX Road.’
18 A: Gui dua?
‘Which section?’
19 B: Wo dua.
‘The fifth section.’
20 A: Sa mi mia?
‘What is your name?’
21 B: XXX
22 A: XX O.
‘Oh XX.’
23 B: Li de zai yia (.) wa kua li zuo ming sho a.
‘You do know (.) I feel that you look very familiar.’
24 A: O (.) li za chi ho (.) sa sa (.) li za wo ho hia o?
‘Oh (.) is the house number twenty-seven (.) three three (.) around the number twenty-
five?’
25 B: He a.
‘Yeah.’
26 B: Hn (. ) a li ta zao lai gia a?’
‘Yeah (.) then how come that you are here now?’
27 A: Wa diao lai gia {?} wa shong gong kua lai [dio-]
‘I have been dispatched to this area for {?} no wonder I felt that you [look-]
28 B: [He a] wa kua lai ming sho ming sho li.
‘[Yeah] I felt that you look very familiar.’
29 B: Hn (.) a wan chi a di hia le zo (.) zo (.) ho-wu-sin la.
‘Yeah (.) and my girl friend works there (.) works (.) works as a waitress.’
30 A: Zo ho-wu-sin ni?
‘As a waitress?’
31 B: A za i dian zia wu ha ban le (.) a wa a mei dan li mi a.
‘And she will get off from work after twelve o’clock (.) and I can’t get in there.’
32 A: A li hi lo lin (.) a ging gin he long (.) long (.) long liao a ho? Mo go (.) mo go hi lo a ho?
‘And the one that you (.) the one that you used to had are all (.) all (.) all finished
yeah? You do not (.) do not have that anymore right?’
33 B: Mo a la.
‘I don’t.’
34 A: Mo a o.
‘You don’t.’
35 A: Mo go (.) mei zui-go ni? A si go mei sa?
‘You don’t (. ) sell fruits anymore? Or you sell other things?’

36  B:  Mo a la.
‘Not anymore.’

37  A:  Gin zia mo a o? Mo le mei zui-go a o?
‘Really not anymore? You don’t sell fruits anymore?’

38  B:  Ta wu he mei zui-go e.
‘There is no selling fruits.’

39  A:  A ging gin en si (?) si lin lao-mu le mei a si li le mei (. ) en si (. ) zo (. ) di hi le ma? Zui-go e.
‘Didn’t you {?} before (. ) did your mother sell it or you sell it (. ) didn’t you (. ) sell (. ) it there? Selling fruits.’

40  B:  Mei hi chong (. ) hi le liang e [la].
‘We sold that (. ) the cold drink.’

41  A:  Mai liang e o? Mei liang e o?
‘You sold the cold drink? Selling the cold drink?’

42  A:  Dua di zia le dan o?
‘And you wait up here?’

43  B:  He a (. ) a mo a ma mei dan li ni lai de ze a.
‘Yeah (. ) otherwise I cannot go inside sitting somewhere there.’

44  A:  A li go dua di ho (. ) go dua di (. ) di (. ) di hia li la?
‘Do you still live nearby (. ) still live in (. ) in (. ) in the same old place?’

45  B:  Mo a (. ) wa (. ) gin (. ) dua di XX.
‘No (. ) I (. ) currently (. ) live in XX.’

46  A:  Dua gao XX o?
‘You live in XX, that far?’

47  B:  He a (. ) a wa (. ) XX kui gi gin **ci che yin siang**.
‘Yeah (. ) and I (. ) open a car audio store in XX.

48  A:  **Ci che yin siang**.
‘Car audio.’

49  B:  **En**.
‘Yeah.’

50  A:  Ga di kui e a si?
‘Do you found it on your own or what?’

51  B:  Sn gong-zuo-shih.
‘It’s a studio.’

52  A:  **Ci che yin siang**.
‘Car audio.’

53  B:  Hn.
‘Yes.’

54  B:  A (.) ka **jin-bao** e hi chong e.
    ‘Well (.) it’s mostly for the cool kinds.’

55  A:  Ka **jin-bao** e.
    ‘The cool kinds.’

56  B:  He (.) bon bon e hi chong e (.) lan dai-wan siao-len-a ai yong e {?}
    ‘Yeah (.) the ones that make big sound (.) the one that teenagers in Taiwan love to use {?}’

57  C:  O (.) **li hai de o**.
    ‘Oh (.) that sounds cool.’

58  B:  **Duei a (.) yi tai {?} ran hou cyuan bu tong guo yi hou {?}
    ‘Yeah (.) one set of the audio {?} and then after all of those are passed {?}’

59  C:  Long kn yin-hiong? **La ba**?
    ‘Do you all put stereos there? Stereos?’

60  B:  **Duei (.) shih er ke (.) shih er ke shih er cun de.**
    ‘Yes (.) twelve stereos (.) there are twelve stereo, which are all of twelve inches.’

61  A:  La za be (.) la za be ho ni (.) li a?
    ‘Number sixty-eight (.) it is sixty-eight? You (.) your address (.) is it the house number sixty-eight?’

62  B:  He a.
    ‘Yeah.’

63  A:  He (.) dio (.) la be ho (.) a li bui kai la (.) ka za zun bi ba n.
    ‘Yeah (.) right (.) sixty-eight (.) well you have gained weight now (.) you used to be skinny.’

64  B:  He a (.) a (.) ging gin zia-ho-zo-king-ko en.
    ‘Yeah (.) well (.) I used to make ends meet.’

65  A:  Wa dong zo si li za i hong hi le {?}
    ‘I thought that you are the one whose home is on the alley twenty first {?}’

66  B:  {?}

67  A:  Li (.) li (.) za i hong en si ling wa hi le {?} he le
    ‘Well (.) well (.) isn’t the one who lives on the alley eleventh the person who {?} who’

68  B:  Za i hong hi le kiao ki a la.
    ‘The one who’s on the alley twenty first has died already.’

69  A:  E si a nua?
    ‘What happened to him?’

70  B:  A e zo kang kue e si zn sia lo lai.
    ‘He fell down while he was at work.’

71  A:  Yin ba hi le ne (.) hia di a hi le ne.
    ‘His father is that (.) part of the gang.’
B: He a.
   ‘Yeah.’
A: {?} Zo ti (.) zo ti a ne?
   ‘{?} manufacture iron (.) the one who manufactures iron?’
B: He (.) a sia si a (.) mei bi hi zn dua ga i houng-
   ‘Yeah (.) and he fell down and died (.) he was nothing compared to the time when he {?}
A: A li mo do li ling wa hi bin hia o? {?}
   ‘And you don’t come back to your old home? {?}
B: Mo a.
   ‘No.’
A: Mo a o?
   ‘You don’t?’
A: A li (.) hi bin (.) a li (.) a li (.) a li zu hi bin hia go sung di hia mo?
   ‘And you (.) that home (.) and you (.) and you (.) is there still anybody living in your old
   home now?
B: Chun (.) wan ma (.) a ging a (.) XX (.) a wa chu lai wa kao dua.
   ‘It’s only (.) my mom (.) my aunt (.) XX (.) and I moved out to have my own place.’
A: A li go li-hun o?
   ‘Did you divorce again?’
B: Gong go ka dua sia e.
   ‘You can say it more loudly.’
A: Li gia e tia dio o?
   ‘Are you afraid that he will hear?’
B: ((laughter))
C: Sun ba.
   ‘You have been thinking too much.’
B: E long gong wa en dio la (.) a ma en si wa en dio.
   ‘She has been saying that it was me doing her wrong (.) and it wasn’t all me doing things
   wrongly.’
A: Ln bing long en dio.
   ‘Both sides were wrong.’
B: A hi bing ma en dio a (.) wa gin ma (.) chun hi lo (.) chun wan sio-mei-a a.
   ‘Her side was wrong too (.) and I now (.) only got (.) got my daughter.’
A: A en si le mei (.) mei (.) hi lo ma? Le mei {?}
   ‘Aren’t you selling (.) selling (.) that? Selling {?}
B: Mei (.) bin-lang-tan {?}
   ‘Selling (.) it is a betel nut stand {?}
A: O (.) gin ma wu le mei ming gia a la (.) mei gia e.
‘Oh (.) and now it sells other things (.) selling food.’

91 B: He a.
‘Yeah (.) selling (.) some simple food.’

92 B: Siao-chih e (.) dio a.
‘Simple food (.) yeah.’

93 A: Wa do si kua hi lo ming ka ging.’
‘I just thought that your face looks fatter.’

94 B: ((laughter))

95 C: He la (.) ying gai- yin gai bu cuo le la (.) ho (.) jia you la.
‘Alright (.) it seems- seems that you are doing fine (.) yeah (.) keep working on it.’

96 B: {?}

97 C: Hao la (.) a (.) dang le mei (.) gia ki duei (.) gia ki duei?
‘Ok (.) well (.) and later on you will (.) where will you head to (.) where will you ride to?’

98 B: Shan hua.
‘Shan hua.’

99 C: Hao (.) na lu shang siao sin la (.) ho hao (.) bye-bye.
‘Ok (.) then be careful on the road (.) ok yeah (.)’

100 B: Bye-bye.