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Abstract
Second language identity involves not just the social profile of the learner, but his position within the L2 community, whether a pedagogical, social, or professional context. Confounded by the attribution of otherwise inexplicable variation in L2 French sociolinguistic studies to stylistic choice, this study set out to examine narrative performance of very advanced L2 French learners and its intrinsic connection to second language identity. Grounding notions of L2 development and competence in cognitive sociolinguistics and sociocultural theory, the analysis brings together the historical development of L2 resources and realized language repertoire within personal narratives of three very advanced L2 French speakers. Using two hours of elicited oral narratives per participant, a language history, a metalinguistic interview and a discourse completion task, the analysis first catalogues sociopragmatic repertoire, then connects the instances of sociopragmatic features to contexts of use. The final stage situates these feature-context pairings within the speaker’s own socio-cultural history to reveal agentive instantiation of second language identity. That identity is the positioning of self in a given socio-cultural discursive moment dovetails with the developmental perspective of sociocultural theory and schematization of cognitive sociolinguistics. The language resources a learner uses represent at once the social and historical context of development, as well as the immediate, local positioning within the discourse. Identity can then be accessed through contextualized discourse analysis triangulated with language histories and development.
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1.1 Problematizing the advanced second language learner

The elusive second language advancedness at near-native proficiency is a revered, yet poorly understood, goal. Indeed, is advancedness an endpoint, an echelon, a never-ending journey, or a nebulous state of being? Successful and (or) enthusiastic classroom language learners often pursue an international sojourn intended to hone and provide cultural context for their academic skill. Once arrived, however, they are confronted with challenges of opportunity to engage in linguistic practice, acceptance in social milieux, and, most puzzlingly, a seemingly entirely different language system from the academic one they had been studying. In pursuit of advancedness, the learner confronts challenges to develop local community ties, ergo occasions for linguistic practice, as well as discrepancies between actual oral speech practices and linguistic proficiency that is validated as advanced foreign language capacity in instructed settings.

We know an advanced second language learner when we meet one (e.g. Coleman & Klapper, 2005), and we know which factors can contribute to developing advancedness (e.g. Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002a). Current assessments of advancedness, however, in fact fall short in wholly evaluating actual advanced learner language as compared to contemporary native speaker language (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a). There is abundant research to evaluate advancedness within pedagogical objectives by a range of criteria from different communicative perspectives, and even some that probe benchmarks of professional proficiency. Yet, once the
learner moves beyond the scope of these scales, there is a significant gap in benchmarks until the learner (now an advanced, but still learning, user), arrives somehow at near-native competence (Bartning, 2009). In this space falls the recently charted territory of cataloguing and characterizing actual oral language (e.g. Gadet, 2003), replete with many as yet untaught markers of oral discourse competence that an advanced learner must independently acquire through everyday social or professional interactions. Several studies on second language sociolinguistic proficiency (a widely-considered component of advancedness), for example, ascribe outliers of traditional native-speaker-like variation, commonly seen when individual performance is evaluated (Tarone, 2002), to stylistic choice (eg, Lemée, 2002). While there are cognitive schema proposed for learning and using sociolinguistic variables at lower levels, where overall group-level systematicity has been shown (Tarone 2007; 2002; Ellis 2002), there are none for the agentive advanced learner. An evaluation of learner language at the very advanced level, informed by new descriptions of contemporary oral discourse, may provide categories for assessment at this level, and reveal agentive systematicity behind stylistic variation.

This project seeks to validate language choices of very advanced second language learners as products of agentive identity with a twofold goal. The first is to reconcile the disparity between the oral performance markers of an advanced speaker (in terms of pedagogical objectives and in social contexts) and the actual characteristics of native speaker speech. The second is to propose a more satisfying interpretation of individual language performance that goes beyond the popular default of personal stylistics. The findings of the study to follow will show that there is nuanced, socially-informed intentional systematicity to how a very advanced learner uses sophisticated oral discourse strategies. These stylistic choices will be connected to
contexts both within discourse and from the learner’s language history, and be argued to constitute a developing state of identity in the second language.

To this end, this study connects the language choices of advanced learners of French to both the context in which they are used in personal narratives, as well as the contexts in which they were learned and internalized by the speaker. It uses this evidence of form-context pairings to argue that sociopragmatic variation in very advanced L2 language is more systematic than has been previously described in L2 sociolinguistic studies for the very advanced learner. This systematicity is subsequently argued to constitute developing second language identity, a more integral state of second language-ness than notions of proficiency, or even capacity, as defined below, account for.

To ground this study, this chapter first reviews several recent inquiries on what constitutes an advanced learner from perspectives of learning objectives, performance assessment and personal function (section 1.2). It next presents two complementary theoretical frameworks of language development which can account for what is generally understood as the acquisition of second language resources and their reformulation in performance: cognitive linguistics and socio-cultural theory (section 1.3); and finally it summarizes objectives of the present study and overviews subsequent chapters (section 1.4).

1.2 Identifying the advanced language learner: definitions and assessments

Second or foreign language proficiency at the advanced level has been addressed in a small set of volumes in the past decade. Each problematizes advanced language from a different perspective: specific professional training (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002a); learning (Byrnes, 2006); teaching (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002a; Byrnes et al., 2006); curriculum and program
design (Byrnes & Maxim, 2003); or research (Ortega and Byrnes, 2008). As the notion of the native speaker norm as the ultimate aim of second language proficiency has dissolved and been replaced by various iterations of performative competencies, assessments and instruction for achieving advanced proficiency have been reconceptualized. Yet, a comprehensive definition of advancedness, one including particular attention to communication and interaction as well as professional or other niche capacities, eludes the applied linguistics field. Challenges to arriving at such a definition are found in institutional and pedagogical traditions which have already established proprietary notions of “advanced”, as well as the rhetoric on language where terms such as proficiency, competence, target, native, and so on are historically charged with meaning that is not open to new interpretation.

Advanced language learning, teaching and research have been hindered in part by the perception that advancedness is an extension of intermediate capacities or simply what comes next after learners are released from language-centric courses to literature, civilization and professional purpose ones. Almost universally, at least in American universities, language structures and skill-sets are targeted pedagogically at the basic through early-intermediate levels. Beyond this, learners who continue in language programs move on to literature and civilization courses that at once focus on written discourse-level language and educational or similarly-formal genres and registers (Byrnes, 2002; Sprang, 2008). From here, the learner is encouraged to study abroad for a summer, semester, or - increasingly rarely- a year. During this time the disparate needs of Cook’s (2002) language learner as compared to the language user are undeniably if not alarmingly evident: The emphasis for a learner is delayed application of classroom skill sets; yet when time for application comes to become a language user, the usage norms may be quite at odds with language constructs presented in pedagogical contexts.
A second, peculiar, challenge in an intensive language institute setting is that these learners who pursue advanced language instruction end up in courses targeting a particular facet of an advanced learner. The conundrum here is that the language competence of advanced learners is perceived to be more cohesive and homogenous than it often is among any group of such learners, and a singular advanced curriculum cannot address the diversity of learners’ needs. As noted by Leaver & Shekhtman (2002b), these learners have individual language histories, experiences, needs and intentions. Thus, a curriculum that merely extends intermediate-level focus and practices and assumes that advanced learners are arriving with a uniform set of skills will poorly advance advanced second language competence.

In spite of divergent agendas, the aforementioned volumes on advanced-level L2 offer consensus that enhancing how the applied linguistics community probes, understands, and attempts to foster advanced language proficiency has been significantly limited to date by the lack of a cohesive definition of advancedness. Byrnes (2006c) laments that applied linguistics is bound by its charged lexicon for various aspects of language and language proficiency (i.e., communicative competence; investment; or target) while she and others (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a) note that there has been some (at times unavoidable) circularity to how each faction has independently defined, explored, and analyzed advanced language thus far. Her solution for exiting this cycle invokes Swain (2006) and amiably invites discussion on the subject, proposing that through *languaging* about advanced language we might arrive at a responsible and viable definition. This definition of advancedness will reflect the contemporary understanding of language and language use, and will allow teaching, learning and research agendas on advanced language proficiency to move forward from a mutually respected point.
Contributing to this dialogue, this section reviews measurements used for assessing learner language, and reviews research that has focused on features of advanced-level L2 and related competencies. In the most recent volume addressing advanced learner language, Ortega & Byrnes (2008a) advocate the term *advanced capacities* to encompass the working skill sets of an advanced language learner. The term *capacities* is broad enough to address the discrete aspects of language proficiency targeted in various traditional approaches to advanced language. The authors outline four such categories of language learning benchmarks used widely in teaching and research. These are institutional status, standardized tests, presence of late-acquired features, and use of sophisticated language. Each is elaborated below individually. A survey of studies that have incorporated the measurement into teaching or research design illustrates the potential of each measurement, and shapes a discussion of its merits and shortcomings in informing past and future advanced second language considerations. While it will become evident that these measurements are rarely used alone, addressing each in turn will allow for an understanding of what each specific categorization and consideration can reveal about learner language. The measurement also makes transparent the privileged perspective on language proficiency and ideology adopted by the instructor or researcher.

1.2.1 Institutional status

Institutional status refers to progress through a curriculum, where the level of study (whether by numbers of semesters or degree pursued) implicitly assumes a corresponding degree of proficiency. An advanced learner within this parameter is generally one who has satisfied minimum program requirements, for example for a major of study, or an earned degree. In spite of the convenience of this benchmark, courses or research targeting advanced learners by this
definition may find it problematic in how disparate such experiences may be depending on the requirements necessary to qualify progress through a program (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002b), or in how different learners require a range of time, a variable that is context dependent, to develop certain proficiencies (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a). Participants in a longitudinal study on study abroad (Kinginger, 2008; Kinginger & Blattner 2008) were recruited for having satisfied department requirements for study abroad. These included successful completion of basic language requirements through the intermediate level and at least one advanced-level composition or oral production course. An array of assessments, including a standardized language test, an oral proficiency interview, and a pragmatic assessment were administered pre- and post- study abroad. The reported results (see Chapter 2) illustrate the diverse and disparate nature of capacities a learner may exhibit for either institutional benchmark of completing requirements to enter advanced-level courses or of participating in study abroad. Alternately, there may be a discrepancy in program objectives, and skills sufficient to complete study tasks. For example, Paribakht & Wesche (2006), investigating lexical inference in university-level EFL learners whose L1 was Farsi, found that participants were hindered by limited lexical resources and cultural knowledge, in spite of their relatively advanced proficiency, which had been determined in a reading comprehension assessment.

The unreliability of institutional status in identifying proficiency levels may also lead to friction within a group. For example, Belz (2005) presents a case study of communicative breakdown from a broader study pairing American foreign language learners with L1 German speakers who were also EFL students. There were proficiency differences in the two groups where American learners were in their fourth-semester of language study, thus at the intermediate level while the German participants were business students studying English for
professional purposes and had a more advanced level of proficiency. The learners also had different goals, motivation and interests (professional versus casual interpersonal interactions). These two differences became significant qualitatively and quantitatively in how interactions unfolded over the 8-week correspondence period where the tensions resulted in eventual withdrawal from the partnership by one of the American students.

These frictions with advanced populations defined by institutional status may arise because the advanced level is traditionally the end point of the sequence beginner – intermediate-advanced. Learners arrive, however, at advanced coursework relatively early in a sequence of language learning and use, typically once all simple syntax has been presented. An informal survey of curricular offerings and sequencing of eleven French departments at state universities shows that advanced is considered to be achieved, or at least teachable, after a relatively short amount of study. A search for the term “advanced” in both course titles and descriptions found that “advanced” courses were offered beginning at the 300-level at seven of the schools. One school had an advanced offering at the 200-level for oral French while at the same time listing advanced composition as a 400-level course. Only two schools did have advanced language courses above the 500-level, with the description of one focusing on sophistication, suggesting that the advanced level is satisfied before graduate-level coursework. Course descriptions for several of the schools noted that the advanced courses were equivalent to study abroad: a student who had studied abroad could not enroll. It is apparent that advanced language courses are not synonymous with advanced language use. What is most often advanced in a curricular sequence is actually only the beginning of what professional programs would label advanced.
1.2.2 Standardized tests

The second possible set of parameters for assessing learner language, standardized tests, is potentially more informative and reliable than an institutional benchmark. Standardized tests include the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) used by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Such scales are often tied tightly to aspects of proficiency required for the academic or professional objectives of the institution administering the test. The FSI’s Interagency Language Roundtable scale rates learners as levels zero through five, where 3 through 5 denote a capacity to function professionally in the L2. This test aims to evaluate and target a number of competences and language structures. These include appropriateness of expression, (structural) linguistic competence, precision of lexicon; and discourse, emotional and social competences. (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002b; Shekhtman et al., 2002). ACTFL’s scale rates learners as Advanced or Superior beyond the Novice and Intermediate levels in separate assessments for speaking, listening, reading and writing. The scale provides descriptors that categorize a proficiency performance based on the presence and degree of command of various structural and discursive features, with a vague nod to cultural appropriateness. The Council recently added a category for Distinguished speaker beyond Superior. While there are descriptors for this level, there are, problematically, no assessment procedures nor criteria (Ross & Kasper, 2013). The TOEFL measures levels of proficiency quantitatively. For the traditional paper-based version, the total score is a composite from listening, reading and writing sections with a maximum score of 677. A score over 600 is generally required for admission to a college or university, thereby marking a perceived capacity to perform academically with L2 English
(Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a). More recently, the internet-based version is increasingly available and includes a speaking section. The total possible score is 120, and schools generally require a score above 80 for admission. The *Test de Français International* used by Kinginger (Kinginger, 2008; Kinginger & Blattner. 2008) similarly quantifies proficiency: scores above 600 (and up to 990) will place learners in one of the four post-intermediate proficiency classifications: Basic Working, Advanced Working, Professional, and Advanced Professional.

There are three problematic limitations with such measurements. First, the design is based on an assumption of a uniform trajectory for competence development, as well as a singular cultural model. The tasks required may not align with actual competence required in certain cultures. For example, (Polanyi, 1995) critiqued the role-play used in assessing L2 Russian where females were asked to give a toast, when traditionally a woman in Russian culture had not been called upon for that role. Second, as noted by Pavlenko (2006), the quantitative composite does not give nuanced understanding of the user’s actual competence in varied contexts. Third, and perhaps most problematic, the descriptors, particularly in the case of the ACTFL standards, have been interpreted as end-points for curricula. While it is understandable that an instrument would be developed to assess criteria for entry to or exit from a program, this in turn makes the instruments narrow and not necessarily generalizable. Therefore, when their use is extended beyond the original intention, the results may be misleading to inaccurate, as seen in the results of Kinginger (2008; Kinginger & Blattner, 2008), where different kinds of assessments yield different perspectives on learners’ proficiency and performance. Furthermore, that there can be a presumed distinguished level with no means of assessment consummately exemplifies the state of highly accomplished advancedness in SLA: we know there is competence well beyond what we have previously described as advanced, and we can broadly
categorize it as more __ than advanced (or superior) language skills, but we cannot yet qualify it beyond vague ideas of sophistication, fluency, effectiveness or accuracy.

1.2.3 Late-acquired features

Late-acquired features represent the most prevalent definition of advanced proficiency within the SLA literature. The acquisition of these features is understood to require time plus adequate instruction or exposure in an immersion context. The definition of late-acquired features is largely determined by the perceived complexity of language and L2 developmental patterns. Encouraged by Pienemann’s (1998) work showing that language acquisition is sequential regardless of context and instruction, Bartning & Schlyter (2004) aimed to identify such a sequence for L2 French. They analyzed two corpora of adult L2 French (L1 Swedish) speech, examining verb morphology, tense and aspect, negation, object pronouns, gender and subordination, and developed a six-stage acquisition sequence. Stages four through six are low-, middle-, and superior- advanced, and summarized here in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Advanced L2 French Characteristics, from Bartning and Schlyter, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. low-advanced</td>
<td>• Use of object pronouns with compound verb tenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of conditional, plus-que-parfait, subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early use of multi-propositional or relative sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More complex negation (rien, personne, jamais)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generally consistent use of conjugated verbs (as opposed to infinitive forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overuse of mais and parce que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued difficulty with noun gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mid-advanced</td>
<td>• Correct constructions of compound tenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased use of subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Occasional difficulty with 3p pl inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued difficulty with gender and noun agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of dont and gerund relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stabilized verb morphology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other markers of late-acquired features investigated in advanced language studies include passive voice and modalization, as well as narrative competence, figurative speech, or intonation patterns (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a). These last three represent strategic and conceptual competences, not just structural mastery. Sociolinguistic and pragmatic research also point to features that are acquired relatively late in the learning process. These are generally considered to be under-addressed (relative to their prevalence in native speaker usage norms), neglected altogether in pedagogical materials, or inadequately represented in a classroom context (see Belz & Vyatkina, 2005; Rehner et al., 2003; or vanCompernolle, 2012 for a discussion on how sociolinguistic and pragmatic features are addressed in classroom materials and language). When targeted, however, learners can acquire these features in an instructed setting. For example, Belz & Vyatkina (2005) present a 9-week study exploring the use of modal particles by L2 German students. American learners of German collaborated with L1-German EFL learners on a cross-cultural project. The initial 5-week phase of telecollaboration with no pedagogical intervention on modal particles showed only one learner with awareness of the modal particles prior to instructional intervention. Three stages of pedagogical intervention led to increased use, and more syntactically and pragmatically accurate use, of the particles by the learners.

There is an opaque issue on the validity of how these features have come to be defined. Advanced learners are proceeding through curricula that may be the product of generations of adaptations and adjustments, but whose core sequencing remains largely unchanged. Structural characteristics of the L2 developmental patterns initially informed curricular sequencing, but
these have not necessarily been changed in classrooms as new understandings of L2 development emerge. Late-acquired features may remain late-acquired simply because they are late-taught features, and assessments are not looking for them at earlier stages. Curricula heavily emphasize and privilege features of formal, written language rather than oral communication (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008b), which means that oral discourse structures are left for the learner to acquire through time-intensive implicit exposure.

Some recent SLA research suggests that these features in an instructed context are actually acquired early on, and that more advanced learners rely less on the so-called late-acquired features as they expand their repertoire within different genres and appropriate native-speaker norms. In the case of relativization, Byrnes and Sinicrope (2008) look longitudinally at the development of relative structures in L2 German, considering specifically frequency and complexity, over four levels of study. Complexity was operationalized based on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy (NPAH). This framework sequences embedded clauses on a scale of increasing complexity (both developmental and syntactic) from subject, through direct object, indirect object, object of a preposition, genitive and finally object of comparison. This model proposes that the performance of a particular relative in learner language assumes acquisition of the lesser ones on the scale. The study followed a group of 23 learners through three basic language levels of German and one advanced course. At the end of each course, participants provided a writing sample that reflected an appropriate genre for that level, ranging from personal narration for level 1 to argumentation for level 4. The samples were coded for the presence of relative clauses from the NPAH scale (excluding object of comparison which is not an option in the German language) and the mean length of clauses was measured. There were three unexpected findings. The first was that novice learners (within a corpus, thus across
learners) were able to produce the entire range of relative clause possibilities. Second, the most frequent relative form was with the preposition. This form is supposed to be more conceptually complex than relative clauses involving direct and indirect objects, which were less robustly represented in the writing samples. Finally, while the use of relatives increased through level three, from levels three to four the overall use and complexity of relativization diminished. Each of these findings contradicts traditional suppositions on advanced learner language: that complex features are late-acquired; and that complex language is a marker of advancedness. It seems instead that even learner language follows Gricean maxims of clarity via simplicity.

Other recent work in SLA shows that traditionally late-acquired features are teachable at earlier stages. Low-intermediate learners were shown to increase pragmatic capacity after attending an individualized six-session tutorial on three sociopragmatic features in L2 French (tu/vous; nous/on; and (ne) ... pas). The study design emphasized conceptual aspects of indexed stance in the differences between the variants, and followed a systemic-theoretical instructional model informed by socio-cultural theory (vanCompernolle 2012). These findings suggest that these traditionally later-acquired features are accessible earlier on if learners are directed to attend to them and provided schematic support for understanding the meaning of sociolinguistic variation.

A similar trajectory in findings led to Dewaele's (2002) model of development for sociolinguistic variables. He proposes three stages of learner acquisition of the nous and on variants, both pronouns for the first person plural we. The nous form is predominant in classrooms and remains the preferred written form. It is debatably considered the more formal variant (as will be discussed later) but nonetheless is rarely used (less than five percent of the time) in spoken French. The on variant is taught as the indefinite third person one, and
mentioned as an alternative to *nous*. It has been widely shown to be quickly acquired in an immersion setting (e.g. Martin, 2012; Dewaele, 2008). In Dewaele’s study, learners at first use high rates of formal variants (*nous*). Once aware of the more informal variant (*on*) they use it in abundance, overgeneralizing across formal and informal contexts. Finally, learners appropriately discern the pragmatic constraints for individual variants. While these may be *late-acquired* variants marking advancedness, perhaps later-acquired competence modulates usage patterns, thereby marking highly accomplished advancedness.

1.2.4 Sophisticated language in context

The fourth measurement of advanced language, the use of sophisticated language in context, is an attractive one, but one that is challenging to corral into learning, teaching and research. The construct involves sociopragmatic skills, negotiating and navigating the intricacies of how participants, places and time influence communication. It is “linked also to aspects of literacy, to diverse manifestations of cultural competence, choice among registers and multiple speech community repertoires, voice, and identity in cross-cultural communicative settings” (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008a: 8). Discursive competence, including, for example cohesive narration (Pavlenko, 2006), is also emphasized, as part of global communicative competence. Sociolinguistic competence is rooted in the study of language variation and targets how lexicogrammatical inventory indexes social identity. Pragmatic competence, on the other hand, is rooted in theories of politeness and speech act and targets the perlocutionary, or performative nature of language. Sociopragmatic competence, then, reflects the ability to make language choices that meet the needs of the speech act and the demands of the social context (Kasper & Rose, 2001). Sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences are powerfully blended in vanCompernolle’s (2012) articulation of *sociopragmatic capacity*, which privileges both the
communicative impact of various sociopragmatic constructs and the speaker’s agentive role in meaning-making. Crucially, the capacity is an active process, and competence is not grounded in L1 norms (as per traditional understandings of sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence) but in the speaker’s communicative intent.

These four main approaches to assessing learner language (institutional status, standardized tests, late-acquired features, and sophisticated language), are not in equal favor. Norris (2006) surveys ten studies targeting advanced FL learning from 2000-2003 for how they define the advanced learner. Of these, four use institutional status or enrollment in a course, five employ a predetermined score on various proficiency assessments, and one cites a native-like accent. Often, a combination of these is used to articulate aims of a curricular or research agenda. It seems that one measurement is used to identify participants at an initial stage and a second measurement is subsequently used for analysis of learner language. In the case of the Foreign Service Institute, institutional status is conferred by a rating on its standardized test, the ILR.

Study abroad implies advancedness no more than does any particular amount of study, although linguistic sojourns do foster certain language gains and competence development (eg Dewaele 2008).

Norris (2006) constitutes a reprimand to the SLA community for slighting, minimizing or ignoring the critical role of assessment in advanced L2 teaching, learning and research. He calls for more investment on the part of the research and teaching community in articulating assessment in part of its conceptualization of the advanced “agenda” rather than deferring to government or testing groups to develop such measures. In fact, there seems to be a history of this particular sort of circular conceptualization of advancedness where the language of standards, such as those of the OPI or ACTFL, which are indeed assessment standards, has come
to stand in for a true definition of L2 advancedness. This is especially problematic because these evaluations tease out singular skills as representative of a purported “whole” of advanced proficiency. Each skill, which should be considered one among many possible leading markers of a certain degree of proficiency, becomes elevated to a requisite acquired skill, where now all criteria must be met to “pass” up to the next level. Generalizing advancedness to a definition from this fractal representation slights the process of development in favor of an end-point of acquisition. This cycle perpetuates the notion that developing L2 advancedness is elusive and challenging because the criteria to do so are now all-encompassing (Lantolf and Frawley, 1985). As an example, ACTFL has brought this prophecy full circle by introducing the category of Distinguished speaker with descriptors but no assessment measures. Further, these standards are lacking in elaboration or specificity of terms (Pavlenko, 2006). Norris’ criticism may seem harsh given that those interested in advanced L2 were, at that time, calling for and struggling to articulate a coherent unified definition of advancedness; this definition being a necessary precursor to assessing such a capacity. He is nonetheless right to note the variability in the research and teaching agenda; variability driven in part by the target populations of advanced L2 learners. Such diversity, as he more generously labels it, does little to improve the generalizability of research on advanced L2 (Byrnes 2006). While generalizability of small-scale features may be necessarily elusive given the diversity of advanced learners, the concepts of advancedness and related competences are ripe for re-evaluation.

Returning to the notion of *advanced capacities*, what exactly does this term privilege? Ortega & Byrnes (2008a) propose it to account for what is profiled by the various measures above. Yet, to serve the applied linguistics community well in moving forward with an agenda on advanced second language, it should be more than an umbrella term for what has already been
done before, and must account for evolved understanding of social language practices and individual linguistic agency. Arguments such as Norris’ (2006) only echo the call of Byrnes & Ortega to more aptly define advanced learner language, and the surveys of how research had defined and profiled aspects of advanced learner language only underscore the need for a more unified perspective. There are several issues that must be explored and addressed as we language through a framework for approaching advanced learner language.

What is feasible, appropriate and responsible at this point, as the community languages out a definition, as Byrnes (2006b) with a nod to Swain (2006) suggests we do, is to be sure that the research, teaching, and learning be guided by principled and informed notions of advanced language proficiency. That is, focusing on language and markers of competence as they emerge in L2 learners, rather than on the status of an individual learner, may lead to a broader recognition of advanced capacities. As Ortega & Byrnes emphatically, if not with exasperation, declare: “It is about time we free ourselves from analytical and conceptual pitfalls that equate L2 development with monolingual development. Quite simply, if multicompetence is not a clone of L1 competence, then the advancedness of multilingual users cannot be expected to be isomorphic with the advancedness of monolingual users. (2008b:284)” They continue with a reminder of the range of registers native speakers manipulate in their L1 across genres and settings, in a host of media, and with different interlocutors to underscore the multiplicity of communication.

1.3 (Second) Language Identity and Advancedness: Theoretical considerations

This dissertation project explores the role of second language identity development, as evinced in sociopragmatic capacity, in understanding L2 advancedness. As will be elucidated
below, identity, the presentation of self, accounts for the linguistic agency apparent in both L1 and advanced L2 language.

This study of second language identity development in the advanced L2 learner is grounded in sociocultural theory and cognitive linguistics, specifically drawing on a new line of blended inquiry: cognitive sociolinguistics. Sociocultural theory holds that experiences shape language resources while cognitive linguistics provides a framework for analysis thereof. Cognitive sociolinguistics represents inquiry by cognitive linguistics to account more fully for the influence of social contexts within cognitive linguistic analyses, at the same time providing cognitive underpinnings for sociolinguistic variation. I will first address these in turn and then in tandem their implications for L2 identity analysis.

1.3.1 Sociocultural theory and language development

Sociocultural theory posits that experiences spur developmental change. In this Vygotskian theory of socially-derived cognition, experiences mediate and are mediated by language. Mediation, a crucial component of this dialectic theory, represents the interaction of the mind with the world via physical or symbolic tools. It is the means by which external social and environmental experiences are connected with internal cognition. Mediation was articulated by Vygotsky in two forms. One is explicit, where there is conscious awareness of the tools and processes at hand in connecting thought to action. Implicit mediation, on the other hand, is transparent and inherently interwoven with the mind-world system (Wertsch, 2007). In either case, mediation sparks development as it at once fosters and represents an ongoing cycle of newly internalized mental tools acting on the social world. Language, once acquired through
social interaction, assumes a unique role of representing and reformulating these life experiences both internally and in social communication. This development is evinced in controlled mental functioning (Lantolf, 2007).

For a second language learner, how he experiences language and the language he is exposed to will shape the resources he has and how he redeploy them (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Vygotsky conceived of language use as action, not process (Wertsch, 2007), whereby language is a dynamic, intentional interaction with one’s social environment rather than solely an internal cognitive process resulting in words. Novice and intermediate level second language learners often rely on explicit mediation, both in instruction as well as in production, where the learner is consciously selecting from among language resources to communicate (as in the case presented in Liddicoat, 2006, for example). As language resources are internalized, they become implicit mediation. For the advanced second language learner, these social experiences often extend beyond the classroom to in situ experiences, where both social interaction and language production represent implicit mediation. A learner’s mediated language history, or the sociocultural constraints that shape these experiences, then include those driven by pedagogy as well as those driven by a learner’s motivation, engagement, relationships and so on as he takes advantages of affordances in a study, work or travel abroad opportunity. Controlled behavior in language use could be understood as consistency in language choice.

1.3.2 Cognitive linguistics

Following cognitive linguistics, instances of language use (as experienced in everyday activity, including language acquisition for L2 learners) are internalized by connecting the word or utterance to the actions and settings in which it was used. Each use of the word adds to the probabilistic schema of usage conditions. For each individual, the meaning of the word or
utterance is intrinsically tied to these conditions such that invoking the word or utterance also calls upon the physical and social positions of any actors and objects. Consequently, a speaker will re-project what he understands to be the appropriate local and social positions when employing a particular term. Langacker (2006) describes how language derives from speaker choices about what to profile and foreground through syntax. The speaker’s perspective is determined, in part, by his embodied experiences of like events. Language is a dynamic (re)construal of how people have processed experiences.

Thus, as a learner experiences language, he amasses an inventory of usage examples where the words, structures and situations are schematically collocated. Because advanced learners often alternate classroom and in situ social settings throughout their second language career, it stands to reason that there is a tension of usage norms shaping their L2 competencies. Traditionally, and largely still, classroom teaching emphasizes structures while sojourns abroad foster the acquisition of pragmatic formulas and sociolinguistic variation, in particular more colloquial expressions. Advanced language, then, once a learner becomes aware of the choices available to him, involves somehow integrating the form-meaning potentials from instructed learning with the sociopragmatics from an immersion experience. While the two environments are not at odds with each other, there is an undeniable difference between social feedback in a classroom and social feedback in an immersion setting, and the advanced learner needs to blend the two from his personal history. Very advanced learners are often challenged by spontaneous concept development while abroad, at least for sophisticated oral discourse features (which have little history of being taught, efforts at the intermediate level by vanCompernolle (2012) notwithstanding).
Two important aspects of a cognitive linguistics model relevant to the advanced learner language are: 1) that realized language reflects a deliberate choice on the part of the learner with respect to the meaning he wishes to convey; and 2) that this language choice falls within the range of appropriate choices (available to the speaker based on historical exposure) for the context.

1.3.3 Cognitive Sociolinguistics

Two recent volumes explore the implications of blending cognitive linguistic and sociolinguistic inquiry (Geeraerts et al. 2010; Kristiansen & Dirven, 2008). Cognitive linguistics has thus far accounted for the cognitive representation and seamless mechanism for subsequent language use, and sociolinguistics has catalogued variation of realized language according to differences in social contexts. The argument for merging the two veins of inquiry outlines mutual benefits for both domains, although the impetus is from cognitive linguists. The working group on Cognitive Sociolinguistics (CSL) advocates pursuing “empirically validated investigation into the social dimensions of linguistic variation (1),” where there is a need to account for social (contextual) input to schematic variation in addition to the represented concept and referent of an utterance (Kristiansen & Dirven, 2008). This blend is particularly applicable in considering linguistic variation (on any number of levels, including register and style) where variants are conceptually synonymous but socially distinct. For example, the differences between bike and bicycle or It needs washed or It needs washing are grounded in social context. In Langacker’s (1999) model, the Ground is a fixed referent superficially evident in an utterance, one which allows for interpretation of so-called moving parts of the utterance. Cognitive sociolinguistics posits that the Ground may be conceived of as the social context in which an utterance is made,
thus illuminating variation between such conceptually identical terms as bike and bicycle (Kristiansen, 2008). This social Ground anchors the conceptual frame to explain variation.

Elaborating the mutual interest of cognitive and sociolinguistics, three types of variation are articulated as being potentially useful to sociolinguistic analysis by providing a (more satisfying) cognitive rationale for variation. These are Formal onomasiological variation (FOV), Conceptual onomasiological variation (COV), and Speaker/Situation variation. The first, FOV, refers to lexical or structural variation for the same concept. The second, COV, refers to variation of topic or theme between discourses (subject matters). The last, more evidently, largely encompasses variation of context, including speakers, setting and even type of discourse (e.g. monologue or dialogue). These three interplay in varying combinations for any particular utterance (Geeraerts et al. 2010). The three perspectives on discourse are held in tension, where shifts in language reflect an interdependent shift in structure (lexicosyntactic), discourse (topic or type), or context (speaker, setting, and so on). For example, French speakers from hexagonal France are more likely to look forward to le weekend, while Québécois French speakers still take off on the fin de semaine. This lexical variation (FOV) draws on a change in speaker, as well as an historical (if not physical) geographic change. Alternately, over the course of a conversation in French, two speakers meeting for the first time may switch from formal address forms (v) to informal address forms (t). This formal variation is supported by a perceived change in relationship between the speakers (this concept, stance, is discussed below). In one final example, since address forms require active or reported speech, they are likely absent in other forms of discourse, but alternate structures may convey dialogue (indirect reported speech), or use summary terms for topics. Thus, the absence of particular address forms (or other features of sociolinguistic variation) does not necessarily suggest lack of acquisition or development.
While cognitive linguists will benefit from integrating social or contextual motivation for variation into their analysis of conceptual representation, sociolinguists will benefit from examining the conceptual relationship between social-linguistic variants. In the domain of L2 sociolinguistics, Tarone has resituated interlanguage acquisition within a usage-based model. To this end, she cites Ellis (2002) showing frequency effects of input on probabilistic language production. She elaborates the connection between these probabilities based on input and variation based on context, where the social setting affects input by determining the language types a learner is exposed to, and affects production by governing how the speaker wants to represent his theme within the aspects of that particular setting. Schematic varieties (akin to Ellis’ cognitive probabilities) are activated by any number of factors, including context, noticing, or creative communicative intent. She considers these schema as voices internalized by the learner, where the voice includes both the linguistic structure, social markers of the speaker, and the social stance conveyed in the utterance (Tarone, 2002).

The synergy between the cognitive sociolinguistics model and Tarone’s integration of usage-based principles for her model for interlanguage sociolinguistics is the intersection of individually realized language and the socially-grounded composite that constitutes a language system. Both perspectives highlight the need to account for speaker positioning in acquiring and re-producing language. Both also suggest that language resources are not fixed elements, but vary by social and structural conventions as well as by agency of the individual speaker. More precisely, the link between formal variation and speaker/situational variation aligns with Tarone’s notion of internalized voices. Both models account for form-context pairings, where the context is defined by a matrix of factors. Following Tarone, positioning through speech choices reflects a re-voicing of stance that draws on acquisitional and usage experiences. A speaker is not
merely invoking formulaic chunks, but the indexed stance attached to particular combinations. For example, a second language speaker selecting *tu* over *vous* is drawing on a cognitive composite of his experiences with the forms and invoking the desired relationship between him and the addressee.

1.3.4 Identity development and instantiations

Bringing these strands together, two aspects of L2 Identity crucial to the argument and analysis in this study emerge. First is that L2 Identity is instantiated in *controlled language choices*. *Language choice* is not merely a lexical entry, but rather discursive choice which will be situated within the local context of a narrative. *Control*, representative of development, is evinced in consistency, which will be found in systematic pairings of discursive strategies and sociocultural contexts. The second aspect of L2 identity is that these instantiations reflect only a particular moment in time, as identity is an on-going process, not a product.

While the notion of identity development necessitates a spectrum of sustained changes over time, presumably from the onset of second language study, this study limits itself to the very advanced learner. Several studies evaluating sociopragmatic choice and agency among different stage learners suggest that the connection between presentation of self and L2 choices are governed by explicit mediation, while for the advanced learner it is through implicit mediation. Early learners profess to choose the first language feature that comes to mind rather than operating from a place of agency (Liddicoat 2006). Intermediate learners are more reasoned, but may rely on a pedagogical schema (e.g. vanCompernolle 2012). Learners at this stage have even been shown to be inattentive to L1 speaker invitations to modulate register (Kinginger & Belz 2005). Early advanced learners can discuss in more sophisticated terms the role of language in presentation of self, but the rationalizations for sociopragmatic choice still draw on
pedagogically-informed norms rather than in situ observations (vanCompernolle & Williams 2012). Rather than relying on discrete features to mark a stance, very advanced learners, as will be shown, modulate register holistically within a communicative event much as do native speakers (Coveney 2000) and bilinguals (Koven 2007).

1.3.5 Departing from competence

A developmental perspective calls into question the framework of competence proposed by Leaver & Shekhtman (2002b). Their rhetoric may seem commensurate with the notion of advanced capacities of language highlighted in a socio-cultural and cognitive consideration of language. Yet, the details and descriptions they offer for the elements of competency reveal a perspective on language learning and performance that is not in line with this dynamic, emergent and context-sensitive nature of L2 advanced capacities. Rather, Leaver and Shekhtman seems to outline a script for a static auto-pilot performance. For example, in discussing appropriate approaches for advanced level programming, the authors reveal their perspective that the discrete set of competences and needs at this level are relevant only at this level, rather than emerging over time:

Up to and through the Advanced-High level of proficiency, students do not need extensive and specific cultural information. They have a more essential requirement: to build a toolbox of the basic and intermediate structures of the foreign language while more often than not necessarily ignoring much of the language’s richness and uniqueness. Moreover, they are not capable of receiving cultural specificity in the target language
because their level of vocabulary is not extensive enough. (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002b:23)

The authors do call for socio-cultural and socio-linguistic knowledge to interpret and deploy contextualized, situationally appropriate language. This is quite sensible, but it is problematic that the authors find this necessary only once the learner is at the advanced or superior level and consider such information distracting before that point. It suggests that the preliminary elementary and intermediate language skills develop in a cultural and social vacuum. There is a before-and-after dichotomy of language focus and what they term Communicative Focus (CF). Once learners have amassed enough lexical and structural inventory, they may shift focus in language production from the language itself to actual communication, where the attention is no longer on language structure exclusively but additionally on context and intentionality, or the sociopragmatic aspects of language.

Considering the elements of the competence model they outline, however, reveals that communicative focus arises from a rigid “mastery” of language structure. These components of distinguished and superior-level competence, as elaborated by Leaver & Shekhtman (2002b) are condensed and summarized here:

Appropriateness of expression requires awareness of how social and cultural (both historic and contemporary) context shapes grammar, semantics, and idiomatic expressions. There may be a range of forms that represent dialectal differences and idiolectic styles. These ranges may not be apparent and their embedded meaning may be quite opaque or elusive to learners. Linguistic competence and precision of lexicon demand “sophistication and accuracy”, where “grammatical accuracy, without any doubt, is the most important element” in allowing a learner
to focus on what he is saying rather than how it needs to be said” (Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002b: 24). *Discourse competence* involves manipulating registers and using full texts. *Emotional competence* is an element that marks the difference between the distinguished level and superior-level learner, where there is a stabilizing of personality, and social competence allows the learner to participate in a range of routine and spontaneous interactions.

Shekhtman et al. (2002) outline the Shekhtman Model of Communicative Teaching that is designed to promote these competences with CF. The description of the model is heavy with metaphors for aspects of language teaching and performance. Among these are *islands* and *laundry*, which connote isolation and sterilization. Again, the particulars belie the terminology that otherwise might seem commensurate with the functional competences encompassed in Advanced Capacities. The SMCT promotes, rather than functional sociopragmatic interaction, a sterile, rehearsed performance with standard formal language. For example, discourse competence is described as producing full texts, and a strategy for this is using islands, or hopping from one rote monologue (in verbatim text or prototypical structure) to the next. This neglects the concept of co-construction of discourse through interaction and denies the learner strategies of relying on a native interlocutor. The laundry approach is cited for achieving linguistic competence, where the dirty parts of language performance (errors) are washed out, through several washing cycles if necessary.

Considering advancedness from a contemporary cognitive and developmental perspective may re-inform what capacities constitute advancedness and how one can move towards such a capacity in a second language. This understanding would privilege the indexical meaning-making potential of language, which itself is derived from human experience, and consider how
a speaker uses language in meaning-making activities and how language choices reflect the experiences that shaped them.

1.3.6 Advanced, intermediate or novice learners and language choice

A significant assumption of this study is that advanced learners, in being aware of the myriad performance options open to them, are making implicit choices in repertoire they realize. This is distinct from a corollary assumption on novice and intermediate second language learners, which is that they have neither adequate depth nor command of second language resources to make a deliberate choice between possible variants with the same degree of sophistication. The scope of this present analysis does not consider implications of second language identity at earlier points on the L2 development spectrum.

A review of the findings from several studies on the use of sociolinguistic address variants *tu* and *vous* by L2 learners at different developmental stages illustrates how the role of L2 identity in sociopragmatic capacity changes from one stage to the next. Novice learners made aware of the different forms confess to simply choosing the first that comes to mind. Intermediate learners are indiscriminately loyal to textbook teachings in spite of repeated invitation from a native speaker to switch to a familiar register (Kinginger & Belz, 2005). High-intermediate to low-advanced learners hesitated when faced with several contexts as they determine the nuance of relationships in Sax (2002). Even promising implications for sociopragmatic pedagogy (vanCompernolle, 2012) do not provide evidence of sustained development that would suggest intermediate learners make choices from a socially-formed schema over one that was grounded as pedagogically correct. Exploring identity at earlier stages of L2 development may be confounded by language choices driven by chaos, pedagogy, or uncertainty rather than implicitly mediated stance.
1.4 Study aims, organization, and scope

Having problematized the advanced L2 learner in this chapter, this project continues in Chapter 2 to review literature on L2 French sociolinguistic and pragmatic proficiency; contemporary oral French; and L2 performance. Chapter 3 includes the rationale for personal narratives as a medium for advancedness and identity analysis, followed by the methodology for the study. Three case study analyses are presented through Chapters 4, 5, and 6. Chapter 7 discusses the findings and relevance of the study.

With the question on L2 advancedness now introduced, this study aims to build an argument for second language identity as evinced in language choice through three research questions. To capture language choice, sociopragmatic performance in personal narratives is first catalogued. The use of sociopragmatic features are then analyzed against the local contexts of the narratives in which the features were realized. Finally, these findings related to L2 sociopragmatic repertoire are re-considered in the broader context of an individual’s second language learning history.

From a group of ten advanced learners recommended to a larger study, three were selected as case studies to profile in this analysis. This subset constitutes several very advanced learners among an already advanced cohort. The three focal participants each had in their profiles several extended sojourns beyond the routine semester abroad, and had engaged in professional activity in France. Additionally, in the final interview, they reported in some way a sense that French was organic, or integral, in their being, rather than an objective skill.

Cataloguing oral discourse of the very advanced learner, as well as chronicling a distinct L2 linguistic identity, extends recent work L2 French sociolinguistics which examines the advanced
learner. The profiles and performance of the three focal participants for this study reflect the very advanced learner in question.

Results of this analysis will show that advanced second language speakers use features of contemporary oral discourse in addition to previously researched sociolinguistic variants and pragmatic formulas as part of their competence repertoire. Within narrative discourse, they vary language choices according to micro contexts, such that what has been previously thought to be broad stylistic variation is in fact intentional, nuanced orchestration of repertoire within sociopragmatic constraints. These patterns will be treated as evidence of controlled language choice that constitute agentive second language identity development. Significance of these findings include realigning advanced L2 French performance measures as they compare to contemporary oral discourse, and furthering the understanding of how advanced learners realize language choices. Additionally, the methodology itself presents a new approach for analyzing very advanced learner speech, in particular sociopragmatic variation, in local and historical contexts via personal narratives.
Chapter 2

French Sociopragmatics: Advanced L2 and L1 Speakers

Recent research on advanced second language learner competences, and on the characteristics of everyday spoken language of L1 speakers dovetail in their mutual agenda to dispel myths of formal, standard and correct forms of oral communication. They focus on a speaker’s ability to manipulate language within a repertoire of language resources for particular communicative purposes. This manipulation is based on communicative constraints and individual intentionality in language construction. From the perspective of cognitive sociolinguistics, the choices an individual makes in creating utterances directly reflect the language inventory he has amassed in experiences throughout his language history, and reveal his perspective and position with respect to the event being conveyed. Individual stylistics can thus be reinterpreted as systematic situational variation. This chapter reviews recent research on sociopragmatic repertoire in advanced French L2 learners and features of native French oral language in the first two sections. The final section frames these capacities in second language and identity development.

2.1 Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatic competence merges the use of sociolinguistic variants and pragmatic formulas. For learners, usage is traditionally measured against native speaker usage norms; usually in oral performance although occasionally in competence as interpreted from comprehension or recognition (Kinginger & Blattner, 2008). Research on sociolinguistic variation in learner language distinguishes two types of variation, where Type 1 is the range of
forms acquired and Type 2 is the way in which they are used (Mougeon et al. 2004). Similarly, pragmatic research explores both the range of formulas a learner is familiar with and the ways in which these are used, again as relative to native speaker usage norms.

2.2 L2 French: advanced capacities

There have been three main veins of inquiry on sociopragmatic competence in advanced L2 learners. First is the sociolinguistic line, second the pragmatic or pragmalinguistic line, and the third is contextualized or discourse-based. Each follows a research agenda that models the one set forth for parallel inquiry of native speaker communities. Sociolinguistic research of learner language correlates variables of learner demographics and learning environments with the emergence of sociolinguistic features identified as native features (Mougeon et al. 2004). Pragmatic research on learner language explores the extent to which learners are aware of forms appropriate to a range of communicative acts (Kasper & Rose, 2001). Studies focusing on language and discourse look at late-acquired features or those that allow for discourse-level communication, such as in personal narratives or professional activities. Studies included in this area may also consider the range of register reflected in lexical and syntactic expression (see for example, Wolf, 2006).

In addition to identifying the resources appropriated by learners, these approaches all have a secondary agenda, which is to compare the extent to which the learner repertoire aligns with that of native speakers. The range of features acquired, and the extent to which learner usage mimics that of native speakers, have been described by Mougeon et al. (2004) as Type 1 and Type 2 variation, respectively. Another predominant, although not exclusively held, premise on L2 French competence is that a learner’s competence will be systematically evinced in
performance data. These perspectives slight learner agency by not crediting the creative exercise of language use. Learners may well be exercising choice in selecting language forms to create specific meaning rather than being bound by the limits of their novice-to-intermediate repertoire which may not be extensive enough to allow for choices between contexts or stylistic variation, may not reflect an appropriate understanding of L1 norms, or may not broad enough to allow for variation in the first place. Learner language needs to be examined as a valid form of language production worthy of analysis for its own set of emergent features, not just against the benchmark of NS norms. Furthermore, recent work by Howard (2012) on individual performance of advanced L2 French sociolinguistic features reminds us that native speaker norms are in fact a measure of central tendency of individual variation. Learners whose usage profiles do not exactly match the norm may well be performing nonetheless within a range of “normal,” and are quite possibly drawing on personality and identity (his terms) to project a particular sociopragmatic profile.

There have been several overviews of recent research on L2 French that summarize pragmatic and sociolinguistic inquiries (i.e., Ayoun, 2007; Dewaele, 2005; and Warga, 2007). Ayoun, for example, advocates that we move beyond singular lines of inquiry. She encourages bridging individual proficiencies (traditional strands such as phonology, syntax, pragmatics and sociolinguistics) to consider instead blended or interdependent proficiencies such as lexico-grammar (syntax-semantics) or sociopragmatics. For the advanced learner, there is power in this position as even early models of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990; Savignon, 1997) recognize that using language is an integrated performance whose whole is greater than the sum of its parts: a comprehensive understanding of language use involves more than compiling discrete vertical samples of individual language competences.
divided to conquer a new understanding of performative competences beyond the classroom, with single-faceted inquiries, we are perhaps now at a point where rejoining and de-polarizing these singular research strains may mark the next wave of inquiry of contextualized cross-domain L2 language. This point is undertaken, for example, by the nascent work of cognitive sociolinguistics to more fully consider the social influence on language schemata (Kristiansen & Dirven, 2008; Geeraerts et al. 2010).

2.2.1 L2 French Sociolinguistic studies

There is a canon of sociolinguistic features that has been explored and exploited in this first generation of L2 French sociolinguistics research. Several surveys of L2 French sociolinguistic research review studies on phonetic and morphosyntactic variants (the most researched variables include the *ne* deletion, */l/* deletion and variation of *nous* and *on* pronouns), pronouns of address, gender, tense, and aspect (Dewaele, 2004; Dewaele, 2007; Mougeon et al. 2004).

As a case study of L2 French sociolinguistic research, I present here an overview of research for the *nous* and *on* variants. These are variants for the first person plural, *we*, where *on* is now used almost exclusively in spoken French and *nous* is a highly marked variant. The approaches and findings are representative of those for other features, especially the *ne* and */l/* deletion. These features are all specific to oral language and studies often consider them in tandem. Categories of sociolinguistic and extralinguistic factors that are considered to affect acquisition and use include: gender and social class; length of L2 study and time abroad; learner participation (or motivation or engagement in the learning process); the formality of contexts of use (including theme, setting and interlocutors); the L2 learning environment; and specificity and
restrictedness of the referent. Female learners do tend to use *on*, the variant traditionally perceived as informal, at lower rates than do male learners (Rehner et al. 2003). Length of study and study abroad may be the two most determining factors in acquiring sociolinguistic variants (Dewaele, 2004, 2007). There is a positive correlation with length of study and Type 1 acquisition of the variants, and an increased effect with study abroad (Dewaele 2002; Lemée, 2002; Sax 2003) Rehner et al. (2003) find an over-representation of *nous* in written course materials, but a positive effect for teacher use of *on(N)*. Both Rehner et al. (2003) and Dewaele (2002) find learner participation in L2 social interaction and engagement to be important determinants of acquisition and use. The more engaged involvement a learner has with the L2 and native speaker interactions, the more sophisticated, if not normative, his appropriation of the sociopragmatic variants. In spite of disparate approaches to assessing formality, the findings all suggest that learners display a broad range or Type 2 variability. They do not often have the pragmatic resources to distinguish appropriate use of the *nous* and *on(N)* variants. While different studies have defined formality within context (Sax 2003), theme of discourse (Lemée 2002) or mode (Dewaele 2002), all have found an overuse of the *on(N)* variant in “formal” language in spite of an overall overuse of the *nous* variant as compared to NS. It is noteworthy that positive effects of length of study, study abroad, the learning environment and learner participation on Type 1 variation, do not extend to Type 2 variation: while all these factors foster acquisition of variants, they do not equally foster native speaker-like usage patterns.

This body of research on *nous* and *on* is commensurate with the three consistent findings across studies identified in other summary literature: learners overuse formal variants, time and exposure in L2 contexts (both pedagogical or immersion) are necessary for acquisition, and variability is greater among learners than native speakers (Dewaele, 2004; Dewaele, 2007;
Mougeon et al. 2004). This first finding is often attributed to the classroom setting, where there is an abundance of written material, overly-explicit direction lines, and a proportionally small amount of native-speaker-like oral communication. Targeted instruction of sociolinguistic features early on has been shown to significantly increase awareness and conceptual understanding of variants, but to only marginally increase the normative use in oral contexts (see Liddicoat, 2006 on address forms; or van Compernolle & Williams, 2012b on the *ne* particle)

The value of a linguistic sojourn to L2 sociopragmatic development cannot be understated, yet is often overstated as a sociolinguistic cure-all. Such an experience has been consistently shown to be a component of L2 study that normalizes sociolinguistic frequency. Such success, however, is strongly tied to degrees of social interaction in the L2 environment (see for example Kinginger, 2008). As with other late-acquired or sophisticated features, there is the risk that these are considered as such because they are late-taught, or untaught, and not part of evaluation schema until later in the language learning process. There is new evidence not only that these features are teachable at earlier stages (van Compernolle, 2012), but also that learners may use them, even near rates of native speaker norms, pre-sojourn even when they are left untaught (Howard, 2012). In the case of his study, Howard proposes that this may be because of native speaker instructors giving greater representation to contemporary oral practices in the classroom. I would add that even with non-native speaker instructors, today’s classroom is a wired, multi-media one with an easy abundance exposure to more, more recent language samples than with previous generations of teaching materials.

The third point, learner variability, is a common theme. While individual learners often exhibit a notably narrow range of socio-stylistic variation, variation patterns among learners are greater than those for native speakers. Studies often find categorical differences between
learners, but these are ungeneralizable across learners. This variability is attributed to an unsystematic understanding of sociolinguistic features in oral language (Howard, 2004; Howard, 2006; Mougeon et al. 2004) or to differences in personal stylistics (Dewaele, 2002; Sax, 2003).

A conundrum for advanced learners is that these marked oral features are at odds with traditional markers of sophisticated (dit literary) language. Consequently, the individual is constantly trying to reconcile explicit information, classroom history and in situ examples of language use. This challenge is particularly evident in syntactic variants, such as with interrogatives. Sax (2003) shows that appropriating native speaker norms requires using informal and stigmatized formulations for questions: what constitutes rhetorical sophistication is not necessarily conversational currency. Those that are in fact preferred, unmarked interrogatives in oral conventions (i.e. rising intonation) are those that a learner may have learned to be marked as informal and thus avoided. A learner unfamiliar with the difference between oral and written preferred conventions may in fact make a marked choice (i.e. inversion) while attempting to select the correct form.

2.2.2 L2 French Pragmatics studies

Pragmatics research reveals similar trends to those found in sociolinguistic research: that learner use of native-like features increases with study time and study abroad, but with variable improvement often dependent on the individual. For example, Harlow (1999) finds that for requests, thanks and apologies, learners used more direct strategies and showed less syntactic deference to older or unfamiliar interlocutors while also showing more deference to “peers” than native speakers. As reported in Warga (2007), Hoffman Hicks (1999) explored pragmatic development of compliments, leave takings, and greetings during study abroad. Findings noted
only slight development in pragmatic acts, the increased use of discourse particles, formulaic speech and wishes in greetings and leave takings, and that formulas for compliments largely retained the L1 English norms.

Kinginger & Blattner (2008) and Kinginger & Farrell (2004) report on learner awareness of colloquial language and address forms, respectively. While learners do typically exhibit conservative linguistic behavior, the authors argue that learner competence may not always be evident in performance. Thus, the studies use the Language Awareness Interview (LAI) which allows learners to report on lexical and pragmatic situations. Findings from both studies show that pragmatic awareness (representative of Type 1 variational competence) can be heightened during a study abroad experience for learners who are engaged and observant.

2.2.3 Additional advanced L2 studies

Several studies have shown surprising trends in learner language development. Specifically, the acquisition of advanced language does not always mean more accurate and sophisticated formal language, but rather may be more nuanced exercising of register. Byrnes & Sinicrope (2008) found in a longitudinal study on relativization in L2 German learners that over time there is actually a simplification of relatives used. Sax (2003) finds that learner interrogative forms trend toward native speaker usage norms, but that these norms represent a preference for a supposedly stigmatized form. Using rising intonation at the end of an utterance, or even including the formulaic phrase est-ce que requires no syntactic transformation, as does the formal interrogative form with an inverted subject-verb order.

Language play may represent another avenue for advanced learner language development. Belz (2002) and Belz & Reinhardt (2004) explore such play with language, which
requires a great deal of learner autonomy and initiative in testing boundaries of morphosyntactic permutations. The new forms created in this play represent neither errors nor partial understanding of the morphosyntactic paradigms, but rather a deliberate attempt to create within these paradigms and forge connections with interlocutors.

Using two learner corpora which included pre-service teachers and doctoral students, Bartning & Schlyter (2004)’s six-stage acquisition model for L2 French, dedicates the last three stages low, medium, and high advancedness. This last stage includes, among other concrete linguistic categories, stabilized inflectional morphology, discourse markers, and maintaining multiple levels of information across an utterance.

Studies applying the macro-syntax framework to oral French learner language also reveal developmental differences between novice-intermediate and advanced learner speech. Macro syntax is a holistic consideration of discourse where the syntax (the micro level) cannot be separated from pragmatics, intonation, or cognition, among other elements (Bouveret & Legallois, 2012). The model proposed by Blanche-Benveniste (1990) (elaborated more fully in section 2.3 below) reconceptualizes utterances as unfolding in time around a vertical axis, where meaning is adjusted and redefined in the social act of conversation. The framework includes left- and right- expansion, normative corrections, hesitations, and redefinitions as valid aspects of speech, rather than disfluent false starts. (Gadet, 2009; Bilger & Tyne, 2007; Blanche-Benveniste, 1990). An exploratory study applying this framework for analyzing oral syntax from the Groupe Aixois de Recherches en Syntaxe (GARS) to learner language found that more advanced university-level students were more likely to use in-line macro syntax, where meaning is adjusted over the time of the utterances. In contrast, introductory-level students were more likely to have long pauses followed by compact, prepared speech with few adjustments for
meaning elaboration or clarification over the course of the utterance (Bilger & Tyne, 2007). Advanced learners were shown to be able adapt as the utterance was underway to convey the intended meaning.

In comparing criteria for this high advanced stage to long-time L2 French speakers, judged to be native-like near-native speakers, Bartning (2007) found a gap in characteristics, suggesting that there is room for more advancedness beyond the emergent advanced categories of Bartning & Schlyter’s (2004) acquisitional model. The distinction between intermediate and advanced is signified by the range of features and an increased stabilization in correct syntax. The advanced stage is marked by largely stabilized syntax, broad use of discourse markers, textual coherence, and the ability to maintain several themes across an utterance. There is no accounting for markers of intersubjectivity or sophistication in register variation or oral syntax, all of which fall into the space between advanced and near-native speech by accounts of other inquiry. That half the model is dedicated to advancedness, and yet Bartning can still identify a significant gap between Stage six and near-native and native-like speech only underscores the need to pursue a more coherent understanding of advanced learner language.

2.2.4 Acquiring L2 sociopragmatic competence

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the acquisition trajectory for sociolinguistic variants proposed by Dewaele (2002) traverses phases of unawareness, awareness followed by indiscriminate overgeneralization, and finally context- and register-sensitive use. In pragmatics research, findings also suggest a non-linear acquisition of pragmatic forms, and different rates of acquisition for different functions. Kasper and Rose (2002) describe five stages of acquisition for requests: prebasic; formulaic; unpacking; pragmatic expansion; fine-tuning. Such a sequence has not been identified for other pragmatic acts. Warga (2005) espouses the notion of routines as
outlined, for example, by Kecskes (1999), which more generally account for acquisition of the acts. Similar to Dewaele’s sociolinguistic model, pragmatic acts are first transferred from the L1 (largely ignorant of L2 norms), next used creatively as the learner distils appropriate L2 usage patterns, and finally used normatively within the L2 pragmatic constraints. Both Dewaele’s U model and the notion of routines are commensurate with a cognitive, usage-based model of language acquisition where learners are integrating experiences into an ever-evolving probabilistic schema of how these features are instantiated in a socio-cultural context.

Explicit classroom instruction has been shown successful in sensitizing students to language features. Abbuhl (2006) found that targeted instruction reduced boosters and increased hedges in L2 English law school students. Findings from several studies, however, underscore the importance of a linguistic sojourn or second language experiences to develop sociopragmatic competence. Bardovi-Harlig (2001) found that second language learners in the L2 context were more attuned to pragmatics than grammar in speech, while foreign language classroom learners privileged grammar over pragmatics. Subsequent studies (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Niezgoda & Röver, 2001) corroborate these findings, although the later studies interpret the findings on a grammatical-pragmatic salience continuum rather than in terms of a grammar-pragmatics dichotomy.

A sojourn itself is not enough to foster sociopragmatic competence. Hassall’s (2006) self-study shows the importance of invested personal relationships, and the salience of interaction and attention to language for advanced competence. He explores the pragmatic use of leave-taking structures in the analysis of personal journals kept during two sojourns in Indonesia. Over the course of a 3-week and a 3-month stay, he records the expressions he used for leave-taking, the contexts that helped him judge appropriateness, (including location, interlocutors, and topic of
conversation or reason for the interaction), the response from his interlocutors, and overall impressions from various interactions. The analysis is interspersed with post-hoc evaluations of his emotional state in response to particularly successful or awkward leave-takings, and the discussion reveals how he became more sensitive to what would be well-received by native speaker interlocutors.

Developed sociopragmatic competence may thus be seen as the capacity to discern appropriate usage norms for sociopragmatic makers of an L2, and execution of said capacity in communication. A significant caveat to this assumption is that these features which are traditionally perceived as markers of advanced language (such as complex and sophisticated features) may actually wane with advancedness, such that advanced usage does not necessarily mean higher frequencies (Byrnes & Sinicrope, 2008), but effective style (Bilger & Tyne, 2007). Nor is it necessarily the acquisition of the colloquial register that displaces the formal standard features in a learner’s repertoire following a study abroad or immersion experience (Sax, 2003).

Perhaps not coincidentally, as will be explored in the following section, native speaker norms, particularly in oral communication, do not align with standard structures outlined by prescriptive grammars. This informs considerations of sophisticated language, which may well not be represented in formal, standard structures. The significance of this for the advanced learner is that the pedagogically-grounded social competence of the classroom setting must be socially adapted and schematically expanded to meet the social communicative capital acquired and required once living, studying or working in the L2 environment.

2.3 Native Speaker French

2.3.1 L1 Sociolinguistics: Interpreting native speech
Sociolinguistic research aims to correlate variation in speech patterns with social affordances and constraints. Over the past several decades, sociolinguists in France have worked to catalogue features of spoken language, presenting evidence that calls to question the extent to which standard language is in fact the oral standard. While early binary studies of micro variation were a compelling era of sociolinguistic study, expanding sociolinguistic inquiry to include features such as complex syntactic and semantic variation requires a new paradigm and framework for analysis (Blanche-Benveniste, 2007).

2.3.1a The networked perspective

Questioning the notions of variation and error as deviations from the standard norm, Gadet (1997; 2003) sets out to describe everyday spoken French. Beginning with data from a corpus of 90 minutes of telephone conversations, she illustrates the range of phonetic and syntactic resources to achieve various communicative effects. In the end, these elude social class assignment, but do raise provocative questions on the nature of language structure, language shift, and language use. Gadet (2003) argues that, in part, what might be considered as syntactic variation is really a difference between oral and written syntax, particularly in situations where expression may rely on intonation, gaze, gesture and interlocutor contributions of a similar range. Written syntax is far more explicit, and relies on syntactic resources to forge meaning with the audience while oral syntax is complemented with discursive and interactive resources. In spite of resisting the notion of socially marked variation, there are certain features of more familiar oral language that can be considered socio-stylistic markers.

Gadet (2003) extends the description of features prevalent in oral language to a discussion on the communicative value of exercising such options, arguing that the creativity in language is from neither social laziness nor ignorance but from efforts for clarity and simplicity.
In English, for example, prescriptively avoiding ending sentences with a preposition often leads to stuffy reconstructions that are particularly awkward in oral communication (which unfolds in-line and cannot easily be rewritten to remove the offending form). At the same time, constructions and forms which seem the most simple may be the least so: forms that index status are encumbered with opaque meaning. Address forms, a deceptively simple choice in French between *tu* and *vous*, are notoriously fraught with social implications. For the second language speaker, whose identity rests on an additional outsider plane, and who lack the lifelong socialization of explicitly marking relationships as such, the system may never become more transparent.

Gadet proposes that a dynamic consideration of networked meaning is more appropriate than strict sociolinguistic interpretations. Demographic profiles of age, gender and class do show stratified usage patterns, but are a challenge to interpret, not in the least because they obscure the function of language, interaction, and individual patterns of use. Rather, from the networked perspective, form and meaning are determined and interpreted by interlocutors in part by the frequency, intensity, reciprocity and content (such as advice, cooperation, friendship) of interaction. It is the relationship between speakers and to the subject matter that determines how language is realized, from a foundation of creative language resources available. In the case of address form selection, there is not a fixed matrix, but a fluid one. The shift from *vous* to *tu* in the course of a relationship is marked by an explicit invitation such as *on se tutoie?* (*Shall we use tu?*).

Certain lexical features or semantic formulas may be specifically associated with certain demographic profiles, which often include gender, age, education, professional status, social class. Such variation is also more broadly influenced by geography. Gadet (1997; 2003) has
proposed that such language profiling, though informative on the descriptive level, is misleading and not well-grounded for drawing research conclusions. Her principle refutation of reductionist generalizations about language patterns based on social variables argues that the profiles often represent composite averages rather than actual individual language use. Thus, the range of an individual’s performative repertoire is obscured by central measures.

2.3.2b Macro syntax

The work of GARS concurs that the shape of oral syntax is different from written syntax. While written language is interconnected within a text, oral language unfolds in two ways. The first is across time down a vertical axis, with many in-line adjustments in different paradigmatic positions to clarify or elaborate meaning, as well as to achieve linguistic accuracy. The second is the horizontal plane, which represents the intended conceptual utterance. To illustrate how macro-syntax is seen on the two planes, Bilger & Tyne (2007:176; translations added) present an intended concept: *j’avais une bourse au collège* (I had a scholarship in middle school). This horizontal plane, the completed concept, can in fact only be understood, distilled, after several adjustments were made along the vertical plane. The actual utterance being considered is: *j’avais une une bourse euh au chose au lycée quoi au collège* (I had a a scholarship um in thing in high school /you know/ in middle school). Looking at the utterance with vertical columns for different parts of the sentence allow one to see how a speaker dwells vertically on a particular feature.

Macro syntax, requires looking at the parallel units within the utterance, and how speakers dwell in a particular paradigmatic slot. The dwelling may represent hesitation, correction, or expansion. (Bigler & Tyne, 2007). What may be otherwise considered disfluency (such as false starts and
repair) are considered to be part of the meaning-making act of producing an utterance. (Blanche-Benveniste, 2007; 1990)

2.3.1c Semantic equivalence

Another foundational point is that sociolinguistic variants must be semantically equivalent, but used in different social contexts by different individuals. Address forms represent a much-researched example in French and other languages, where there are formal and informal forms, commonly interpreted as determined by the relative status of interlocutors. Coveney (1997), for example, shows how different interrogative forms hold equivalent meanings. Gadet (1997), however, illustrates that semantic equivalency is not always as simple as its formal grammatical interpretation. Meaning, rather, may be determined by the historical use of a certain form, or by a complex matrix of social factors. As evidence, she presents two forms of the future which are ostensibly equivalent:

*Je vais avoir un enfant* [I am going to have a child]

*J’aurai un enfant* [I will have a child]

In spite of what are strictly semantically equivalent interpretations, the two utterances carry socially distinct meanings, which are not interchangeable. If a pregnancy is already underway, the first is the only option possible, while in the second a pregnancy may be in the indeterminate future, so not future-indicative at all (Gadet, 1997: 84).

2.3.2 Features of L1 oral French

Researchers are increasingly interested in cataloguing syntactic and lexical features of French which are open to variation or error for French language speakers. While many of these
characteristics are popularly believed to be contemporary, and youthful in particular (Walter, 2007), they have been documented in many cases over at least the past three centuries (Blanche-Benveniste, 2007). In simple sentences, possible variations include word order with dislocation, subject doubling and prepositional phrases, as well as interrogative constructions, deletion of the *ne* particle, and agreement. Subject doubling is emphatically (although increasing less emphatic and more *so de rigueur*) preceding the subject pronoun with the disjunctive form (*moi-je; toi-tu; lui-il; nous-on; eux-ils*) or in the case of 3p following the noun phrase subject immediately with the subject pronoun such that the compound form is one lexical and conceptual unit. This is distinct from dislocation, which is the elaboration or disambiguation of a subject or object pronoun by placing the referent either before (to the left of) or after (the right of) the main proposition of an utterance. Examples (1), (2), and (3) show the difference between subject doubling (1), left dislocation (2) and right dislocation (3).

(1) *moi-je vais au cinéma ce weekend*

(2) *le film, mes parents l’ont vu hier*

(3) *mes parents l’ont vu ce film hier*

Although once considered the same phenomenon and not separately evaluated in research (Nagy et al. 2003), subject doubling is now considered to be distinct from dislocation. The pronoun doubling is redundant, not disambiguating, and serves an emphatic function, or stylistic preference. Dislocation, on the other hand, is a marked form of unfolding macro-syntax across an utterance.

In complex sentences, variation is evident in alignment of tense and aspect, in method of subordination and conjunction (including generalization and overgeneralization of the relative
pronoun *que*, and paratactic and hypotactic constructions), as well as the use of nominalization, indirect interrogatives, and complements (of time, location, consequence). At the lexical level, this can include differences of register from formal to slang, as well as creativity with suffixes and derivations, grammatical metaphor, codes and punctuation (Blanche-Benveniste, 2007; Gadet, 2003; Walter, 2007).

Learner variation for these NS features fall globally into three categories (Coveney, 1997; Gadet, 2003): the presence or absence of a feature; alternating between two or more elements; or alternating among structural collocations. The presence or absence of a feature includes optional deletion of the *ne* particle. Choices between variants appear at the lexical level, such as in address pronouns and auxiliary verbs, or syntactically such as the choice between the *proche* and *simple* future tenses. These can also be seen in sociopragmatics with the choice of formula for various speech acts such as leave taking and expressions of gratitude. Collocations include the pre or post positioning of adjectives and formulations of interrogatives. There is also a tentative fourth phenomenon, which is use of the marked formulas in formal public- or political-level discourse. In the networked perspective, what Gadet finds more revealing on social variation than whether or not an individual uses a particular form is how different features are combined in a range of situations. This is co-variation, the pairing of a language feature to contextual aspect. In practice, the result is how an individual modulates genre and register with his inventory of linguistic resources, such that the contexts are more relevant to understanding language in use than the frequencies themselves. Studies of contemporary oral language show that sociolinguistics features are more likely to co-vary based on situation or language function than by socio-economic status (Gadet, 2003).
2.3.3 Summary and implications for Advanced L2 French

In sum, sociolinguistic choices are governed by the social situation and by semantic constraints of different variants, and are therefore more precisely sociopragmatic choices. Different variants each invoke a unique set of immediate (individual) and historical (social) meaning, which Silverstein (2003) articulates as degrees of indexicality; a speaker makes a choice of linguistic feature based on the constraints present in the local exchange (setting, participants, theme, and so on) as well as on the constraints of a broader experiential history and how the individual wishes to define his role on that plane. Returning to Gadet’s position that an individual’s repertoire is more representative than his socio-demographic norms, individual variation shows how an individual interprets the local and historical social matrix and how this interpretation informs the choice of language forms to be used.

While Ortega & Byrnes (2008) call for advanced learner language to be evaluated within the scope of advanced capacities, this term is designed to encompass yet respect distinct threads of inquiry into learner language. A cohesive understanding of advanced capacities can only be discerned from overlaying findings from these various approaches. What emerges from a union of these multiple perspectives is the notion that advanced language learners assert choice that is appropriate to a situation, rather than that the situation dictates a correct language formula. Thus, interest in the choices available to native speakers in syntax and sociopragmatic repertoire is apt to provide better understanding and appreciation of advanced learner language than a rigid notion of correctness. Contextualized and thematic analysis of how language resources are individually realized holds promise in revealing connections between learner experience and the language choices that constitute sociopragmatic competence.
2.4 Advanced learner language reconsidered

2.4.1 Limitations of current research

As outlined above and in the previous chapter, much of the research focusing on advanced syntax, sociolinguistic and pragmatic features in learner language departs from two restricting premises. These are that there is a correct way to use language, modeled after the native speaker, and that performance data is adequate to measure learner acquisition and variation.

French sociolinguists have acknowledged that the standard for oral language is one that is consummate only when language is considered as speech, gaze, gesture, intonation and so on (Gadet 1997). At the same time, the nascent inquiries of second language sociolinguistics have been implicitly limited by the traditional focus of advanced curricula emphasizing literature and other formal written genres. A classroom learner is thus quite unlikely to become familiar with, much less easily use, features of contemporary oral language. Many of these sociolinguistic studies focus on defining a demographic profile, and to a lesser extent correlating these to learner experiences, of how learners use standard forms (e.g. Mougeon et al 2003). In many cases non-standard forms are expressly excluded from analysis when performance is evaluated (see for example Sax 2003, or Dewaele, 1997) or not incorporated into the model if comprehension is being evaluated. Justifications for the exclusion of non-standard language may include logistical constraints in the design, such as limitations of the VARBRUL program cited in Sax (2003). Nonetheless, this approach limits the extent to which the findings are informative about actual learner language use. Further, while these studies explore sociopragmatic features, the pragmatic aspect is addressed in the literature review, and used in informing the research questions, but then disregarded in the design and analysis. The result is a narrow understanding of advanced
learner language as compared to actual learner language, and as compared to oral French. Contemporary spoken French is, in fact, described by Gadet as “ordinary” French, which includes a range a widely used but traditionally stigmatized forms.

An additional frustration of previous studies is their reliance on computational variation models (e.g. VARBRUL) rather than discursive analyses. The need to code data for statistical models leads to rejecting non-conforming data. Dewaele (1999) notes that the variability among options in question formation makes comparison between native and non-native speakers difficult. While one can concede that it is a challenging task (and likely a misguided one) to tabulate and compare question forms used by advanced learners, this very concession perhaps leads to a more fruitful question. The matrix of possibilities intimates the complexity of individual, linguistic, and extralinguistic influences that result in a particular form being employed. Considering the repertoire of an advanced learner should involve assessing the range exhibited and the degree to which the uses are appropriate, rather than mere or sheer numbers of questions.

Additionally, Dewaele (1999) excluded from the analysis data from three participants who played the role of interviewee but not interviewer. The resulting data for these participants was “categorical” or lacking a verb, such as the example provided where the participant reprises a portion of the original question asked.

Interviewer  *tu vas prendre des vacances en Angleterre?*

Interviewee  *prendre des vacances ?*  (p 170)

While the second utterance admittedly does not provide one of the syntactic structures identified for analysis by the author, at the same time it constitutes a communication check and functions
as an interrogative. This utterance is entirely valid when considered in the paradigm of macro syntax.

Similarly, aiming for consistency in the analysis, Coveney (1996) excludes syntactically deficient questions as well as those which are “correct” but whose pragmatic function is not interrogative. Because the aim in evaluating advanced L2 is assessing the repertoire, it seems important to open up the analysis to all instances of actual language that meet the functional criteria rather than excluding these two categories of non-conforming structures. The first, which may be constituted of incomplete or incorrect utterances may indicate linguistic breakdown in the learner, or, as Gadet (2003) is mindful, an utterance that seems incomplete but is completed in communication, with context, body language, or paralinguistic features. The second should also be considered in how it shows the ability to blend syntax schemata across pragmatic functions. As discussed in Abbuhl (2006), ESL learners often underuse hedges, relying on more direct and explicit language. As language use drives language change (Tarone, 2007), it seems as important to explore the language that distills into cognitive schemata as it is to explore how these schemata are creatively redeployed in new ways.

Having established the forms and features that represent a range of variation within and between registers, sociolinguists next turn to what these forms mean. There are two perspectives to this. One is how these syntactic-level features shape discourse and the second is what they index in terms of interlocutor identity. A study by Coveney (2000), takes on several popular hypotheses, representing perspectives on both discourse and identity, on what dictates the use of the nous or on subject pronouns. More specifically, while on is the predominant form used, he aims to isolate what provokes the rare use of the nous form. In analyzing data from his Picardy corpus, collected from interviews with employees at a summer camp, he evaluates proposed
schemata for the role of *nous* in contemporary spoken French from semantic (distinct meaning), discursive (change in theme), pragmatic (inclusion or exclusion of audience), demographic (speaker profile) and linguistic (co-variation) perspectives. The use of *nous* from all these perspectives was inconsistent; the inconclusive results ultimately lead him to cite stylistic preference in governing choice to elect *nous* over *on*. He continues to show that *nous* is used as a marked form in passages where there is an overall shift in register, for example using *demeurer* instead of the more common *rester*, such that the speaker intends to mark a shift for a particular passage, not just for a singular feature.

Such stylistic variation, repeatedly discarded or ignored in traditional L2 sociolinguistic studies, is the very thing that marks a very advanced L2 user, where linguistic repertoire approximates that of a native speaker, but the choices in discourse vary subtly (Bartning, 2007). Moreover, this variation may be better understood not as variation determined by external factors, but as agentive instantiations of style. Grounding second language sociolinguistic variation in a cognitive theory allows us to interpret this heretofore stylistic variation as the unique pairing of past language experiences and the immediate communicative context.

2.4.2 New directions for advanced capacity research

Advanced capacities, as advocated by Ortega & Byrnes (2008), represents an understanding of second language competence based on control and choice within a speaker’s sociopragmatic repertoire. Gadet (1997; 2003) has also proposed a reconsideration of sociolinguistic variants, having established in her work that actual language use of certain forms which have been stereotyped and stigmatized as marking certain user groups actually transcend these perceived social class boundaries in everyday, ordinary language use. Thus, the variants do
not strictly vary based on social framework. Embracing the notion of advanced capacities represents a conceptual shift from strict categories of correct usage norms, and requires recognizing broader spheres of influence in realizing language choice. Their notion entails, however, not departing from traditional lines of inquiry, which are valid descriptions of how learners use language, but for redirecting how these findings on learner language are interpreted and validated.

A missing element in existing studies may be in matching the emergence of syntactic and sociopragmatic features in textual discourse analysis with considerations of choice and identity. This notion aligns with sociolinguistic agency as articulated by van Compernolle and Williams (2012a; 2012b), where the learner, based on conceptually-driven understanding of sociolinguistic choices, is introducing agentive meaning rather than responding to a predetermined context. Although applied in their research to novice and early-intermediate L2 learners functioning entirely in pedagogical contexts, their emphasis on learner agency has power in describing the task and volition of an advanced L2 user living abroad for academic, professional, or personal purposes.

Deliberate choice based on a complex matrix of influences, such as all those considered by Coveney (2000) would indeed be difficult to schematize in a corpus study. Yet, potential for such a consideration within a discourse analytic approach is seen in studies such as Koven (2007) and Wolf (2006). Wolf has highlighted distinct structural, syntactic and lexical differences in L1 and L2 French narratives and a service encounters. Koven has explored lexical and stylistic differences in bilingual narratives and their implications for differences in L1 and L2 identity among bilinguals. Franco-Portuguese bilinguals are shown to perform two distinct identities between languages and cultures when performing narratives in both languages.
Advanced learners may be shown to modulate repertoire performance within utterance sequences as do the speakers in Coveney’s corpus, where it is the suite of features used together that are more indicative of a stance and any singular feature. The following section reviews several studies evincing linguistic agency and exploring L2 identity.

2.5 Linguistic Agency and L2 Identity

The issue of learner identity can be approached from a host of perspectives. It has been widely mentioned in literature on second language learning, and is implicated in a range of factors and terms, from sociopolitical group affinity, to sociolinguistic demographic profile, to variables of affect and motivation, to learner agency and choice, to intersubjectivity and sociocultural sensitivity. In the sociopolitical vein, identity is marked by subordination and difference and linguistic analysis is used to explore group alignment and power differentials (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). Sociolinguistic identity creates linguistic profiles of speakers who use particular variants, drawing on marked cases to denote differences from normative speech (and the presumed normative population). This singular linguistic profile has come under scrutiny as discourse-based studies highlight great individual variation within the group norm (Gadet 2003), and corpus-based studies show that between-group variation for certain stigmatized features may not be as pronounced as previously thought (Coveney, 2000; Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2003). These require a poststructuralist consideration of identity, as elaborated by Norton (2010; 2013), one which considers individual identities within a group.

The identity framework outlined by Bucholtz and Hall (2004) embeds identity within the semiotic process of language use. In their view, language use inextricably constitutes identity instantiation: identity cannot be separated from language as a meaning-making system, nor is it
merely tangential to language meaning. The model for analysis considers four planes within which identity is realized: practice, indexicality, ideology and performance. Practice refers to group behavior, or historical cultural norms, while indexicality is the connection between language and semiotic meaning. The indexed meaning of an utterance is anchored between the Practice and Ideology, which is the power held by different user groups. Performance is the individual instantiation of language, which they describe as a “deliberate, self-aware social display”.

This model of identity aligns with a sociocultural one of language development and use, where language cannot be separated from its contexts of acquisition and use (N.B.: their use of sociocultural does not invoke Vygotskian theory). The second language learner is thus schematizing the practices and ideologies of language. If learner variation represents a revoicing of the indexical stance associated with particular features (Tarone, 2007), L2 identity, the choice of re-presentation of stance, is thus evident in performance and understood in conjunction with the sociocultural matrix surrounding it. For the advanced leaner, agentive performance is the realization of advanced capacities rather than pedagogical performance.

2.5.1 Approaches to identity research

For the second language learner, there is rhetorical consensus that identity arises from personal characteristics and is evinced in language style. What comprise personal characteristics and constitute style vary somewhat among studies. While discourse-level studies have looked at group affinities, and sociolinguistic and pragmatic studies align speakers with group membership, it remains to be explored how individual identity is realized in language construction. Previous studies have considered what language content directly and indirectly reveals about identity (see, for example the framework proposed by Pavlenko, 2007). Identity,
however, should also be considered as a motivating, schematic factor for language choices at the syntactic level. At issue in particular here would be variants long considered to be semantically equivalent by sociolinguistics, yet widely recognized in practice as carrying a distinct meaning and stance.

Including identity performance in advanced L2 capacities renders more complex how these capacities are understood. Language choice now encompasses what the learner considers appropriate to the situation and which specific choice (although not necessarily normative) best represents how the learner wants to communicate his perspective on and position within the discourse. That is, the language selection comes not merely from passive responsiveness to correct language norms, but from a learner intention and agency in a particular social setting.

There have been four main approaches to L2 learner identity. Two have been fairly well addressed in language learner research and two much more tentatively so. These are considerations of affect and personality, sociolinguistic demographics, narrative accounts of learner experiences, and identity as evinced in discourse. The narrative and discourse approaches draw on previous research with immigrants and bilinguals and draw on how speakers position themselves in communication.

2.5.1a Personality influences

The most frequently invoked approach concerns the role of personality, affect, and motivation in language acquisition. Among the ten “desirable characteristics” for superior distinguished level learners cited in Kubler (2002), four address personal variables: highly motivated; extrovert; young; and single. Personality addresses whether or not one is an introvert or extrovert, and therefore less or more likely to engage in practice opportunities with the language. Affect is most often considered in terms of anxiety. Motivation is measured in terms of
engagement. (see for example, Coleman & Klapper, 2005; Ehrman, 2002; Evans, 2007; or Norton Peirce, 1995). Abbuhl (2006) notes the investments of time and money on the part of her participants as part of motivation.

Norton (2000; 2010; 2013) faults this understanding of learner engagement for unilaterally considering the learner as the responsible party, and not accounting for the external socio-political contexts, particularly for immigrant communities. She invokes investment, which represents the interplay of individual motivation as well as the individual’s relationship to the social construct in which the L2 is being learned or used. This social construct is the sum of individual interactions as well as underlying socio-political constraints. Norton cites such ideological controls as possible reasons to limit a learner’s L2 development. In certain situations, a learner may be restricted from fully or freely interacting with L2 community, thereby lacking sociocultural mediation to foster development.

Leaver & Shekhtman (2002) subscribe to the idea that individual language style is a question of personality, and that this manifests itself similarly in L1 and L2. That is, for the learner, “his or her idiolect reflects his or her own linguistic proclivities in any language. If students are erudite in their native language, they exhibit erudition in the foreign language. If they are descriptive in their speech in their native language, they develop culturally appropriate descriptive strategies in the foreign language. If they punctuate their native speech with humor and sarcasm, they punctuate the foreign language with culturally appropriate versions of the same.” In addition to asserting that L1 and L2 personality mirror each other, the authors propose that as one increasingly asserts one’s L2 personality, there emerges a neutral composite that is equally acceptable in either culture. This position neglects issues of participation and status and performance of identity as addressed by other researchers evaluating how L2 users
involve themselves in discourse, social interaction and community activity. On the linguistic level, this also is at odds with findings on cross-cultural differences of how discourse is structured and how information is privileged and encoded in linguistic means. Thus, these aforementioned stylistic differences of humor and sarcasm, in addition to other attempts at intersubjectivity through interaction, are more likely realized and valued on different planes in different languages (and corresponding cultures) than not. This model is difficult to find feasible in a cognitive-socio model of language development. If language indexicals are inseparable from language forms, then the learner’s “personality” must vary according to stances of ideology and practice within the L2 community.

2.5.1b Sociolinguistic-demographic predetermination

The second consideration of identity is from the perspective of sociolinguistic research, which, as discussed above, generally outlines demographic profiles of groups most closely associated with the use of certain variables. For learners of French, upper-class older females are generally more likely to use and over-use formal variants. Learners who study abroad, who again tend to be university-age females, tend to acquire a certain measure of colloquial language as well as phonetic and morphological markers of more informal every day speech (e.g. Mougeon et al 2003).

2.5.1c Narrative and Discursive instantiation

From research in bilingual and immigrant identity, second language researchers have begun to use narrative inquiry as a means to explore learner experiences, and to correlate these findings to evidence in language acquisition, or attrition. Pavlenko (2004) argues that history and contemporary circumstances (material, social and political) do shape second language identity. Norton (2001) articulates the notion of imagined communities, where an immigrant’s experiences
may be shaped by what she had anticipated them to be like. An immigrant may embrace or withdraw from a new community depending on the extent to which the actual experience aligns with the preconceived one. Kinginger (2008) and Kinginger & Blattner (2008) illustrate several such examples from learner journals kept during a study abroad where violated expectations can hinder engagement and subsequent openness to interaction and learning.

Discourse analysis is applied to Franco-Portuguese bilingual narratives in Koven (2007) to examine identity as evinced in language choices between languages. Her analysis provides examples of how identity is reflected not just in a global sense of self within a particular language community, but also in specific and systematic language choices that speakers make. She specifically considers how her bilingual study participants "experience their multiple identities as a result of how they experience their ways of speaking in each language. (p. 4)" Her analysis derives from the notions that speakers can indeed realize two distinct identities and that identity is an issue of performance. This perspective is at odds with Leaver and Shekhtman’s (2002) assertion that in advanced stages of second language acquisition a composite personality emerges, one that is neutrally appropriate in either culture. This also delves beyond aspects of affect and motivation in how language comes to be realized, even taking into consideration that advanced learner language can be far from near-native language. Koven’s findings include that, with complex backgrounds shaping bilinguals’ experiences over time and across cultures, they do assert “nonequivalent personas” (238) in French and Portuguese, as is evident in their language choices in each language and in their sense of self when exercising these language choices.

Belz (2002) explores the role of play in L2 multicompetences, including an L2 identity that emerges through play in multilingual narratives. Her analysis focuses on hybrid language
forms that mix features of English and German (or other languages) produced by learners. She argues that these forms are intentionally produced and do not appear as a result of incomplete L2 knowledge. Rather, the learners are exercising agency such that “their developing knowledge of German interfaces with their knowledge of English … new and unique languages, and consequently prideful and pleasurable reflective modes of expression” creatively emerge (p 32). Belz pairs affective considerations with aesthetic ones to capture the notion of how learners can be intentionally creative in what they are saying. This creativity is expressed through availing themselves not only of the structural options available in their two languages but also of the culturally entrenched meanings in metaphors. Further, learners may intentionally use constructions that blend L1 and L2 syntax. Such utterances may look superficially incorrect but their meaning is complete and comprehensible in the intercultural context of the interaction. Belz (2002) represents a rare piece of SLA research that addresses identity as more than a factor vaguely encompassed in affective or social variables. Rather, she draws together a cohesive sense of what role, from a socio-cultural perspective that inherently implicates human experience in language resources and realization, learner agency can play in shaping second language use and performance.

Belz & Reinhardt (2004) present a case study which extends this discussion of L2 competence and identity as evinced in play. Seamus, a fourth semester German student, was part of a larger-scale study in which participants were paired with telecollaborative keypals, using their L1 and L2 each about half of the time. Examples of student wordplay include grammatical metaphor, such as nominalizing adjectives with suffixes, creating compound words, and elongating words through multiple repetitions of letters. Seamus uses language play, in part, to establish intersubjectivity with his German interlocutor (such as when he tried a second time to
create a word when the first attempt had been reprised by the partner), and in positive-face
politeness. Belz and Reinhardt hypothesize that word play was a means for him to make his
presentation of self more dynamic within the constraints of the text medium.

2.5.2 Agentive language choice

Several studies on advanced syntax and sociopragmatic repertoire open questions on the
role of learner identity in shaping language choice, rather than the context of study determining
the extent of competence. While both Dewaele (1999) and Sax (2003) acknowledge the
sociolinguistic and pragmatic functions of interrogative structures, their analyses nonetheless
focus on the sociolinguistic variation. Pragmatic research may be seen to pick up where
sociolinguistic research leaves off, or, alternatively, to undermine the significance of its findings.
Pragmatics, after all, shows that the semantically equivalent structures identified in
sociolinguistic work can, in fact, be quite different in terms of communicative significance and
that these differences may change the semantic meaning indexed, thereby disrupting the
argument for semantic equivalencies. Further, it is troublesome that the very non-standard
constructions that both Dewaele and Sax exclude from their analytic model due to coding
problems or non-grammaticality reinforces in L2 research a similar shortcoming from L1
research. While these constructions are being perceived in isolation as “errors”, they are in fact
utterances completed in the sociopragmatic context of communication (Gadet, 1997; 2003;
Blanche-Beneveniste, 2000). Further, Sax (2003) found that overall the learners’ use of
interrogative patterns standardized toward native speaker norms, including the casual use of
intonation and the so-called stigmatized forms. In spite of L2 development toward native speaker
speech, the privileged patterns of native speakers that are appropriated by learners in study
abroad and extensive study, are neither "late acquired" nor particularly sophisticated. What these features do represent, however, is a broader repertoire. Connected to these oversights is the extent to which competence may not be evident in performance, as underscored in Kinginger & Blattner (2008).

While the discussion in Harlow (1999) centered on how different profiles of addressees affected the address forms used by learners, it does not address what is indexed by these language choices. For example, considering that NNS are consistently more likely to use the *vous* address form, this may be signaling that they do not see themselves as group members or in a position deserving deference, even if the interlocutor is of a similar or younger age. This perspective on positioning may be evident throughout the utterance, in the syntax. Similarly, through quantitative analysis, Wolf (2006) finds that learners use different perspectives in L1 and L2 narratives and interactions, as expressed through pronoun, verb and other syntax choices.

For his part, Hassall (2006) also transparently notes the limitation of approaching the acquisition of leave-takings exclusively from a pragmatic perspective. Sociolinguistic considerations could, for example, inform how the interactions of the participants may affect the degree to which a certain formula is appropriate. While Seamus’ experimentation with the language (Belz & Reinhardt 2004) may parallel that elaborated in Hassall (2006) for example, of a learner deducting through trial-and-error the usage norms of leave-taking in Indonesian, a crucial difference is that Seamus already he knows the structural rules and is experimenting with the extent to which he can reconfigure them.

Having opened the conversation on sociolinguistic agency in L2 learners, van Compernolle & Williams (2012b) use language data, interviews, and language histories to triangulate the indexicality of *tu* and *vous* in two classroom learners. Their analysis shows that
learner identity, how they perceive themselves as L2 speakers, govern learners’ language choices more than their conceptual understanding of sociolinguistic concepts.

Considerations of the individual and his contributions to second language need to move beyond how affective, personality and demographic categories foster learning. Thus, potential avenues for exploring learner identity in discourse include broadening the range of features considered in syntactic and sociopragmatic analyses, exploring the extent to which learners creatively play or otherwise construct meaning with language, and looking within discursive meaning and for intentionality in language choice.

Investigating learner identity additionally requires situating language choices in social and historical contexts. Advanced linguistic resources, whether standard, creative, stigmatized or non-standard forms, allow the speaker to construct and convey a certain perspective on the participants, setting and actions carried out. Langacker (2006) outlines how cognitive grammar allows for speakers to communicate the perspective from which they experienced and processed events through lexical and syntactic choices. Thus, every utterance foregrounds certain information and conveys a trajectory of events specific to the perspective adopted by the speaker. While Langacker abdicates a position on implications of this perspective for second language learning and teaching, the perspective adopted by a second language speaker should be equally evident in second language choices as it is in first language choices. From a sociolinguistic perspective, lexical choices also index local and global relationships. Silverstein (2003) articulates multiple degrees of indexicality, which reference the relationship between the interlocutors, and the speaker’s position in a broader context, as well as infinite potentialities of additional local and historical contexts. Such a perspective on native speech, one that liberates a speaker from explicit norms of written text and embraces the contextual and interpersonal
affordances of oral communication, enlightens research on advanced second language learning. As advanced second language competences include sophisticated discourse and sociopragmatic competence, recognizing how these are realized and perceived in native speech is a step in defining these advanced L2 competencies.

In narratives in particular, this indexical projection (Silverstein, 2003) happens simultaneously on several levels: to represent at once the social constraints of the narrated event, and those of the narration between the speaker and the audience. By retracing the indexical steps provided in the narrative, we can reconstruct the sociopragmatic schemata a learner holds for certain features. Socio-cultural theory (SCT) conceives this indexical positioning as an assertion of self: an instantiation, in this case in and of an L2, of how we see ourselves relative to social constraints, in the perceived present (social), past (historical), and future (projected) (Penuel & Wertch, 1995). Further, SCT holds that language is developed (Lantolf, 2007) rather than acquired. Development requires a sustained state of performance. This performance, however, is not a consistent relationship of feature-to-function, but rather a dynamic and agentive one. It is thus that L2 repertoire choices may be interpreted as assertions of L2 identity

2.6 Research Questions

This review of literature and motivation to extend the understanding of the advanced L2 French learner, lead to the formulation of the three research questions as articulated below. The first aims to extend the understanding of L2 French sociopragmatic competence to include oral syntax features illuminated in recent work on L1 French oral language. The second situates repertoire choices in local contexts of narratives. The final question situates these repertoire-
context pairs in the broader social history of the learner. Together, these three tiers of repertoire analysis allow for a consideration of L2 identity development.

RQ1: What range of sociopragmatic markers of advanced capacities do participants display within a set of personal narratives? These include sociolinguistic features, recently illuminated oral discourse features, and discourse strategies traditionally associated with writing.

1a: In what ways does the learner favor written or oral conventions for narration?

Formal, written, or literary language may include the *nous* subject pronoun, the *passé simple*, inversion question formation, or complex relative clauses. In narrative structure, these may include explicit pronoun tracking. Markers of oral language may include discourse markers or paratactic sentences.

RQ2: How does the range of resources used for single narratives compare to that of the whole set of narratives? How are the subsets of repertoire from individual narratives connected to the contextualized discourse events of that narrative?

Are the registers displayed particular to certain themes, to narratives that involve a certain profile of participants, or used more significantly in reported speech?

Is there a difference between resources used when narrating events that originally took place in the L1 or L2, or that involves participants whose L1 is French or English?

Is there a difference between resources used for formal or informal contexts, or those that involve friends, family, colleagues or strangers as co-participants?

Is there a difference between resources used for different narrator roles?
RQ3: In what ways do sociopragmatic language choices assert an L2 identity? How is the participant portraying self, others, and activities relative to the sociocultural indexicality (historically and locally) of the narrative event, and how does the participant explain such language choices?

3.1 What stances do the participant adopt for self and others in narratives (actors, agents or recipients), relative to the theme, cultural construct (L1 or L2), and initial language of the event?

3.2 How does the participant portrayal of self in narratives and linguistic interview align or diverge?

3.3 How does the participant’s language history inform these discursive interpretations and participant explanations?

Specific methodology to pursue these questions is outlined in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter, I detail the methods for data collection and the framework and procedures for analysis. To summarize the research questions elaborated in Chapter 2, the purpose of this study is to investigate the sociopragmatic repertoire of the advanced L2 French speaker on three levels: to the extent that it aligns with the repertoire of native French speakers with particular attention to contemporary oral syntax; to the extent that sociopragmatic choices are socio-culturally contextualized within local discourse; and to the extent that sociopragmatic choices are socio-culturally contextualized within an individual’s historical L2 experiences. These questions were designed to blend growing interest in understanding the L2 advanced sociopragmatic repertoire and L2 identity via socio-cultural and cognitive linguistic perspectives on L2 development. A synthesis of these strands situated in socio-cultural theory, as well as a rationale for the narrative medium, follows as a prelude to the research design.

3.1 A framework for L2 identity through narratives

Recent research in L2 sociopragmatics has centered on a small range of features for sociopragmatic repertoire of the advanced learner (e.g. Dewaele, 2006; Sax, 2003). For this narrow set of features, these analyses are also limited in that they only compare usage frequencies of features to those of NS, and often ascribe differences in usage to individual stylistics. Additionally, these studies primarily focused on a traditional cannon of features driven by binary variationist studies, namely the ne particle, tu and vous address forms, and nous and on subject pronouns, although some recent studies have begun to include discourse-level constructions (e.g., Sax 2003 includes interrogative forms). This study is designed in part to specifically explore usage patterns of sociopragmatic features, and to expand the categories of consideration to reflect recent work on
characteristics of oral French, in particular indexical discourse-level constructions. The narrative medium holds power in two ways. First, it allows access to indexical meaning in a broad range of contexts. Second, through surface content and structure stylistics, narratives reveal the positioning of self to others within the narrative and narrated contexts.

Distinct sociopragmatic repertoires for each of a bilingual speaker’s languages have been found in parallel narrative repertoire of Luso-French bilinguals, as analyzed by Koven (2007; 2002). She found that for the same stories told in French and Portuguese the sociopragmatic resources used were different between languages, as well as between contexts within the narratives, and that these differences could be attributed to a change in perspective and representation of self and other in the narratives. The study outlined here explores applications of this approach to advanced L2 speakers in two ways. First it aims to connect the use of different sociopragmatic features to the socio-cultural context of individual narratives, thereby accounting for usage patterns beyond individual stylistics: do advanced learners realize repertoire similarly to simultaneous bilinguals? This study then attempts to connect shifts in perspective and personal representation in narratives to L2 identity: does advanced L2 repertoire performance align with local and historical constraints?

Deconstructing the complexity of the act of narration reveals the multiplicity of data provided even within simple narratives (Bamberg, 2012). That narratives offer this connection between language choices, topic content and historical context is elaborated in Pavlenko (2006), where she advocates accounting for multiple levels of meaning and influence in narratives as data. A single narrative traverses many smaller contexts. An oral narrative requires immediate interaction with an audience in a real-time local setting (the act of narration), as well as projected interactions between characters, in an internally local time and setting (the narrated event).
is additionally an orientation to the historical frame of the narrated event. Particular language choices in a narrative can be situated in these socio-cultural constraints and tied to indexed identity via the projected relationships in both the immediate, narrated content as well as the embedded, contextualized meaning. Because spoken narratives are texts with coherent internal structure and which employ oral linguistic strategies (including colloquial registers, oral syntax devices, and intersubjective strategies) they are well-suited to exploring how an advanced learner would use oral strategies.

This connection between language use and identity draws on cognitive linguistics and socio-cultural perspectives on L2 and identity development. Cognitive linguistics (CL) posits that there is an inherent connection between how events are experienced and how they are subsequently represented through linguistic reporting or narration. The trajectory of sentences, which includes the position of participants in the actor or recipient slots and the directionality of action betray the cognitive representation we hold of events (Evans & Green, 2006). Extending a CL framework to genre-specific and discourse-level analysis is relatively new. For narratives, this includes examination of viewpoint shifts through reported speech, intersubjective alignment, and how narration responds to conventions of the broader historical context (Dancygier & Sanders, 2010). Following this line, the systematic difference in the positioning of characters and events by bilinguals between languages and roles within narratives (Koven, 2007) may be interpreted as reflecting the cognitive representation and re-creation of the features used.

Socio-cultural theory (SCT) similarly holds that there is a dialectical relationship between how we experience events and the language we use to represent them. For SCT, development is driven by experiential interaction with the targeted developmental activity (Lantolf, 2007). Language development is unique in that language (L1) is at once a mediating tool for development
and the targeted developmental activity. The shape of the language we develop reflects a composite of the shape of the experiences we had in developing it, including associated stances and circumstances. Language-experience pairings create language use potentials. In addition to being probabilistically represented in a learner’s repertoire in terms of syntax, as Tarone (2002) outlines, language resources also include an inseparable index of social meaning. It follows that a second language, if developed to an advanced level, should similarly reflect perspective and positioning constructed in developmental events. Since very advanced learners arrive at this point through varied paths, their language resources differ accordingly.

There are two crucial points that bear reiteration. The first, from cognitive linguistics, is that language choices specifically orient objects, actions and characters to reflect the speaker’s point of view in reconstructing events through language. The second, from SCT perspective on development, is that developmental experiences shape the tools one has (which in turn shape subsequent experiences). In the case of language, language resources are linked to the experiences of learning and development, thus the orientation of objects, actions and characters. Bringing these two points together, a particular language choice in discourse orients the speaker at once to his developmental experience and his perspective on the subject of discourse. In the Discussion of findings in Chapter 7, these points will be more explicitly connected to L1 speech and advanced learner language. Returning to sociopragmatic repertoire in the advanced learner, it can be argued that the sociopragmatic choices of the advanced L2 speaker index far more than a learned decision of recognizing an appropriate context. These choices constitute a multifaceted set of indexical choices that draw from the present time and place, those of the narrated event and the speaker’s language history. Utterances are not dictated by pragmatics manuals, nor prescriptive grammar. They are not merely responses to a context, but an act upon it. An advanced speaker has adequate
resources to choose from multiple appropriate utterance configurations, and intentionally constructs one with nuance that reflects the circumstances of the here-and-now, the history of the there-and-then, and the individual’s own interpretation and intent.

If there is, in fact, an L2 discursive self akin to that which Koven (2007) found in French-Portuguese bilinguals, therein lies evidence of L2 identity development. This suggests that socio-stylistic variation is not merely random whimsy, but rather an agentive indexical choice on the part of the speaker to situate self and others within the narrated and narrative contexts. The data collected for Koven’s study include speaker reports on sense of self in two languages, speaker reports on perception of the portrayed self in two languages, and discourse analysis of stories told by the bilinguals in both French and Portuguese. Thus, Koven is able to consider the meaning in language and the accounts of the bilinguals and their interlocutors, and also looks at actual patterns of discourse. She also incorporates contextual background of an ethnographic nature for both the speakers’ histories and (local) positioning in the narratives.

To address the research questions concerning L2 repertoire, contextualized sociopragmatic language choices and their connection to L2 identity, it is necessary to collect a body of data that includes advanced learner language and access to information on local and historical socio-cultural constraints, including L2 learning experiences and attitudes. Personal narratives are ideal for the all three of these in how they offer rich diversity in local social contexts through their settings and participants within the narratives, as well as the historical contexts that frame the narrative.

While many previous studies ask participants to provide language for a given context, this approach allows the learners at once to provide the context and to select language resources that match their interpretation of the relevant social constraints.
3.2 Data Collection

In this section I will review the procedures for data collection, describe the materials used, and elaborate the transcription and coding processes. Copies of the materials and the transcription code are provided in the appendix.

3.2.1 Procedures

The data collection took place from Summer, 2009 through Spring, 2010.

Data collection took place over six sessions with each participant. Participants were compensated for the time, and provided with refreshments for sessions two through six. One of two research assistants, who were also compensated for their time, worked with each participant for two of the sessions. All names presented here for the participants and interview assistants are pseudonyms.

Recruitment: Potential participants were contacted via e-mail with an IRB-approved message. The invitation to participate in the study included a brief description of objectives and requirements for the study, and provided contact information for the researcher. When applicable, the message also named the individual who had recommended the potential participant. When a potential participant responded with interest in the study, a meeting time was set for the first session. During the data collection process, a code was assigned for each participant’s research materials. Participants were later assigned pseudonyms when the researcher began processing the materials for analysis.

Session one:

The first session took place in the researcher’s office on campus. The researcher presented a summary of the study objectives and procedures, then gave the participant an opportunity to ask...
questions. Once the participant confirmed interest in the study, and signed the Informed Consent form, there were then three documents for him to complete. These were: Language history; Narrative Prompt Worksheet; and Interview schedule. This initial meeting was conducted in English, and was neither audio- nor video-recorded.

Sessions two through five:

Narrative Interviews: Narrative Interviews were conducted in sessions two through five. Participants met with either the researcher or her assistant, depending on the language being used to tell the narratives. The sessions took place at a downtown coffee shop of the participant’s choosing. When the participant arrived, he was invited to get lunch or a snack, which was paid for by the researcher. Once the participant and interviewer were situated (snacks, recording equipment and small talk), the interviewer opened the interview.

Over the four Narrative Interviews, participants told two parallel sets of narratives in French and in English. For each set, the researcher randomly made a list of every other topic the participant had provided, and then randomized the two lists. One set of prompts was used for the first two sessions, Narrative Set A, and the second set for the next two sessions where Narrative Set B was told. In the first session of a set, participants were asked to tell each story in turn, until an hour had passed. Once an hour had passed, participants finished the story in progress and then the interview was concluded, regardless of how many topics remained on the list of prompts. The number of narratives recounted in an hour varied among participants, depending on the length of the stories. For the second session, participants were asked to retell the same stories in the same order, but using the alternate language from the first session. Once the participants had retold all of the stories, regardless of how long it took, the interview was concluded. The order of language
was varied between sets, such that if a participant told Set A in French to the assistant and then in English to the researcher, he would then tell Set B in English to the researcher and then in French to the assistant. Half of the participants started with a French narrative set, the other half with English. These sessions were both audio- and video- recorded.

The elicitation technique followed the form of a semi-structured interview for personal narratives. Thus, for each story told, the interviewer selected the prompt from the list and asked the participant to tell the story. The interviewer asked questions seeking more elaboration as the participant set up the story with background information. Once the participant reached the “heart” of the story and began narrating in earnest, the interviewer only spoke to encourage continuation with expressions such as “and then?” or to ask for clarification where necessary. When the participant was winding down the story, the interviewer again engaged in small talk dialogue, asking questions or commenting on the story. The interaction in the warm-up and wind-down phases was to reinforce the sense that the interviewer was a near-peer, and to assure the participant that the interviewer was listening and engaged in the story. The first prompt for narrative Set A was always “Please give a summary of your French career”. After that, the interviewer proceeded with the list of prompts.

Session six:

During the final session, participants first completed the Discourse Completion Task, then the Meta-linguistic interview was conducted. The DCT was designed to verify or complement the sociopragmatic repertoire realized in the narratives. The meta-linguistic interview was an opportunity for participants to elaborate on their relationship with the French language, to justify specific language choices from the narratives, and to clarify any points from the Language History
or from the narratives themselves. Participants were thanked for their time and follow-through and then received the final compensation for study participation.

Because the present study aims to identify if and how advanced learners use particular sociopragmatic and oral discourse strategies, and how their language connects to their on-going language history, only data from sessions one (language history), six (discourse completion task and meta-linguistic interview), and the two French-language interviews (narrative elicitation) were used. Future analyses will compare the French and English language narrative sets.

Equipment and Data Storage: All of sessions two through five (the narrative interviews) were video- and audio- recorded with hd recorders. The metalinguistic interview portion of session six was audio recorded. Following each session, files were transferred to the researcher’s home computer, and backed up on two sets DVD’s. Until pseudonyms were assigned, the file names encoded participant and session information with a series of letters and numbers.

3.2.2 Materials

Language History (Appendix A): The Language History form collected information on past and present practices and experiences with first, second and other foreign languages. The form was divided into three sections: First language; Other languages; and Experiences abroad. The first section asked the participant to identify his first language and whether this was the main language used at home or work. The second section asked the participant to identify other languages he knows or has studied, in what contexts he had (or has been) studying these languages, and to elaborate how these languages are currently used in daily life. The form provided space for three languages and participants were asked to provide information in a similar format on extra paper if necessary. The final section asked the participant to list any experiences abroad lasting 2 or more
weeks. For each sojourn, he was then asked to specify the purpose of the trip and how (when, why, how, how much) French was predominantly used during the sojourn, factors which would indicate the extent of linguistic immersion. These included the purpose of the trip, living situation, and social activity. While the participant filled out the Narrative Prompt Worksheet, the researcher reviewed the Language History, and asked follow-up questions where clarification or elaboration was needed. The questions generally focused on the participants’ area of study and time abroad.

*Narrative Interview Worksheet* (Appendix B): This worksheet was designed to have the participant brainstorm possible personal narratives before the actual narrative interviews. In a previous study, the researcher had used specific prompts (e.g., a weekend with friends; a family vacation). This approach put the participant on the spot to think of a narrative and often left the participant fumbling to come up with a topic. The researcher explained this, and told the participant that she would select approximately 15 of the topics provided to use in the subsequent narrative interviews. It was anticipated that this process would somewhat alleviate potential performance pressure during the interview.

The *Narrative Interview Worksheet* provided 14 categories across themes and asked the participant to think of up to two per category, aiming for a total of 20 possible narratives. Themes included time frames or contexts such as “elementary school”, “study abroad”, or work situations”. The directions asked participants to think of narratives that involved “other people, be they friends, family, colleagues, or strangers”, letting them know that it is generally “easiest to tell stories that were remarkable in some way or that involve deep emotions”.
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Interview Schedule: Before the first session concluded, participants were asked to provide a tentative schedule for subsequent interviews. At this time, they were also provided with a list of several downtown coffee/sandwich shops and asked to choose a location where they would be most comfortable with video-recorded interviews. Prior to this, the researcher had scouted and selected locations where some semi-private seating was available. It was hoped that this would allow the interviews to be conducted somewhat discretely and with minimal background interference to the quality of audio recording.

Discourse Completion Task (Appendix C): The Discourse Completion Task (DCT) was a worksheet that presented 20 scenarios for which participants were asked to write what they would say in each. They were told that even though it was a written task, they should put down what they say, and not to worry about form or spelling. The directions for the task were in English, and the scenario descriptors were in French.

To design the DCT, the researcher first outlined 20 scenario descriptors in English. She then had Jeannette, one of the French language assistants, translate the text into French. Jeanette was asked to match the register of language to the potential participants (ie a colleague vs. a good friend) of the scenario. Appendix D is the original English version of the scenarios. The aim of the DCT was to provoke learners into displaying various sociopragmatic features in the event that they were not performed over the course of the narrative interviews. Thus, the range of scenarios involved several different settings and a variety of potential interlocutors.

Meta-linguistic interview (Appendix E): Once the DCT was completed, the final session transitioned to the post-hoc interview. Participants were first asked about any points from their
Language History requiring clarification. Participants were then asked to describe their relationship with the French language, its purpose in their personal and professional lives, the future role it might hold for them and to summarize their tentative career goals. Participants were also asked to comment on certain features of their speech and how these relate to the discourse context and language experiences, to describe usage norms for certain sociopragmatic features, and to cite salient experiences that contributed to learning and understanding the feature. This interview was conducted in English and was audio recorded, only. A composite of sample questions used for this interview can be seen in Appendix E.

3.2.3 Research assistants

Two research assistants conducted the French-language narrative interviews. They were recruited as native speakers of French. The assistants completed the university’s IRB protocol and were trained in procedures for the study before interviewing study participants. The training took place over two sessions. In the first, the assistants met with the researcher to review study objectives and the interview protocol. In the second session, they conducted a 30-minute mock interview to practice elicitation techniques. Interviewees for these sessions were acquaintances of the researcher who were advanced L2 French speakers but did not meet study criteria in some way and thus could not become participants. Both were compensated for their time. The researcher reviewed these practice interviews. Prior to the first interview with a participant, the researcher discussed the practice session with the assistant. Feedback focused on the elicitation technique. The priority was to start the participant on the narrative and encourage her to continue the story as needed, but not co-construct the narrative with her. The interviewer was instructed to engage in
discourse only after the main narrative had been completed (for example, sharing a comment about having visited the same place, or having had a similar experience).

Sabine was a graduate student in the French department and was recommended by a faculty member. She conducted interviews with three participants (Brittney, Meghan, and Noah). The other assistant, Jeannette, was a personal acquaintance of the researcher and the spouse of a post-doctoral researcher. She conducted interviews with the other seven participants. The research assistants were compensated for their time.

3.2.4 Body of Data

Following the protocol described above, participants each contributed a language history form plus interview, four narrative interviews, a discourse completion task, and a metalinguistic interview to the study. Table 3.1 summarizes the materials collected from each participant. It also shows which research assistant conducted the French language interviews and the order in which the narratives were told. A second set of narratives was not collected from Toni because she had to move out of the area sooner than expected. I was able to conduct a final interview with her, and thus have her DCT and metalinguistic interview.

Table 3.1: Materials Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Language History</th>
<th>Narrative Set A</th>
<th>Narrative Set B</th>
<th>DCT</th>
<th>Metalinguistic interview</th>
<th>Language Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>EF*</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>EF**</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>EF**</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>FE**</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>FE**</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Jeannette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Along with the Language History and Metalinguistic Interviews, there are also the researcher’s interview notes from these sessions. Occasionally, there are comments from the research assistant following the French language narrative interviews. These were not solicited; however, occasionally when the researcher was picking up materials from the session the assistant made spontaneous remarks about something that had struck her during the interview, and these were recorded.

In three cases there is only video or only audio for part of an interview session due to technical difficulties. The third and fifth sessions with Paul have only partial video, but full audio. The fifth session with Louise has full video but only partial audio. There was no case where data from a session were completely lost due to audio and video equipment malfunction.

### 3.3 Participants

Ten participants were enrolled in this study. There were three categories of criteria for participation: proficiency in L2 French, program of study, and experience abroad. Participants were recruited at a large mid-Atlantic university through recommendations by French department faculty, graduate students, or as a personal or professional acquaintance of the researcher. The researcher had taught for and taken courses with several graduate students in the French department. Requirements for participation were that the individual (a.) be an advanced L2 French learner; (b.) be pursuing a graduate degree in French or a related field; and (c.) have had spent at least one semester, or a summer session living abroad in a Francophone context. These criteria were determined to yield a comparable cohort of advanced L2 (AL2) French speakers. That the

*indicates order of language for narrative set. EF means that the first session of the set was in English and the second session in French, while FE indicates the opposite

**missing video or audio from part of set (never both)
participants were engaged in graduate-level study and had spent time abroad are at once criteria that support the advancedness required by criterion (a.) and provide two sets of contexts that have similar socio-cultural scripts. The only exclusion criterion was that the AL2 French speakers must have United States American English as their L1.

**Advanced L2 French learners:** The search at large for AL2 French speakers was initially based on recommendations. The researcher described the objectives of the study and selection criteria to several faculty members of the French department, asking them to recommend *very advanced L2 French speakers*. It was assumed that the recommendations made reflected the faculty members own perception of advanced L2 speaking ability, as well as a speaking ability relative to that of other students in the department. For example, one faculty member initially recommended only 2 learners. The researcher then asked her to expand her working definition of an “advanced speaker” and she provided the names of several more potential participants. Participants were also asked to recommend students based on the three criteria listed above. Five participants were approached through such references. Of the other five, two participants had participated in a previous study with the researcher, two were colleagues in the researcher’s department, and one was a personal acquaintance.

Advanced language proficiency was later verified through the initial stage of analysis on lexical and discursive repertoire in narrative interviews and the discourse completion task. These procedures are described below.

**Initial French and current program of study for participants:** All participants were enrolled in a program of graduate study at a large mid-Atlantic university. Five participants were pursuing a
PhD in the French Department studies (literature, linguistics or civilization); 2 participants were pursuing a Master’s in the Department of French and Francophone Studies; 2 participants were pursuing degrees in the Department of Applied Linguistics; and one participant was pursuing a PhD in the College of Education.

Most participants (seven) had begun studying French at the secondary education level and continued through undergraduate and graduate levels. Of the three who had not, two had begun studying French during their undergraduate studies, both motivated by personal connections. Hannah had a roommate from France and Paul had met a number of French people in on-line chat rooms. Toni had begun studying French while working on her Master’s in Intercultural Education, but not for professional reasons. She was dating, and eventually married, a French-Belgian man.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Current degree</th>
<th>Middle and High school French study (yrs)</th>
<th>Undergraduate French study (semesters)</th>
<th>Graduate French study (semesters)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MA-Fr</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td>PhD-Fr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>PhD-Fr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>PhD-Lng</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>PhD-Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>PhD-Lng</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>PhD-Fr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>PhD-Fr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>MA-Fr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>PhD-Fr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*semesters of Graduate French study include MA and PhD work, and were self reported but not verified. It may be that some included the year of being a language assistant abroad, as well as semesters of dissertation work

French Language Sojourns: An inclusion criterion was that participants had to have spent time abroad for at least a semester of study, or an equivalent. Thus, seven of the ten participants had taken part in a study abroad. Of the three who had not, two had been teaching assistants in France.
and the third began studying French after she met her now husband, and had spent several summers visiting family with him. Table 3.3 shows French language sojourns taken by the participants, and lists the purpose and length of trip, the living situation, and what sort of access participants had to French language use. Participants had been asked to list travels of two weeks or more and to describe the quality of language experience for each. Two participants, Noah and Joseph, met only the minimum requirement of a semester of study abroad. They were, however, also the only two participants still at the MA level of graduate studies and both were considering the teaching assistant abroad opportunity in the near future. Six of the participants were English language teaching assistants in France. In two cases, the participants stayed for a second year. In one case, Brittney left what should have been a year-long position after three months, not even staying through a full semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Purpose of sojourn</th>
<th>Length of sojourn</th>
<th>Living situation</th>
<th>Language access* via personal contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>College summer program</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Auberge with other American students</td>
<td>Service encounters**; instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Rented a room in French host home</td>
<td>Colleagues; landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>High school exchange</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Host family</td>
<td>Host family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Apartment w/ Fr student</td>
<td>Classes, roommate, service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Apartment alone</td>
<td>Colleagues; few friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate research</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Apartment alone</td>
<td>Some friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate research</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>Apartment alone</td>
<td>Some friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Friends; service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Friends; service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Fr roommates</td>
<td>Colleagues; friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Language Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>Family visits (in-laws)</td>
<td>3 mos, non-consecutive</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family; husband’s friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney**</td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>1 academic yr</td>
<td>Apartment alone</td>
<td>Classes, service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>High school study abroad</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Hotels/Rm with host family</td>
<td>Host family; some service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Dorm w/international students</td>
<td>“Sponsor” family; service encounters; some friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>2 years (non consecutive)</td>
<td>Apartment alone</td>
<td>Colleagues; Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate research</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Friends; professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate research</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Friends; professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Rented room in French host home</td>
<td>Host family; classes; friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Apartment by self</td>
<td>Colleagues; Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Rented room in French host home</td>
<td>Host couple; friends; classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>College study abroad</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Host family with other international students</td>
<td>Host family; Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College study abroad***</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Dorm w/ Belgian students</td>
<td>Friends; Classes; Roommates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Apartment with husband</td>
<td>“Sponsor” couple; Colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is assumed that all participants spoke French via service encounters during travel. These are specifically mentioned as means of language access when they were listed or discussed by participants as a primary or significant source of language practice during time abroad

** Whitney also spent two years on a Peace Corps assignment where she often spoke French as a secondary language in professional contexts

***All of the experiences listed took place in France with the exception of Louise’s semester abroad, which was in Belgium.

**Representations of advancedness within the study group**

The cross-section of AL2 French represented by this group is not a uniform slice of L2 French.

Since the purpose of this study was to explore representations of sociopragmatic repertoire in the advanced learner’s discourse, a singular assessment of advanced language was not feasible for this
study. The DCT does allow for comparison of provoked repertoire across like situations. In Chapter 4, the repertoire of individual participants, as it was represented both in the oral narratives and the DCT will be more specifically discussed. In the case of all participants, the performed repertoire did include most to all of the features identified in previous research as indicative of an advanced L2 French speaker, including the standard cannon of sociopragmatic features (address forms variation, *on*, *ne* omission) as well as written discourse such as relativization.

While the participants met minimum criteria for levels of language study and experience abroad, many factors, including an individual’s motivation and agenda, had significant influence on the style of advanced L2 she developed and consequently represented in the narratives. As will be discussed later, some spent time abroad as teaching assistants, honing a professional identity, while others focused more on personal relationships. Others still were immersed in academic research and lament the lack of personal connections made or maintained. Some deliberately pursued a casual register as a means of communication, while others favored an academic register as an object of study.

The analysis presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 aims to explore repertoire and identity in the very advanced learner. This second language speaker is identified by Bartning (2008) as one who has moved beyond advanced pedagogical proficiency but is moving towards near-native proficiency; one who currently resides in an analytical gray area. The argument for identity development aligns the language choices of advanced learner speech choices with the intended projection of self and learner history, rather than defaulting to the first that comes to mind as does the novice speaker (Liddicoat 2006) or indiscriminate use of newly acquired features as does the intermediate learner (Dewaele 2002). To account for these two further restrictions of the present study, the analysis focuses on only three students whose experiences and circumstances fostered
this very advanced, near near-native competency: Hannah, Mark, and Meghan. These students stand out in sheer numbers when looking at time and travel related to language study. They also convey (in varying ways) in the metalinguistic interview that French is integrated into their sense of self, such that have arrived at where they see French in their lives rather than as a future goal. For example, they do not anticipate further sojourns with the sole objective to hone fluency, but for professional or personal reasons.

3.4 Analytical Methods

This section first details procedures that include transcription and coding of data, including the personal narratives and language history. It then outlines the framework of analysis for repertoire, contextualized repertoire, and perspective and participation.

3.4.1 Transcription and Coding

Transcription

From each participant’s set of data, the following were transcribed: the initial question summarizing the French language career; the two French language narrative interviews, and the metalinguistic interview. Of the whole set of narratives stories, the four were selected to represent different contexts and characters.

Transcription conventions (see Appendix F) used were developed to best mark aspects of speech as they occurred, with particular attention to features necessary for analysis. In addition to pausing and intonation, changes in volume and voice quality were also marked. These underscored particular emphasis by the speaker and voicing of other characters in the narratives. For each narrative episode, transcription recommenced when the participant launched the narrative, and concluded when the participant marked the end. Conversation with the interviewer between
narratives was not transcribed. When a narrative is told, there are usually three phases: the warm-up or prelude, the narrative itself, and then the wind-down. A narrative may progress in a number of ways depending on personal narrative style. A narrative may be a brief nugget, or a drawn-out episode with deep background, description, the narrative event and/or discussion of fall-out or implications of the narrative event. In one-hour interview sessions, participants told as few as four (Mark) and, in one case, as many as eighteen (Whitney) stories.

The transition to the narrative from the warm-up is most often marked in one of two ways. Most often, there is a discourse marker followed by a situating lead-in. Alternately, the discourse marker is followed by a reiteration or reformulation of the topic. As the shift to narrating an event is marked explicitly in speech, so is the conclusion of narration. Two styles are typical. In one, the narrator notes the end of narration, or transitions with a discourse marker and then shifts dialogue with the interlocutor. In other cases, there is again a discourse marker followed by a very brief summary of the story.

As the interviewers had been instructed to engage in small talk following each narrative to show that she had been attending to the content on a personal level, each narrative was followed with several turns of dialogue, usually indicating a connection to a particular detail of the narrative. For example, Sabine might mention that she had also visited a particular site, or Jeannette might mention having had a similarly frustrating experience in the United States. In the event that the dialogue contained information that clarified elaborated contextual material, this was transcribed. Otherwise, the elapsed time was noted and transcription resumed when the subsequent narrative topic was introduced.

Coding
Narratives:

Once the narrative interviews were transcribed, they were coded on three levels, each corresponding to a primary research question. The first level was for overall repertoire, the second for contextualized repertoire (local indices to the episode), and the final one for perspective and participation (historical indices to the episode).

For overall repertoire, instances of sociopragmatic features and discursive strategies were marked. A complete list can be found in Appendix G, and examples of each can be found in Table 3.6 in the next section on Analytical methods for Research Question 1. This list was developed from work of second-language French sociolinguistics (e.g., Dewaele, 2007; Mougeon et al., 2004), contemporary oral French (e.g., Gadet, 1997, 2003, 2009; Blanche-Benveniste, 2007, 2000, 1990), and traditional models of advanced learner French (e.g. Bartning, 2007).

To code for contextualized repertoire, each narrative episode was divided into segments based on a change in setting (location or time), character entrance or exit, or topic. For each of these segments, the following contextual aspects were listed: original language of event, characters present, setting. Setting included time, location and relationship between participants.

Finally, for perspective and participation, for each segment the role of the participant within the story was noted. Following Koven (2012; 2007; 2002) these include narrator, character or interlocutor. Koven developed these categories drawing on Wertsch (1991) to identify which voice is talking at a particular moment in a narrative: interlocutor, character, or narrator. As an interlocutor, the speaker is talking with the interviewer or other audience. As a character, the speaker is an active participant (actor) in the narrated event. As a narrator, the speaker is an observer. Incorporating principles of cognitive linguistics, this analysis further accounts for the
positioning of characters as the actor or recipient. This distinction denotes the trajectory or actions: whether the narrator was initiating action or being acted towards in the story.

**Participant Profile and L2A Narrative:**

The Participant Profile and Second Language Acquisition (L2A) Narrative were written drawing on three sources from the data collection process. These were the Language History form, the initial question from the Narrative Interviews (“Summarize your French language career”) and the Metalinguistic Interview. The language history was copied to an electronic file, and the other two were transcribed. Researcher notes from the Language History and Metalinguistic Interview were also copied. The researcher then wrote a Participant Profile which included a summary of the participant’s language history as reported on the worksheet and elaborated in the interview. Highlighted in the summary were events that were likely to be salient in contextualizing narrative episodes that took place abroad or that profiled language learning. From this narrative, the researcher then created cross sections of the participant’s language learning from three perspectives: chronological, motivation and objectives, and access and attitude within immersion. This first, chronological, summarizes the foreign languages a participant studied from high school through graduate school.

The second categorizes language study by the participant’s motivation and objectives in learning different languages. These were categorized as *objects of study*, *means of communication* or *objects of analysis*. For many languages, there were blended categories, or a transition from one to another over time. *Objects of study* were languages studied to systematically learn a language in a linguistic sense; for form but not necessarily pragmatic use. In nearly all cases, high school foreign languages were classified as Objects of study. *Means of communication* were languages
studied where the primary motivation was communicative use of the language, whether for personal, practical or professional reasons. *Objects of analysis* were languages studied in a formal linguistic or rhetorical sense.

The final cross section explored access to the language of study through different experiences and accounted for two perspectives. The first was *passive or active access*, which is whether the opportunity to use the language presented itself through circumstance or whether the participant sought an opportunity for practice. The second perspective was by degree of engagement, in both frequency and intensity of relationships. This was categorized as minor, moderate, or significant.

For example, Brittany’s teaching assistantship occurred between her undergraduate and graduate study, and was meant to be a means for her to experience the language. Thus, her motivation was *means of communication*. She *actively* chose to take on this experience, was renting a room with a family, and working in a school; it would seem on paper that she had a number of avenues to pursue quality interactions and develop relationships, both professional and personal. Early in this sojourn, however, she perceived many logistical and interpersonal difficulties with general day-to-day life in France (ie banking), her lodging and work situations. Thus, while she was in France she had *minor, passive* access as by her own admission, she shut down and was minimally communicative on all fronts. She eventually made arrangements to leave France before the end of the first semester and did not notify her landlord or her employer of these plans but simply left the country.

In a final evaluation, the researcher noted the stance taken for each step of language learning. This included the position of self and the French language. For example, Louise said of her year as a teaching assistant, “I did well” when asked about French language development. This
conveys that French was still an object of study and that a goal of the sojourn was to learn French
in an acquisitional sense, rather than agentive pragmatic exploration.

**Discourse Completion Task:**

The DCT responses were coded for context, features and register.

*Context:* The task itself conveyed imagined sociocultural constraints, including pragmatic
function, interlocutor and setting.

*Features:* Responses of the participants for each situation were coded for sociopragmatic
features, using the same categories as were developed for the narratives.

*Register:* the tasks were categorized into one of four registers:

- Informal – good friends, every day situations
- Casual – friends, special situation with some ritual/conventions
- Polite  - strangers or superiors; general politeness
- Formal – strangers or superiors, or situation requiring especial deference

Table 3.4 lists the pragmatic function, interlocutor, and anticipated register for each
scenario. In several cases, there were consecutive pairs of prompts that differed by one detail, for
example: declining an invitation by a friend versus by a colleague you dislike; or apologizing for
being late to a class they teaching versus a class they were taking. In the table, Q denotes a situation
requiring a question to accomplish the task. The final column classifies the register required.
Situation 10 was the only one with a plural addressee. All of the other situations had an individual
as the imagined interlocutor. Table 3.5 shows an example of a coded DCT response from Louise.

*Table 3.4 Discourse Completion Task: Pragmatic Breakdown*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sit #</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Pragmatic Function (scenario summary)</th>
<th>Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Leave-taking (long-term, sincere)</td>
<td>Casual; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Apology/Excuse (missing significant event)</td>
<td>Informal; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Apology/Excuse (forgotten birthday)</td>
<td>Informal; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Excuse (can’t meet for coffee)</td>
<td>Polite; T/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Excuse (can’t meet for coffee)</td>
<td>Informal; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In your department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Compliment (congratulations)</td>
<td>Polite; T/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Request (Q) (extension on paper deadline)</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Request (Q) (extension on paper deadline)</td>
<td>Formal; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Apology/excuse (late for class as student)</td>
<td>Formal; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Apology/excuse (late for class as teacher)</td>
<td>Formal; Vs pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traveling in France</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hotel receptionist</td>
<td>Service encounter: disagreement</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>Accept or decline offer; thank you</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>Service encounter: request (Q)</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Salesclerk</td>
<td>Service encounter: request (Q)</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>Service encounter: urgent request (Q)</td>
<td>Polite; Vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A dinner with Good Friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Casual; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Compliment (sincere)</td>
<td>Casual; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Informal; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Compliment (insincere)</td>
<td>Casual; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good friend</td>
<td>Excuse; Leave-taking</td>
<td>Casual; T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.5: DCT coded response from Louise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sit #</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Pragmatic Function</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professor; Formal request</td>
<td>Excusez-moi Monsieur, mais mon travail mémoire de fin de semestre ne va pas comme je voulais. Pourriez-vous me donner un ou deux jours de plus pour faire vous remettre qqc de plus poli et soigné?</td>
<td>INV- cond FML PTX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation of Transcripts**

All translations of transcript excerpts and examples were done by the researcher. Efforts were made to convey semantic content while respecting lexical and syntactic tone and form. When deemed appropriate, such as in situations where the researcher felt a translation would lose either
content or intent, a verbatim translation is provided along with a colloquial interpretation of the utterance. Where necessary, one of the language assistants was consulted to better represent the original French.

3.5.2 Analysis Research Question 1: What range of sociopragmatic markers of advanced capacities do participants display within a set of personal narratives?

To assess Sociopragmatic Repertoire, both the narratives and the DCT were considered. The aim was to confirm that the participant displayed a repertoire that was qualitatively consistent with that of other advanced L2 or native speakers of French. To assess the range of repertoire as representative of the broad spectrum “advanced capacities” (Byrnes & Ortega 2006), there were three categories of sociopragmatic features. These were general sociopragmatic features, advanced oral discourse features, and advanced written discourse features. While the advanced oral and written discourse features are not mutually exclusive, certain features have been primarily associated with one medium over the other.

Sociopragmatic features: features in this category of language were selected to reflect previous research in L2 sociolinguistics and pragmatics. These features are traditionally assessed in range and frequency against native speaker norms for a particular semantic variant. That is, does a learner know the same range of equivalent variants as a native speaker, and does he use them with the same frequency as a native speaker would? In the sociolinguistic frame, a semantic variant could represent a lexical index (ie second person address forms) or a syntactic one (ie immediate future or simple future tense forms). In the pragmatic frame, semantic variants are generally formulaic conventions that may be lexical or syntactic.
This study only considers presence in repertoire and not frequency in use, as the focus is on \textit{how} rather than \textit{how much} these features are used. Previous work on the features investigated in this study (see, for example Dewaele, 2004) have looked at productive frequency rates of features, typically between groups at different states of language development, and argued that increased frequency of colloquial, oral, or advanced features may be a marker of proficiency. While features in this study may be used more robustly as compared to their alternative or null form by certain participants, the study design did not incorporate a meaningful benchmark against which to interpret frequencies. This was partially intentional, given the position that instances of use should not be separated from their context in interpretation, and the matrix for form-context pairings is infinitesimal. Additionally, a focus on frequency as a marker of advancedness betrays the notion that second language identity is evinced in agentive choice: choice that may or may not conform to expected frequencies.

Written discourse conventions: language features in this category reflect those associated with advanced proficiency that is traditionally measured against literary, written features. These include complex relativization, formal interrogative forms and the inclusion of the \textit{ne} particle in negation. These also include formal lexical choices, which match the written medium.

Advanced oral discourse conventions: features in this category draw in the work of Gadet (2003; 1997) on oral French. She largely attributes her observations of language as it is spoken (contrasting conventional written French) to co-construction and shared knowledge. Interlocutors often draw on antecedents within a social context or earlier in the dialogue, and often complete thought phrases with linguistic means ancillary to actual words, such as gaze and gesture. This mutual understanding among interlocutors in a shared context facilitates the use of simpler, or seemingly partial, speech (relative to more explicit written language, which cannot rely on co-
construction or clarification). These forms include such features as parataxis, dislocation, simple relativization, and interrogation with intonation rather than an interrogative structure. This category also includes insight from Blanche-Benveniste (2007; 2000), who advocates that oral syntax be analyzed on a horizontal and vertical planes to account for the in-line packing of information. Her model explains the prevalence of features such as dislocation and juxtaposition on oral contexts. Table 3.6 lists a feature from each category with an example from participants’ elicited speech.

Table 3.6: Advanced L2 French Repertoire Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociopragmatic Features</th>
<th>Second person address forms (Tu/Vous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tu**                  | t’es pas obligée de venir mais si tu veux ça va être à sept heures.  
*you don’t have to come but if you want to it will be at seven o’clock*  
(Host mother to Hannah ; 8B3-1.1) |
| **Vous**                | Je vous conseille de repartir à la plage  
*I advise you to go back to the beach.*  
(Flight attendant to Hannah ; 8A2-4.4) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Oral Discourse Conventions</th>
<th>L/R dislocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma mère elle déteste faire la cuisine</strong> (8A2-2.1)</td>
<td>My mother she hates to cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elle a des problèmes cette fille</strong> (8B3-1.3)</td>
<td>She has problems this girl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Written Discourse Conventions</th>
<th>Complex relativization (hypotaxis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tout le monde répond que oui à cette question sauf moi, parce que je suis enfant unique et ça fait depuis toujours que je veux quelqu’un d’autre à la maison.</strong> (8B3-1.1)</td>
<td>Everyone answers yes to this question except me, because I am an only child and it’s been since always that I’ve wanted someone else at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C’est pas qu’ils n’aident pas, mais c’est qu’ils ont pas vraiment le temps, et ils préfèrent manger autre choses.</strong> (8A2-2.1)</td>
<td>It’s not that they don’t like [cooking], but it’s that they don’t really have the time, and they prefer to eat other things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the narratives were coded, instances of each feature were catalogued to show the range of sociopragmatic strategies the participant had produced in the narratives.

3.5.4 Analysis Research Question 2: How does the range of resources used for single narratives compare to that of the whole set of narratives? How are the subsets of repertoire from individual narratives connected to the contextualized discourse events of that narrative?

The aim in assessing contextualized repertoire was to explore a connection between sociocultural contexts (of L2 acquisition and use) and sociopragmatic variation, as a possible means to explain what has been heretofore attributed to individual stylistics (Dewaele, 2007; Sax, 2003). This was done in two steps. First the repertoire produced for each individual narrative was isolated to see if there was a difference of features between the subset used in telling that particular narrative and that from the overall repertoire of all the narratives.

Next, the repertoire produced in each mini-episode within the broader narrative was considered. Three particular contexts were selected to evaluate: reported speech of different characters; the setting of story, including location and original language of event; and the reported speech voice of the participant as compared to his narrative voice.

For each context, the subset of repertoire represented was catalogued. For example, each time Louise’s husband spoke, the features he “used” were collected into his own subset of repertoire. Likewise was done for Louise’s colleagues and good friends. The subsets were then compared for differences in the presence or absence of certain features.
3.5.5 Analysis Research Question 3: In what ways do sociopragmatic language choices assert an L2 identity?

The aim of this question was to further explore the subsets of repertoire found through RQ2 and their connection to an L2 identity. What might provoke a speaker to reserve certain features for certain contexts? Why would there be a different voice as a narrator or as a participant in a story? Is this indicative of an emerging L2 identity or merely stylistic choice?

To achieve this, subsets of repertoire produced were first compared across pairings of groupings of contexts and speaker role. Combined categories allowed the researcher to examine subsets of repertoire in multifaceted contexts, and to explore which voices of self and other were represented within these categories.

Second, these distinctions in the repertoire of selves and others were aligned with information from the Language History and L2A Narrative. Three specific aspects were explored: 1. Superficial experiences and interactions; 2. Positioning of self in narratives and in L2A experiences; 3. Perspectives on L2A. For each aspect, the researcher looked for parallels in how the participant expressed perspective and participation through both sociopragmatic repertoire and stance in the metalinguistic and language history reporting.
Chapter 4

Participant Profiles: Language History and Overall Repertoire

4.1 Introduction

Through three case studies, this chapter and the two following address each of the research questions on advanced oral L2 French repertoire and identity in turn. To situate these findings for contextualized repertoire (Chapter 5) and second language identity (Chapter 6), participant profiles are first presented in this chapter for Hannah, Mark and Meghan, along with brief summaries of the stories told in each participant’s narrative set. This is followed by a description of each participant’s overall sociopragmatic repertoire (RQ1). The next two chapters present the analysis of repertoire as contextualized in local and historical constraints (RQ2) and the relationship of these repertoire patterns to foreign language experiences and reflections and what this reveals about second language identity (RQ3).

The profiles presented here catalogue social factors from myriad vectors that influence language development and use. These include a chronological history, where we know time and sojourns both positively impact L2 development (eg Dewaele, 2007). They also include living arrangements, social networks, and professional activity while abroad, where access to language and the relationships with people in these situations shape opportunities for language use and reinforce the individual’s understanding of how the organization of language features maintains relationships between people and spaces. A learner may internalize specific voices in her environment (Tarone, 2007) or may reinforce a particular repertoire based on the access she has to a certain community (Norton, 2010).
Summaries of the narratives told allow us to see how some of the relationships, between time, places or people from an individual’s language history may have been recreated (or not) within the story context. The language resources developed and internalized have an implicit connection to the underlying social contexts (Ellis 2002; Tarone, 2007, Langacker, 2006).

4.2 Hannah

As we meet Hannah and become familiar with her experiences, her linguistic resources, and how she artfully uses them in constructing her narratives, we will come to see connections between her relationship to times, places and people, and the sociopragmatic valence she interprets for individual communicative events. In Chapter 6, it will become clear how Hannah’s linguistic experiences, her reflections on the French language, and her actual language use in the narratives are all connected in the emergence of her deliberate language performance.

4.2.1 Participant profile

This section presents three cross-sections of Hannah’s L2 History: a chronological one across academic programs; an outline of motivation and objectives; and a description of access and agency in language learning contexts. These cross sections draw from information Hannah provided on the Language History form, her summary of her French career from the first narrative interview, and the metalinguistic interview. Additionally, information provided through the narratives themselves, such as comments on relationships with certain people, was used where relevant.

Chronological Language History
At the time of the study, Hannah was in the third semester of a doctoral program in French linguistics, in the process of transferring to another university to study under a particular faculty member. In addition to French, she had studied German, Spanish, Russian, Dutch, and Swedish in different contexts, including high school, college, graduate school, or at language institutes.

Hannah began learning French as an undergraduate at a prestigious private college in the Northeast. She majored in linguistics with a concentration in French, which she had not studied prior to coming to college. She was inspired by one of her freshman roommates from France who was doing a year abroad from her own Parisian college. Hannah voraciously pursued the French language curriculum before spending the spring semester of her junior year in Paris. During this semester, she lived with a host family with whom she had a cordial but not particularly close relationship. She had dinners with them, but “was not the most incorporated” into their daily life and did not stay in touch with them after she moved out. They were a professional couple, a pharmacist and architect, with six grown children no longer in the home. She took courses at a Université in the Paris system, and at the exchange program’s center. In both cases, her courses were with other foreign students, conducted in French, and largely cultural seminars: art history, theatre and the like. She then spent the summer following this semester in Paris and Normandy traveling with a French friend, her freshman roommate, whose sister she befriended as well. She reported it curious that with her former roommate she always spoke in English since that was how the relationship began, but always in French with the sister she had met in France after Hannah had been studying French. This sojourn was a total of eight months. Hannah reported learning a lot of pragmatics (but not particularly new formal language structures) and gaining a lot of practical experience with the language during this time. She reflected that about halfway through this sojourn was when she felt she “owned” the French language
Hannah then entered a Master’s program in a French department at a large northeast state university, concentrating in phonology. During this time, she taught French for the department and maintained contact with the French language for about 10 hours a week outside of coursework, for which she also used the French language. Between her Master’s and PhD programs, Hannah took advantage of an internship exchange that the department offered, working as an English language instructor in Strasbourg. The internship is a one-year position, but Hannah signed on for a second year. Although she lived in an apartment by herself (she reported preferring to keep work and social networks separate), she developed a significant network of friends and contacts. Professionally, the English department conducted all business in French. There was another intern from Hannah’s American university, but they held only a “friendship of convenience.” Outside work, Hannah was part of an acting troupe that acted in English but socialized together in French.

While living in Strasbourg, she also began taking classes in Dutch and Swedish. In these classes she made French friends with whom she traveled, both in France and to Scandinavia. In the summers after the internship years, she studied first in Sweden and next in Denmark for a month each summer. She traveled as well in northern France and in Germany. It was convenient to take quick shopping trips to Germany. Hannah had studied German through middle and high school, and taken 3 semesters at the university level.

Upon her return to the United States, she entered the doctoral program in the same department where she had completed her Master’s degree. She again took classes and taught for the department. While she socialized some with her graduate student cohort, she lived with a roommate not connected to her academic life, again preferring to keep separate her personal and professional lives.

**Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Motivation and Objectives**
Hannah’s foreign language study and extensive travels abroad are catalogued below in Tables 4.2a and 4.2b. Table 4.2a shows how much time Hannah studied each foreign language and at what time, while Table 4.2b shows extensive travels which, for the purpose of this study, were defined as trips of two weeks or more in the same language environment (for example, travel within France).

Hannah transitioned from studying German and Spanish in high school to French during undergraduate and graduate studies, also adding Scandinavian languages in graduate school. In each phase she had a different attitude towards and motivation for learning foreign languages. The high school languages were objects of academic study, before Hannah had a personal connection to the communicative potential of a foreign language. French study began as acquiring a means of communication and later opened up to an object of analysis. The Scandinavian languages were objects of analysis first, with the means of communication an intrinsic secondary benefit.

Table 4.2a: Hannah’s Foreign Language Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/time studied</th>
<th>Secondary school years</th>
<th>Undergraduate college semesters</th>
<th>Graduate univ. semesters</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Research, teaching, correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Used often during 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Type of Access</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Research, correspondence</td>
<td>Living in Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Research, correspondence</td>
<td>Living in Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Occasionally for reading or research</td>
<td>Living in Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>Living in Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Access and Agency**

Hannah’s three French linguistic sojourns are distinct in the degree and quality of access afforded for language models and interaction. Overall, the sum of Hannah’s French sojourns consistently afforded her significant and active access in how she pursued relationships and opportunities that allowed for language interaction. Nonetheless, the undergraduate study abroad, summer travel with friends, and two-year position as a language assistant offered different access opportunities. (Her sojourns in Scandinavia were again distinct from these, due to the structure of the program and her language ability.)

The first sojourn, her semester abroad, was for linguistic and cultural immersion, coupled with an American coming-of-age. During this semester, Hannah had moderate, active access to French language interaction through the host family and classes. She also maintained significant interaction in English through her program peer-group. Her access to French is classified as active.
given her participation in the program itself, her selection of classes at both the program office and at a Parisian university campus, and her living situation. While American undergraduate students often leave their parents’ home to live on or near their undergraduate campus, the undergraduate college experience is often one where the student is coddled by advisors and a no-fail support system that moves them through the stages for graduation, save the actual academic work. The traditional study abroad (although decreasingly so in newer models and programs) confronts the young American with an independence not yet experienced. Throughout Hannah’s narratives there are several references to difficulties she encountered navigating at once the everyday Parisian experience and this new independence, and she consistently offers caveats that the program administrators structured the activity on purpose so that the students could learn from the experience or that the host family was handing down household rules for her to follow.

Hannah stayed that summer in France with French friends for continued linguistic and cultural immersion, but via a friendship not an academic pursuit. This stay was personal in nature. In contrast to the program participant of just a few months prior, Hannah was now solely among peers and free of the constraints of both the program and her host family. Her access for this stay is categorized as active and significant.

Table 4.2b: Hannah’s French Language Sojourns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Language experiences</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris, FR</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Semester abroad</td>
<td>host family; classes; friends</td>
<td>Passive; Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paris, Normandy, FR
3 mos (continuous to semester in Paris)
Travel
Friends
Active, Significant

Strasbourg, FR
2 years
Work
work; social network
Active; Significant

Hannah’s stint as an English language instructor several years later was through an internship exchange sponsored by her home department. The position was originally for one year. When there were no other candidates for the following year, Hannah applied to stay as she had been pleased personally and professionally with the experience. Her objectives for this stay had been to have more interaction with the French language, and more of an opportunity to objectively study French phonetics. She did not necessarily feel that she needed to learn more French. Although she stayed in an apartment by herself, Hannah took a lot of initiative to make contacts with people. She was very involved in several social groups, took some evening classes, and was friendly with her colleagues. The access on this trip was again active and significant.

There were three periods of stateside French language study for Hannah: during her undergraduate, Master’s and Doctoral coursework. For each, she had moderate, passive access to French. While her coursework was intensive in French, she was not in an immersion situation. During both of her graduate programs, she intentionally maintained a social life away from the department and her colleagues for balance. While she did have a French roommate the first year in undergraduate college, and later lived in the foreign language house, there was not constant, sustained access to French. In particular, with her French friend, she said that they most often
spoke in English and continue to do so, as Hannah knew no French when they first met so began their friendship in English.

In sum, Hannah had continuous opportunities of learning and practice with French once she began studying it. Her French career began through personal communicative motivation, and she had two particularly formative experiences abroad. It is important as well to note that the undergraduate semester abroad, although not the most significant in terms of access to French language interactions, was a time of high emotional salience for other developmental reasons, which may have increased the impact of otherwise less intense episodes with the language. Further, it may be this developmental experience that in turn afforded the language capacity for Hannah to be socially and professionally involved to the extent that she was during her teaching assistantship years.

4.2.2 Hannah’s narratives

Between the two French language narrative interviews, Hannah told a total of 17 narratives over 2 hours 39 minutes and 57 seconds, including the first prompt (summary of her French career) and interlude chat with the interviewer. For the analysis of French language repertoire, four of Hannah’s narratives were selected. The French narratives subset totaled 35:50 minutes of storytelling.

Table 4.2c: Hannah’s narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session/segment</th>
<th>French title</th>
<th>English title</th>
<th>Length of recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Résumé de ma carrière française</td>
<td>Summary of my French career</td>
<td>10:50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief summaries of the stories are as follows:

In “living with architects in Paris” Hannah recalls the host family situation during her undergraduate semester abroad where she rented a room with a family. In this narrative, she tells of meeting the host family, some difficulties she had with the room, a confrontation from the host couple, and how they all resolved the situation together. More specifically, the bed and dresser were in a loft. The ladder provided was lightweight and didn’t reach up far enough. She had difficulty getting up the first night, only to find that the ladder had fallen to the ground at night, forcing her to jump down. She then put the mattress on the floor, which upset the host family. When they confronted Hannah, she did not know the word for ladder and had to navigate the conversation around this key term.

Later that spring, Hannah was invited to join the couple and their six adult children for “One hell of an anniversary”. Hannah overheard a peculiar pre-party conversation with young kids concerning the use of a very vulgar term. She did not know who the children were, and could not figure out where in the house they were, only to learn that the family played recordings of previous family dinners to remind them of good times.
Again while living in Paris, Hannah took a trip to visit a friend studying abroad in Spain. As can happen, there was a strike in Paris while she was away. When she went to check in at the airport, she was told, “Paris is closed” and to go back to the beach for some more sun. Hannah negotiates with the airline attendant how to get back to Paris.

Finally, although an only child, Hannah invoked several country music singers as her siblings during a pre-school interview, not realizing that the teacher would then tell Hannah’s mother about these “Imaginary brothers and sisters”.

These narratives represent a range of situations, interlocutors, and languages; these socio-cultural parameters of each narrative are summarized here in Table 3.4. While there are not direct analogues between characters and situations in the stories abroad and that from “home”, there are situational and pragmatic parallels (addressing conflict, asking questions, etc.).

Table 4.2d: Contextual aspects of Hannah’s narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original language</th>
<th>Co-participants (relationship*)</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Pragmatic functions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living with architects</strong></td>
<td>French School officials (F); Host family (F); Friends (I)</td>
<td>Paris: School offices; Telephone; Host family home</td>
<td>Information request; Salutations; Reprimand; Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paris is closed</strong></td>
<td>English/French Friend (I); Airport</td>
<td>Barcelona: City; Airport</td>
<td>Service encounter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Title</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Interlocutors</td>
<td>Pragmatic Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hell of an anniversary</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Host couple(F); Children (F); Friend (I)</td>
<td>Congratulations; Reprimand; Commands; Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary brothers/sisters</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Teacher (F); Mother (I)</td>
<td>Questions; Greeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Relationship denotes anticipated register: **Formal** or **Informal**

** Pragmatic functions include those demanded over the course of the narrative, not only those performed by Hannah.

*Language and Situation*: These stories include one from her childhood in the United States, and three from her time living in Paris. Of these three, two take place in Paris and one in travels to Spain. Thus, one is originally in English, two originally in French, and one partially in French and partially in English.

*Interlocutors*: Interlocutors include her mother, a pre-school teacher, her host family, college program administrators, friends and service professionals.
Pragmatic functions: These narratives included a broad range of pragmatic acts in formal and informal contexts. For the purposes of this study, formality and informality were evaluated based on situation and interlocutor. Pragmatic acts narrated included: introduction, telephone conversation, service interaction, negotiation of conflict, clarifications, directives, interrogation, and salutations.

4.2.3 Hannah’s overall socio-pragmatic repertoire

This section catalogues the socio-pragmatic and advanced discursive features present and absent in Hannah’s narratives. It then presents examples of usage and discusses the extent to which the usage patterns align with findings on advanced L2 and expert French speakers, as reviewed in Chapter 2.

Hannah’s narrative set of the four stories and the DCT were coded for selected socio-pragmatic features, advanced oral discourse features, and advanced written discourse features. Table 4.2e lists all of the features coded for and whether or not each feature was demonstrated in Hannah’s narratives, or DCT responses. Table 4.2f gives examples of certain features from the narratives. Table 4.2g then shows three coded DCT responses.

Table 4.2e: Summary of Hannah’s repertoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Source</th>
<th>Narratives</th>
<th>DCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: tu</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: vous</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Oral discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : intonation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : <em>est-ce que</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced formal discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit antecedent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the repertoire performed across Hannah’s narratives shows a range of discursive strategies and sociopragmatic features representative of an advanced learner. There are examples of all but three features or strategies. The range of Hannah’s socio-pragmatic repertoire across discrete SP features and oral and formal discourse strategies is confirmed by the responses provided in the Discourse Completion Task. As with her oral narrative set, there are no examples of the *nous* subject pronoun, overgeneralization of *que*, nor of right dislocation. The DCT also has no uses of the future tenses, *simple* or *proche*.

**Table 4.2f: Examples of Hannah’s socio-pragmatic repertoire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Address forms (t/v)      | +        | je fais okay um oui alors je suis euh votre étudiante d’échange uh *vous* êtes où et comment je fais pour rentrer et je je voulais qu’il dise ahh oui je peux passer te voir ou quelque chose  
*I go okay um yes so I am uh your exchange student uh where do you live and what should I do to get there and I wanted him to say ahh yes I can come see you or something*  
8.2.5.6 |
| On                       | +        | Et elle fait ah oui, en fait quand *on* était plus jeune *on* avait toujours les magnétophones à table pour enregistrer les enfants |
And she goes ah yes, in fact when we were younger we always had cassette players at the table to record the children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>oh désolé, je vous comprenez pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Oral discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>et puis l’autre elle venait de la floride et en fait c’était elle qui était avec moi dans la chambre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and then the other she came from Florida and in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i twas she who was with me in the [dorm]room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>elle nous a annoncé oui on va aller manger à red lobster. Ma grand-mère qui fait oui, c’est bon d’accord et moi qui fait non.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>she [my mother] told us yeah we’re going to go eat at red lobster. My grandmother who goes yeah, that’s good okay and me who goes no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Juxtaposition | + | et je je je me demandais mais qu’est-ce que- qu’est-ce qui va se passer, qu’est-ce qu’ils vont me dire, est-ce qu’ils vont me dire quelque chose  
*and I I I wondered but what wha- what is going to happen, what are they going to say to me, will they say something to me*  
A08.3.1.6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Colloquial/informal lexical choice | + | je me suis dit, *merde* qu’est-ce que vais faire?  
*I said to myself, shoot what am I going to do?*  
A08.2.5.11 |
| Subject doubling | + | Il y avait pas beaucoup de lumière donc je me suis dit mm ça va être intéressant parce que *moi* j’aime bien la lumière.  
*There was not a lot of light so I said to myself mm this is going to be interesting because me I really like light*  
A08.2.5.7 |
| Futur proche | + | Donc après elle fait um okay okay je vais mm *je vais parler* avec ta mère  
*So after she goes um okay okay I am going mm I am going to talk with your mother*  
A08.3.1.5 |
<p>| Interrogation : intonation | + | Et euh elle fait donc <em>ils ont quels âges ?</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interrogation:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>And um she goes so they’re what age?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>est-ce que</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>et elle me fait en anglais, <em>est-ce que</em> tu veux que euh <em>est-ce que</em> tu veux que je te dise la nouvelle en espagnol ou en français ou en anglais?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual antecedent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>it is maybe nine o’clock and there are the two people who are eating, so monsieur and madame who are eating and then after um they leave</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I told myself okay, well, I am going to go to bed because it was late and I was really tired</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypotaxis</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>je me suis dit okay ben, je vais aller au lit parce qu’il il faisait tard + et j’étais très fatiguée</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>French Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>et je fais okay um <em>alors la raison pour laquelle</em> j’ai déplacé le matelas c’est parce que j’ai peur</td>
<td><em>and I go okay um the reason for which I moved the mattress it’s because I am scared</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>et puis je me suis dit, okay <em>je vais paniquer</em> le matin mais c’est pas grave</td>
<td><em>and then I told myself, okay I am going to panic in the morning but it’s okay</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ils posent des questions à des personnes &lt;où se trouve le bâtiment&gt;</td>
<td><em>they are asking questions to some people « where is the building ? »</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>mais on <em>n’a pas</em> le droit dire toute la phrase</td>
<td><em>but we are not allowed to say the whole phrase</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sociopragmatic features**

The Socio-pragmatic (SP) features used evince an acquired advanced SP repertoire in the range and function of the features used. For address forms, there are examples of both the *tu* and *vous* forms. The example in Table 4.2f above shows Hannah addressing the host father in Paris.
with the formal *vous*. This would be the most appropriate choice for their initial conversation reasons, among them that he is senior to her, they have not yet met and they are entering into a sort of business relationship. Hannah continues the narrative with her imagined response from him, in which he is projected to address her with the subordinate *tu*, as shown in the direct object pronoun choice, *te*. With this distinction, she shows how she perceives the difference between her relationship to him and his to her.

In these narratives, Hannah exclusively uses *on* as a subject pronoun for the first person plural. This is in line with findings for other post-sojourn learners, as well as some reports of native speaker rates. It is unlikely that she is unfamiliar with the *nous* subject pronoun in spite of its absence given that it among the first items taught in French language classrooms.

There is widespread omission of the *ne* particle in negative expressions, in expected contexts as well as some that demand more sophisticated interpretation. In the example in Table 4.2f, it is omitted in spite of the formal address between a hotel concierge and Hannah. This suggests that Hannah is giving priority to the oral context over the relationship in the service encounter. This pattern repeats in the DCT responses, as shown in response 14 where Hannah is asking a sales person for assistance.

*Table 4.2g DCT sample responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It. #</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Un bon ami te propose d'aller prendre un café, mais tu as déjà quelque chose de prévu. <em>A good</em></td>
<td>Ah, merde, j’ai déjà dit à Stéphane que j’allais le retrouver en ville. Tu veux pas m’accompagner et puis se faire un petit café tous les trois?</td>
<td>Colloq. Lng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ne del.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interr. - inton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>French Text</td>
<td>English Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tu es dans une boutique et tu aimerais savoir si ils ont ce tee-shirt rose en bleu, taille 38.</td>
<td>You’re in a boutique and would like to know if they have the small pink t-shirt in medium blue.</td>
<td>Vous Interr. - ECQ Ne del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Excusez-moi madame. Est-ce que vous avez ça en bleu en 38? Je le retrouve pas dans la vitrine.</td>
<td>Excuse me ma’am. Do you have this in blue in 38? I can’t find it in the window.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tu passes un très bon moment, mais tu dois partir tôt.</td>
<td>You’re having a great time, but you have to leave early.</td>
<td>On(N) Interr. - ECQ Htx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ce soir a été formidable, mais je dois m’absenter un peu plus tôt que j’aurais aimé. Quand est-ce qu’on se revoit? La prochaine fois, vous venez chez moi?</td>
<td>This evening was wonderful, but I must excuse myself a bit earlier that I would have liked to. When do we see each other again? Next time you’ll come to my place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advanced Oral Discursive Strategies

The narrative episodes contain a full range of expert oral discursive conventions, including colloquial language, syntactic structures preferred in the oral format (question formation, the future proche), marked oral forms (dislocation and subject doubling), and oral intersubjectivity (contextual antecedents). In neither the DCT nor the narratives are there examples of the overgeneralization of que as a relative pronoun. The DCT has no examples of dislocation nor subject doubling.

Throughout the narratives, there is repeated use of preferred and marked oral forms for lexical and syntax feature variants, as well as the intersubjective strategy for contextual antecedents. Hannah uses a variety of question formats, including the est-ce que and inversion, for rhetorical questions she asks herself or the interviewer, as well as information or clarification requests in reported speech. There are many uses of left dislocation, but none of right dislocation, the more marked colloquial form. For contextual antecedents, there are abundant introductions of a character or object prefaced with “il y a”. This strategy allows Hannah to use the “new” slot for a theme (new topic) that is known through the context, without explicitly outlining the connection in the “known” slot. It is contextually evident, for example, at a hotel front desk that she would be speaking to a hotel employee. This person may be introduced to a conversation with a proper noun or definite article, rather than the preliminary indefinite. Hannah draws on mutual knowledge of a hotel frame to seamlessly draw the new character into the story.

The discourse-level strategies, including parataxis and juxtaposition, are infrequent in the narratives. As mentioned, there are no examples of the overgeneralization of que. There are a few of paratactic fragments, including the one in the table above. Hannah does rely extensively on
juxtaposition and non-fragmented parataxis in her narration, with many sequences of several simple short chronological or descriptive phrases.

**Formal Discursive Strategies**

A full range of written discourse strategies was exhibited in the narratives. Syntactic choices included *ne* particle retention, the *futur simple*, inversion interrogatives, and hypotaxis. Items coded for hypotaxis included simple, standard relativization and subordination as well as more complex formulations. Lexical items included both individual words and formulaic expressions.

In summary, Hannah displays a wide range of socio-pragmatic facility in her narratives, as expected of an advanced L2 French speaker. In spite of the oral format, formal discourse strategies, generally preferred for writing, are quite prevalent. In contrast, while oral discourse and intersubjective strategies are present, they are not as heavily relied on. Hannah is familiar with expert oral conventions, but she maintains a more formal writing-like *style*. In the next two chapters, we will explore how this stylistic preference reflects a stage of L2 development and is connected to local discourse or historical social contexts.

### 4.3 Mark

This second case study introduces Mark, an advanced French learner near the end of his doctoral studies who realizes with surprise in the first interview that he has spent over half his life with the French language. His profile presented here is similar to Hannah’s in his overall sociopragmatic repertoire and French language sojourns and experiences. There are, however, differences in his contextualized repertoire that show Mark to have more of a singular, integrated
voice in spite of a diverse repertoire. Mark reveals in his metalinguistic interview a principled motivation for his French language use, grounded in a respect for contemporary language and cultural practices and fostered by relationships.

4.3.1 Participant Profile

Mark’s participant profile draws on information provided in the Language History and Metalinguistic interview. It also includes information shared in the initial narrative question about his French language career, as well as from other narratives where applicable. The synthesis below considers at Mark’s second language profile from three perspectives: Chronological; Motivation and Objectives, and Access and Agency.

Chronological Language History

Mark comes from a Midwest state with French cultural ties. French was the only foreign language available in the public school system for his area. The local high school sponsored a trip to France every few summers, and for Mark this was an early motivator. While foreign language study was not required, he chose this as his elective path in part because his older sister had done so, in part because he always enjoyed performing accents, and in part because of this travel opportunity. He took five years of French through junior high and high school years. During this time, he participated in the much-anticipated trip to France, and was invited to French Summit, a weekend conference and competition for high-achieving French students.

From there, he continued on to college at a state university, majoring in French and earning a minor in German. He also studied Russian for two semesters. He spent an undergraduate year abroad at a city in Normandy, living in a dorm with other international students. He made friends
with other Americans abroad during an orientation session just prior to the academic year and socialized and traveled with this group throughout the year. He primarily took courses in French designed for international students. Through a city program, he signed up for a sponsor family. The couple he was paired with invited him weekly for Sunday dinner and an outing. They also gave him things to help his stay be more comfortable, such as a small TV they were no longer using. He became very close with the couple and still maintains contact with them.

Mark chose once again to continue French study at the graduate level, moving to a large mid-Atlantic state university for a Master’s degree in French civilization. Following this, he applied to work as an English teacher at a French university through an exchange sponsored by his department. While he lived by himself in an apartment, he developed strong social connections through colleagues and other activities, including a French-English conversation group. He then returned to the same American university to pursue doctoral studies. Coincidentally, at this time his good friend from undergraduate study abroad was also on campus at this time, although in another department. Following his doctoral coursework, the English teaching position in France was open again and he returned for another year, reconnecting with colleagues and friends. He later returned twice to the same city to collect data, staying with friends and drawing on friends to serve as and connect him to other potential interviewees for his research.

In addition to on-going academic work with and in the French language, Mark has managed to maintain contact with French and American peers from each phase of language study. Through coincidence or effort, Mark has managed to weave these relationships to cross-Atlantic experiences such that the people are not connected to just one place and time in his language history. These on-going relationships reinforce communicative motivations and the degree of access Mark has to French language experiences, each of which is addressed in turn below.
Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Motivation and Objectives

Mark’s foreign language study is catalogued in Tables 4.3a and 4.3b below. The first shows the different languages he has studied and how he uses them. The second shows French language sojourns.

As mentioned, Mark began studying French somewhat by default. While he chose to take a foreign language over another elective, French was the only option at the time. Nonetheless, encouraged by his academic success, he continued. His early motivation was the potential means of communication afforded by a second language, and this remained the primary motivation through his academic career with French. Mark romanticized French history and contemporary cultural practices, and was veritably in awe of the language that would provide access to these.

As an undergraduate, Mark was pursuing a major in French, and added a minor in German. Mark enjoyed French as an object of study, but his time abroad opened up a deeper level of means of communication through relationships with other Francophile peers and his French sponsor family. During his graduate studies, both Master’s and Doctoral, he continued to forge and foster relationships via the French language, thus still privileging French as a means of communication even as the object of study became not just an academic pursuit but one that was marketable for employment.

Table 4.3a: Mark’s Foreign Language Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/time studied</th>
<th>Secondary school years</th>
<th>Undergraduate college semesters</th>
<th>Graduate univ. semesters</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Access and Agency**

This section classifies Mark’s language sojourns by how much access he had to the French language, and how much effort he exercised to have these experiences. For his high school trip, Mark and his classmates stayed in part with a host family and in part in hotels. They followed a predetermined travel schedule from site to site. Mark had some communication with the host family, and limited service encounters, but not much self-direction due to the nature of the trip. Language access for the sojourn is classified as passive and moderate.

During his undergraduate study abroad, Mark’s overall language access is categorized as active and moderate. He lived in a dorm on campus with other international students, taking some classes for French language learners and others for the general university population. He initially struggled with the amount of English in his day-to-day life, and reports regrouping for the second semester to seek out more French language opportunities (hence the connection with the liaison family). Nonetheless, he and his international student peers took advantage of being in France to travel and consequently navigated many service encounters and mishaps when coordinating and
disentangling themselves from several situations. (i.e.: being stranded in Bayeux; having an accident in a rental car). Once connected with the French sponsor family through the city hall, Mark’s cultural and linguistic experiences broadened from those of an L2 French cohort to those within everyday French family life.

Mark’s two non-consecutive years as an English language teacher are classified as having active and significant access. Mark did live in an apartment and work with colleagues who also taught English, but they worked and socialized outside the classroom in French. Mark additionally established a strong social network outside the school. He met regularly with friends for various activities and outings. Mark had several friends he maintained contact with, and with whom he later stayed when conducting research for his doctoral thesis.

Table 4.3b: Mark’s French Language Sojourns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Language experiences</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Summer immersion</td>
<td>host family; service encounters</td>
<td>Passive; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen</td>
<td>1 academic year</td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>Sponsor family, classes</td>
<td>Active, Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg, FR</td>
<td>2 years (non-consecutive)</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>work; social network</td>
<td>Active; Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg FR</td>
<td>2 months (non-consecutive)</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Social network</td>
<td>Active; Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Mark’s Narratives

Five narratives were selected for analysis, which span 44 minutes, 43 seconds of narrative time, excluding the French career summary.

Table 4.3c: Mark’s narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session/segment</th>
<th>French title</th>
<th>English title</th>
<th>Length of recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Résumé de ma carrière française</td>
<td>Summary of my French career</td>
<td>17:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Rencontre inattendu d’une copine à Nice</td>
<td>Unexpected meeting of a friend in Nice</td>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Problème d’appareil-photo en France</td>
<td>Camera problem in France</td>
<td>10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Promenade aux plages de Normandie</td>
<td>Walk to the Normandy beaches</td>
<td>10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Appel de crise cardiaque</td>
<td>Call for a heart attack</td>
<td>4:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Post hoc interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total narrative time: 44 min 43 sec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief summaries of these narratives are as follows:

*Rencontre inattendu d’une copine à Nice/ Unexpected meeting of a friend in Nice* takes place during Mark’s undergraduate year in Caen. Mark’s mother comes to visit for spring break and they spend the time traveling, including a stop at Nice. Once on the beach, he runs into a
friend, Jasmine, from his orientation program. She is tanning in the topless fashion and is embarrassed to have to introduce herself to his mother as such.

On his first, much anticipated trip to France in high school, Mark encounters a *Problème d’appareil-photo/ Camera problem*. His roommate comes back late one night and breaks Mark’s glasses. Unable to see without them, he wears his sunglasses as the group tour wine caves. An avid memoirist of the trip as it happens, he is taking pictures in the dark with sunglasses when the lens falls off the camera, rendering it useless. Mark negotiates with his teacher to find a way to repair or replace the camera before the upcoming stop to the Chenenceau château.

During the orientation program for international students in Caen, Mark and several new friends decide to visit the Normandy beaches, taking a *Promenade aux plages de Normandie/ Walk to the Normandy beaches*. With no particular plan, they meet up mid-day, take the train to Bayeux and, after visiting the sites there, and continue on foot to the coast. Only when there at dusk do they realize there are no buses or trains to get them back to Bayeux or Caen. Thankfully, Jasmine had met some French people at a bar and they agree to rescue the four stranded Americans.

While in high school, Mark worked as a telephone operator at the local hospital. As he recounts in *Appel de crise cardiaque/ Call for a heart attack*, there was a special phone for heart attacks, the number for which (99) was often confused with the extension for outgoing calls (9). One evening, he receives a flustered call that someone might be having a heart attack, but loses the call. A second such call arrives, and Mark decides to call the crash cart in spite of the vague information. In the end, it was the hospital president who had indeed had a heart attack, and Mark was responsible for the timely arrival of medical help.
Table 4.3d: Contextual aspects of Mark’s narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Original language</th>
<th>Co-participants (relationship*)</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Pragmatic functions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected meeting of a friend in Nice</td>
<td>French/English</td>
<td>Mother (I); Friend (I)</td>
<td>Nice: Hotel; Beach</td>
<td>Salutations Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera problem in France</td>
<td>English/French</td>
<td>Classmates (I); Teacher (F)</td>
<td>France: Hotel; Caves; Bus; Store</td>
<td>Gratitude; Requests; Commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to Bayeux beach</td>
<td>French/English</td>
<td>American friends (I); French acquaintances (I)</td>
<td>Normandy: In town; Telephone call</td>
<td>Salutations; Requests; Gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for a heart attack</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Unknown callers (F)</td>
<td>US: Office; Telephone call</td>
<td>Salutations; Questions; Commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Relationship denotes anticipated register: **Formal or Informal**

** Pragmatic functions include all of those demanded over the course of the narrative, not only those performed by Mark.

Language and Situation: Three of the stories take place in France, and one in the United States. The three stories in France all involved, in part, English-speaking interlocutors, so took place partially in English and partially in French.
Interlocutors: There are several characters mentioned in Mark’s stories who do not serve as voiced interlocutors. These include his mother, international students in his study abroad cohort, and French acquaintances. Characters who engage in dialogue include Mark, his good friend Jasmine, unknown callers on the phone and his high school teacher.

Pragmatic Functions: In the narratives, Mark navigates a range of pragmatic functions. He recounts two phone conversations which involve service requests. There are several information requests, as well as greetings and gratitude. There are also two situations where Mark is giving instructions to other people.

4.3.3 Socio-pragmatic Repertoire

This section reports on Mark’s overall socio-pragmatic repertoire in the oral narratives and the Discourse Completion Task, presenting findings for the three categories: sociopragmatic features, oral discourse features, and formal discourse features. Examples from the narratives are included, followed by a discussion of the extent to which Mark’s usage aligns with patterns of use from expert French speakers. Table 4.3e lists all of the features coded for and whether or not each feature was demonstrated in Mark’s narratives, or DCT responses. Table 4.3f gives examples of features present in the narratives.

Table 4.3e Summary of Mark’s repertoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Source</th>
<th>Narratives</th>
<th>DCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-pragmatic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advance/Expert Oral discourse features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/R dislocation</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>●</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : intonation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : est-ce que</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced written discourse features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotaxis</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>●</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit antecedent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, from all four narratives, Mark performs a broad range of repertoire, excluding the *nous* subject pronoun, juxtaposition, the *future simple* and interrogatives with inversion. The repertoire performed in the DCT varies slightly. There are no examples of the *nous* subject pronoun, subject doubling, formal lexical choice, the *future simple* and ne retention. Thus, Mark’s repertoire is most robust in sociopragmatic and oral discourse features, although well-represented in written discourse features.

*Table 4.3f: Examples from Mark’s Oral Narratives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address forms (t/v)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Si tu veux j’ouvre la porte ou je fais quelquechose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>si tu veux rentrer après</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>If you want I [‘ll] open the door or I [‘ll do something if you want to come back after]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d’accord il faut accrocher, <strong>vous</strong> avez probablement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appuyé trop longuement sur le neuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>okay [you] need to hang up, you probably pushed too long on the nine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07.3.7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| On                                | +  | et puis on se rend compte qu’on a aucune idée comment on peut rentrer  
|                                   |    | *and then we realize that we have no idea how we can get back* |
| Nous                              | -  |                             |
| Ne deletion                       | +  | Elle a dit non je peux pas c’est pas on peut vraiment pas demander ça  
|                                   |    | *She said no I can’t it’s not - we really can’t ask that* |

**Advance/Expert Oral discourse features**

| L/R dislocation                   | +  | On a- on pensait que la plage c’était peut-être un peu à côté  
|                                   |    | *We th- we thought that the beach it was maybe a bit next to [the town]* |
| Paratactic fragments              | +  | Déjà on avait même pas une carte téléphonique. c’était l’époque où les portables? pas vraiment. au moins pour les nouveaux arrivés. comme nous.  
<p>|                                   |    | <em>Already we didn’t even have a telephone card. it was the when the cellphones ? not really. At least not for the newly arrived. like us.</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>c’était la première fois <em>que j’étais en France</em></td>
<td><em>it was the first time that I was in France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Et j’ai dit, hm probablement j’ai dit <em>putain</em> que c’est Jasmine.</td>
<td><em>And I said, hm I probably said damn that’s Jasmine</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>après, tout le monde partait un peu partout et <em>moi je</em> restais</td>
<td><em>after, everyone left here and there and me-I stayed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>peut-être <em>ça va être</em> la seule occasion que j’ai dans ma vie d’être en France</td>
<td><em>maybe this is going to be the only chance that I have in my life to be in France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : intonation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>il faisait très beau <em>il y avait quoi d’autre?</em></td>
<td><em>It was very nice there was what else?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interrogation : est-ce que | + | Elle a elle a demandé q- quelques uns d’entre nous **est-ce que vous voulez** je sais pas aller à la plage un samedi ou- **est-ce que c’était** un samedi?  
She ask- she asked s- some of us do you want I don’t know to go to the beach one Saturday or – was it a Saturday? |
| Contextual antecedent | + | je crois en avril quatre vingt dix neuf, **ma mère** m’a rendu visite  
I think in April ninety nine, my mother visited me |
| **Advanced written discourse features** | | |
| Hypotaxis | + | donc je travaillais à l’hôpital en tant que standardiste, et en fait les standaristes étaient responsables si il y avait quelqu’un dans l’hôpital qui faisait une crise cardiaque soit appèle un code blue,  
so I worked in the hospital as an operator, and actually the operators were responsible if there was someone in the hospital who had a heart attack [to] either call a code blue, |
| Formal lexical choice | + | **ma mère** m’a rendu visite |
Sociopragmatic features: Mark’s range of sociopragmatic features is commensurate with an advanced L2 French speaker. Given the situations represented with various interlocutors, he appropriately varies *tu* and *vous* address forms. There are only two examples of the formal *vous* address form, both in *Crise* when Mark is talking on the phone to an unknown individual at work. Otherwise, he uses *tu* in interactions between friends, with classmates, and with peer acquaintances in France. As Mark does, it is common for L2 French speakers to systematically use *on* instead of *nous*. He uses *on* to refer to himself and a range of other people, including his mother, his friends, his colleagues and his classmates. Finally, he omits the *ne* particle in negatives throughout his narratives, which is a common oral sociopragmatic practice.

Oral Discourse Features: With the exception of juxtaposition, Mark performs all of the oral discourse features in his narratives, including preferred, marked and intersubjective strategies. The preferred strategies, the *futur proche* and interrogatives with *est-ce que* or intonation, are used regularly. Marked oral features are used less extensively. There are instances of subject doubling,
most often when Mark is distinguishing his own actions from that of a peer. In the example in Table 4.3f, he is saying that a friend went on to study elsewhere while he stayed at the original location. The use of moi-je double subject emphasizes the contrasting behavior. Overgeneralization of que in relatives is used only in two instances, both with la fois, where the standard expression would be la fois où (the time when/where). In the example above, Mark is situating the narrative as his first visit to France. This should be considered a weak example of overgeneralization of que as it may be a formulaic utterance.

There are periodic episodes of fragments, where Mark is stringing together several pieces of the story without integrating them into one syntactic unit. In the example above, each additional element further clarifies the original utterance. This use is similar to that seen in the DCT where Mark is simulating interaction with a supposed interlocutor. In this case, however, he is not engaging in back-and-forth dialogue with the interviewer, but leaving rhetorical pauses. While there are instances of contextual antecedents, this is a minimally used strategy.

Formal Discourse Features: Mark has limited use of written discourse features in his narratives. There is occasional use of hypotaxis and formal lexical choice. He does use explicit antecedents in framing his stories, as well as to reiterate the topic. There are only three instances where the ne particle is retained in a negative construction. Two of these are emphatic, including the example above shown in Table 4.6. The third is part of a formal construction with the subjunctive, shown here in Example 4.2

Ex 4.2  M : ils sont sortis le soir pour que les profs ne uh uh
                J : le sachent
                M : they went out in the evenings so the teachers didn’t uh uh
                J : know it

Mark, 07.2.5.2
The written discourse strategies are more prevalent in the discourse completion task.

Summary: Mark’s repertoire is representative of an advanced L2 French speaker in terms of the repertoire elements performed. Furthermore, they are used in ways that reflect expert oral discourse. Stylistically, Mark makes little use of contextual antecedents, parataxis or hypotaxis in the narratives. He instead uses linear sequences of simple clauses, as seen here in example 4.3.

Ex 4.3  
ma mère m’a rendu visite et on voyageait un peu partout, on a loué une voiture, on est allé à Mont St Michel, à Tours pour voir les châteaux, et puis on est descendu à Nice pour voir le le la mer.  
*My mother visited me and we traveled a little bit everywhere, we rented a car, we went to Mont St-Michel, to Tours to see the chateaus and then we went down to Nice to see the the the beach.*

To get a better sense of Mark’s repertoire, it is necessary to compare several pairs of features across categories, namely the use of the *ne* particle, the future tenses, interrogative forms, and hypo-or parataxis. The first three sets are syntactically equivalent and traditionally considered sociolinguistically distinct. Gadet (1989), however, argues that the variants are so prevalent in expert oral speech that they no longer carry a social valence. Thus, omitting the *ne* particle, using the *futur proche* and asking questions with interrogative forms that do not require transformation (i.e., *est-ce que* and intonation) simply marks facility with oral speech. Mark uses each of these at the expense of their counterparts. There are no examples of the *futur simple* or inverted interrogatives in his narratives, and but three of *ne* retention, each of which has specific communicative value as discussed above.

Hypotaxis, parataxis and juxtaposition are discursive features. While the two latter were traditionally perceived as incomplete or incorrect syntax, Gadet (1989) argues that in speech, the lexical level of an utterance is only partial to the entire thought phrase conveyed. Thus, fragments
or juxtaposition may be used in conjunction with other means of communication to complete a thought phrase. Mark relies on parataxis in narration to introduce certain elements, without a full or relative clause to situate the element within the narrative. Rather, he continues with a parallel aspect of the story but will later refer to the paratactic element as if it had been fully introduced. He has minimal use of hypotaxis, and while juxtaposition may be used similarly to parataxis in oral discourse, Mark does not use this strategy.

Mark’s repertoire represents that of a very advanced speaker not just in features acquired, but also in usage. The next chapters will further examine Mark’s repertoire use by looking at sets of features used within different contexts, which will clarify how Mark uses different strategies, including those he relies on most in his narratives.

4.4 Meghan

This section of the case study first presents Meghan the advanced French language learner, followed by the data set used for analysis, and her overall repertoire. At the time of the interviews, Meghan is near the end of her doctoral studies in French Civilization. While she has a range of sociopragmatic repertoire and sojourns comparable to those of Hannah and Mark, she was more reserved in pursuing social networks beyond professional acquaintances. Consequently, her performed repertoire privileges complex, explicit syntax mixed with colloquial pragmatics and lexical choices. Unique to this case study is that Megan was interviewed by Sabine, and the two were colleagues and social friends outside the study context.

4.4.1 Participant Profile: Meghan
Meghan’s participant profile draws on information provided in the Language History and Metalinguistic interview. It also includes information shared in the initial narrative question about her French language career, as well as from other narratives where applicable. The synthesis below considers at Meghan’s second language profile from three perspectives: Chronological; Motivation and Objectives, and Access and Agency. The profile will reveal Meghan as focused and perfunctory, if not dispassionate, in her approach to studying French, appreciating the cultural affordances of advanced French study and far less so the social affordances or language itself.

Chronological Language History

Meghan began studying French in junior high school as an alternative to a more cumbersome elective course. By her account, playing the violin required practice and carrying the instrument on the bus, while French class required only homework and came with the promise of a summer homestay program in high school. She participated in this program, which included two weeks of living with a family and a week in Paris.

Continuing in college, Meghan majored in French not so much out of a passion for the language, culture or literature studies, but because she did not want to stop and change to something else, and again was interested in the promise of a sojourn, this time an academic year in Montpellier. As she recounts:

c’est pas quelque chose qui: je sais pas si c’est quelque chose que j’ai décidé avant cela que je voulais absolument continuer le français, mais c’était plutôt que je voulais pas m’arrêter et je voulais avoir cette expérience de - d’étude en troisième année en autre pays

*it’s not something which: I don’t know if it’s something that I decided before this [time] that I absolutely wanted to continue French, but rather it was that I didn’t want to stop and I wanted to have this experience of- of junior year study abroad*

Meghan, 1.1.3
She decided to pursue a graduate degree, lacking other enticing ideas of how to apply her specialization:

le genre de boulot euh après quatre ans de l’université d’études littéraires c’est pas très prometteur, donc je me suis dit bon pourquoi pas le grad school

the work field uh after four university years of literary studies it’s not very promising, so I said to myself well why not grad school

Meghan 1.1.4

She then moved from the Master’s to Doctoral program to diversify her study, looking towards a career in teaching and research. She acknowledges that this was the first time she had a concrete objective for French study, which she notes as a big change for her. At the time of the interviews, she was in her last year of doctoral studies, intending to teach the following year.

Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Motivation and Objectives

Meghan’s foreign language study is catalogued in Tables 4.4a and 4.4b below. The first shows the different languages she has studied and how she uses them. The second shows French language sojourns.

Throughout her French study, from the early years in high school through doctoral research trips, Meghan viewed French as an object of study rather than an integral means of communication, although with appreciation that one affords the other:

I wouldn’t say I’m in love with the French language, but I really like it and I like being able to express myself

Meghan 5.1.1
What emerges through her narratives is that neither the language nor its communicative value was significantly motivating on its own. Yet, French study was necessary for the experiences she could have. Throughout the narratives and meta-interviews, there is a recurrence of unpursued and dropped relationships, signaling that while she enjoyed being able to communicate, the actual people were somehow less important. Fitting with her research in contemporary French civilization, she spent most of her free time visiting museums and parks, observing people and places rather than sharing these experiences with friends and colleagues and socially participating in them.

Table 4.4a: Meghan’s Foreign Language Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/time studied</th>
<th>Secondary school years</th>
<th>Undergraduate college semesters</th>
<th>Graduate univ. semesters</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Research/writing, teaching, leisure media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>almost never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the tepid interest in objective language study, Meghan admits implicitly and explicitly to concerted efforts to do well in learning the language. During her junior year abroad, she arrived with no English-language media or music, determined to fully immerse herself:
J’étais venu en France vraiment sans rien parce que je voulais je voulais venir, avoir une vraie expérience d’être entourée par la culture française

I had come to France really with nothing because I wanted I wanted to come, to have a true experiences of being surrounded by French culture

Meghan 3.2.2

With no television in the apartment that year, she committed to regular radio listening. She describes her learning the French language as “holistic” and “organic”, preferring to focus on expression and how it sounds in a certain situation over memorization and meta-knowledge of grammar. She said she “absorbed” a lot by being an avid reader.

Language Study and Sojourns Abroad: Access and Agency

The section considers Meghan’s francophone sojourns from the perspective of access and agency, specifically evaluating the degrees of exposure and effort. This includes living situation, frequency of linguistic interactions and significance of relationships during the sojourn. Meghan admits that she did not make much effort to cultivate or maintain relationships with francophone friends, save one or two people over the course of many stays.

Meghan’s first sojourn was a summer exchange where her family hosted a French adolescent for three weeks, then Meghan traveled to stay with this girl’s family. Her language practice was largely limited to conversations with family members as she had a constant companion to help her navigate experiences outside the household. Her access here is classified as passive and significant, as language opportunities were generally predetermined by the family but she had constant exposure in their company.

For her junior year study abroad during undergraduate, Meghan spent the year in Montpellier, renting a room in a French lady’s home. While they had dinner together regularly,
Meghan reported that they otherwise did not interact much. She took classes in French and independently navigated social and service encounters as needed. She spent most of her time with the cohort from her American university and other international students. This sojourn is classified as having active, moderate access as Meghan had opportunities for interaction at home and school, although was not particularly motivated to build a francophone social network once she established her living and school situation.

**Table 4.4b: Meghan’s French Language Sojourns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Language experiences</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limoges, FR</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Summer exchange – immersion</td>
<td>host family; limited service encounters</td>
<td>Passive; Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, FR</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Study abroad + summer travel</td>
<td>Francophone housemate, classes</td>
<td>Active, Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon, FR</td>
<td>1 academic year</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>work; some socialization social</td>
<td>Active; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, FR</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Professional and service encounters</td>
<td>Active; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, FR</td>
<td>1 academic year</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Professional and service encounters</td>
<td>Active; Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For a year between her Master’s and Doctoral studies, Meghan participated in the university’s Teaching Assistant exchange, going to Lyon for the academic year. She rented an apartment by herself. She was collegial with other faculty in the English department, and made some French acquaintances outside of work, but did not pursue actual friendships. Her access for this sojourn is thus classified as active and moderate.

Meghan then had two research trips to Paris, France. The first was a semester and the second for an academic year when she received a prestigious fellowship for her doctoral thesis project. During the semester, she lived on her own and for the year sojourn her husband, who did not speak French, joined her. For both stays, she was busy with her research and said she did make an effort on Sundays to spend more time relaxing in Paris, but did not pursue a social network. During the year on fellowship, she had monthly meetings with other fellowship recipients. Her husband joined her for this year, and she spent time introducing him to “her” Paris. These sojourns are both classified as moderate, active access.

4.4.2 Narrative set

Four narratives from Meghan’s first interview with Sabine were used in this case study, totaling 19:08 minutes of storytelling. The narratives are catalogued in Table 4.4c. The first two take place during her high school and junior year abroad, and detail the particulars of her living situation, specifically sharing meals with an apartment-mate and regional excursions with a host family. In the third, she elaborates being stranded at the Vaux-le-Vicomte château after hours and an unsuccessful attempt to persuade a reluctant taxi-driver to take her group back to the train station. Finally, she recalls the perils of teenage driving and getting a speeding ticket on her way
to meet friends, having to tell her parents, and explaining the reason for an unfinished project to her teacher the following day.

Table 4.4c: Meghan’s narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session/Segment</th>
<th>French title</th>
<th>English title</th>
<th>Length of recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Résumé de ma carrière française</td>
<td>Summary of my French career</td>
<td>5:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Colocatrice française à Montpellier</td>
<td>French roommate in Montpellier</td>
<td>2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Premier voyage en France</td>
<td>First trip to France</td>
<td>3:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Vaux-le-vicomte</td>
<td>Vaux-le-vicomte</td>
<td>7:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Une amende de vitesse</td>
<td>Getting a speeding ticket</td>
<td>5:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Post hoc interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across the narratives, a range of situations with different interlocutors is represented, as shown in table 4.4d.

Language and Situation: Three of the stories originally took place in French in France, each during a different sojourn. The fourth narrative originally took place in English.

Interlocutors: Interlocutors include her parents, a policeman, a teacher, several acquaintances during a research trip, a cab driver and his wife, a stranger, a host family, and an apartment-mate.

Pragmatic functions: These narratives included a broad range of pragmatic acts in formal and informal contexts. For the purposes of this study, formality and informality were evaluated based
on situation and interlocutor. Pragmatic acts narrated included: apology and excuse, requests, service interaction, directives, interrogation, and salutations.

*Table 4.4d: Contextual aspects of Meghan’s narratives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original language</th>
<th>Co-participants (relationship*)</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Pragmatic functions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living with a French roommate</strong></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Roommate (I); Landlord (F)</td>
<td>Montpellier; Apartment; Market</td>
<td>Salutations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First trip to France</strong></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Friend (I); Host family (F/I); Parents (I)</td>
<td>Limoges; Host family home</td>
<td>Salutations; Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trip to Vaux-le-Vicomte</strong></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Friends (I); Taxi driver (F); Taxi driver’s wife (F); strangers (F)</td>
<td>Paris: Chateau; Train station</td>
<td>Request; Service interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting a speeding ticket</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Friends (I); Parents (I); Police officer (F); Teacher (F)</td>
<td>Friend’s house; Car; Home</td>
<td>Excuses; Apologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Relationship denotes anticipated register: Formal or Informal

** Pragmatic functions include all of those demanded over the course of the narrative, not only those performed by Meghan.
The following sections explore actual language choices within these narratives, how they relate to the internal contexts of the narratives, and how language-context pairings relate to Meghan’s language history and L2 French identity.

### 4.4.3 Socio-pragmatic Repertoire

This section reports on Meghan’s overall sociopragmatic repertoire, including sociolinguistic, advanced oral discourse, and advanced written discourse features, identified as markers of oral fluency or native-like advanced language. The overall repertoire is catalogued in table 4.4e, which shows which features were performed in narrative telling and in the discourse completion task.

*Table 4.4e: Summary of Meghan’s repertoire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Source</th>
<th>Narratives</th>
<th>DCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</strong></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meghan’s narratives and DCT show a full range of socio-pragmatic features, including variation between the *tu* and *vous* address forms, use of the *on* pronoun for the first person plural *we*, and omission of the *ne* particle in negatives. Meghan showed complete appropriation of the *on* pronoun, with no uses of the *nous* subject pronoun. The absence of *nous* as a subject pronoun will be further addressed in the following section.
For advanced oral features in the narratives, Meghan uses marked and intersubjective features regularly, including dislocation, subject doubling and contextual antecedents. While they are represented in the narratives, she rarely uses the preferred oral variants that have a written or more formal alternative, such as the questions formed with *est-ce que*. There were no instances of overgeneralization of *que*, the immediate future, or question formation by intonation in the narratives. These last two were represented in the DCT.

In both the narratives and the DCT, features of written discourse are fully represented. The narratives include passages of internal cohesion with explicit antecedents and hypotaxis, as well as formal lexical choices and more formal future and interrogative structures.

The excerpt here, from *Vaux-le-vicomte*, illustrates the mix of repertoire represented in the narratives. It includes the subject pronoun *on*, contextual antecedents, and hypotaxis for modification. In the first utterance, the prompt offered by Sabine is acknowledged (*Ça c’était*), followed by a complex adverb phrase to modify the time frame. Here, she chooses *quand* rather than the formal option *où* for time. Meghan uses relativization to link information rather than successive independent utterances (*quand ; qui ; parce que*).

*Ça c’était l’année dernière quand je faisais des recherches des jardins. Donc on avait, oui on avait décidé de- il y avait un groupe de- de filles qui voulait aller à Vaux-le-vicomte avant de avant de partir parce qu’on était tous fin on était tous sur le même emploi de temps pour partir*

*That that was last year when I was doing research on gardens. So we had, yes we had decided to- there was a group of- of girls who wanted to go to Vaux-le-vicomte before leaving because we were all well we were all on the same schedule for leaving*

Meghan, A03.6.1

Following the participants of the story through this opening illustrates how she navigates intersubjectivity of the oral setting and explicit cohesion of the narrative. She begins with *on* as
the main actors in the story in the subject position (reserved for known information), then breaks the utterance to clarify who are her co-participants as there was no antecedent, neither in the narrative nor conversation with Sabine. She reintroduces them in the predicate position with *il y avait* plus an indefinite article, then follows with a relative clause to establish the referent for the subsequent, now clear, use of *on*.

The sample responses of the DCT also show how Meghan pairs the (projected) oral medium with co-participants and setting. In response 14, for example, she uses the *vous* address form and inversion question formation, as well as parataxis to add a color preference. Response 5 shows hypotaxis followed by a question asked with dislocation and intonation.

*Table 4.4g DCT sample responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It. #</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Un bon ami te propose d’aller prendre un café, mais tu as déjà quelque chose de prévu. <em>A good friend asks you to coffee, but you have something scheduled for the time he suggests.</em></td>
<td>Ah c’est bête, j’aimerais mais j’ai déjà un truc à faire. Demain/cet après-midi ça te dirait ? <em>Oh, that’s dumb, I’d like to but I already have something to do. Tomorrow/this afternoon works for you ?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tu es dans une boutique et tu aimerais savoir si ils ont ce tee-shirt rose en bleu, taille 38.</td>
<td>Excusez-moi de vous déranger, madame [mille, etc]. Auriez-vous ce t-shirt en taille 38 ? et en bleu ? merci bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>You’re in a boutique and would like to know if they have the small pink t-shirt in medium blue, size 38.</td>
<td>Excuse me, ma’am [miss, etc]. Would you have this t-shirt in size 38? And in blue? Thanks a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tu passes un très bon moment, mais tu dois partir tôt. You’re having a great time, but you have to leave early.</td>
<td>Je suis désolée [les amis/les filles] je dois m’en aller sinon je vais rater le métro. [protestations] Mais si je veux bien rester mais là je n’ai pas le choix. Oui c’est dommage, il faut nous voir le weekend prochain aussi. I am sorry [friends /girls] I have to go or I’m going to miss the subway. [protests]But yes I really want to stay but I don’t a choice. Yes, it’s too bad, we have to see each other this weekend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Summary

This chapter presented the first of three parts of case studies for three advanced French speakers. While each exhibits an overall advanced repertoire, each comes to advancedness through different experiences, relationships, motivations and objectives. These may not shade the overall profile of their repertoire from a traditional sociolinguistic or pragmatic stance, as the learners largely evince acquired features and use them in appropriate ways. Chapter 5,
Contextualized Repertoire, will examine how these learners use the sociopragmatic, oral, and written discourse features between different contexts of the oral narratives. Nuances will emerge that lend to better understanding the socio-historical cognitive profile they hold for the features. Chapter 6, Repertoire and Identity, will then consider these nuanced language choices against the participant profiles introduced here to explore the implications for instantiations of second language identity.
Chapter 5
Contextualized Repertoire

5.1 Introduction

The section of the case studies presented here addresses the second of three research questions of this study: how do local contexts of the narrative influence repertoire choices? This falls between two other questions: what is the overall sociopragmatic repertoire of an advanced French learner; and how does this performance of contextualized repertoire convey second language identity? To this end, this chapter breaks down the overall performed repertoire catalogued in Chapter 4 and examines the subsets of repertoire between and within the narratives. These are marked by contextual shifts of setting, characters or narrator role. Considering context changes between and within narratives allows for comparison of both broad (such as age and time) and narrow (such as the entrance of a new character mid-narrative) shifts.

5.2 Hannah

This section presents several cross-sections of Hannah’s repertoire. First, it presents subsets of repertoire used between narratives. Second, it looks within the individual narratives at micro-shifts in repertoire usage on three counts: reported speech of different characters; changes in setting; and shifts in narrator perspective (as participant or observer.) Finally, it presents contextualized findings from the DCT responses and discusses how these compare to those from the oral narratives.

The subsets of repertoire used in the different narratives are summarized in Table 5.2a. While each narrative includes a range of sociopragmatic, oral and written discourse strategies, the
The greatest range was represented in Narrative 1, Architèctes. As this narrative was more than twice as long as the others, there was more opportunity for Hannah to choose different features.

Table 5.2a Summary of Hannah’s repertoire across narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Narrative</th>
<th>Narr 1 Hebergée - architectes</th>
<th>Narr 2 Paris -fermée</th>
<th>Narr 3 Frères/soeurs imaginaires</th>
<th>Narr 4 Anniversaire incroyable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-pragmatic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: tu</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: vous</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: intonation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: est-ce que</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced written discourse features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Sociopragmatic features

Between Narratives: All four narratives have a comparable range of sociopragmatic features. The *tu* and *on* pronouns are systematically used throughout the narratives. The *vous*
pronoun is used in exchanges between Hannah and her host parents, both when she is speaking to either of them and when the host mother addresses Hannah. The host father addresses Hannah with *tu*. Considering the participants and pragmatic demands of the situations, there are potential opportunities in both *Imaginaires* and *Anniversaire* for the *vous* address but it is not used, primarily because of the content of reported speech.

*Setting* (time; place; original language): For the second person address forms *tu* and *vous* there was no remarkable difference between settings. *Vous* was absent in *Frères et soeurs imaginaires*, but there were no examples of direct address from Hannah to her teacher or between Hannah’s mother and her teacher, where the pronoun might have been used. The *ne* particle was dropped in each story in every setting represented from the host family home to the airport to school in the United States.

For *on(N)*, however, there was varied use of the pronoun in three of the stories but only one instance in *Frères et soeurs imaginaires* This was the only story which originally took place in the US and in English. In contrast, in *Hébergée chez des architects*, which took place in Paris and in French, the pronoun was used to refer to Hannah and her friends at school, Hannah and the host parents in their home, the host parents in their home. This use across changes in place and participants was found also in the other two stories.

*Reported Speech*: The uses of *on(N)* and the deletion of the *ne* particle are consistent in reported speech from speaker to speaker throughout the narratives. For *on(N)*, Hannah, her friends, her mother and her host parents all use the pronoun in referring to themselves with other participants in reported speech. The *ne* particle is dropped in speech represented by a similar range of speakers.
There is varied use of the T/V address forms based on speaker and interlocutor. The first example cited in Table 3.6 for Hannah’s use of T/V address forms aligns with both what would be standard textbook instruction and a more nuanced understanding of how fluid address forms can be. She is recalling the initial telephone conversation with the host couple from her semester abroad in Paris. For this first encounter, she uses *vous* to address the husband, who is a stranger, senior to Hannah, and in a sort of business relationship with her. Her version of the story has his imagined response address her with *tu*, which is neither inappropriate nor required. While the particular instance of *tu* in the example is an imagined line of dialogue, this schema for *tu* is corroborated further in the segment where Hannah again uses direct reported speech to recount the host father’s actual response, as well as the dialogue between another other host family and Hannah’s friend. Given that she is a stranger and a foreigner, *vous* may have been used. The use of *tu* profiles Hannah in a subordinate role as a young foreigner about to live in their home. Hannah is younger than their children. It may also be inferred that the monsieur was broaching familiarity, although that is an unlikely interpretation, especially give other information about and interactions with the couple from elsewhere in Hannah’s narrative set.

There is additionally an instance of mixed use of the pronouns. In *Paris est fermée*, the airline employee speaks to Hannah with both *tu* and *vous* forms within one conversation. There is no apparent shift in setting or relationship to account for the change, and the variation is inexplicable.

*Narrator Role*: There were no differences in the use of sociopragmatic features based on different narrator roles. The *ne* deletion and *on-for-nous* were systematically used across the narratives whether in descriptive passages, or where Hannah was a participant or observer of a
scenario. Address form use did not vary either, as Hannah was only a participant in the reported speech segments.

In summary, for sociopragmatic features, variability was found with both second person address forms and the on(N) pronoun. By evaluating changes in setting, narrator role and reported speech, variation in use of the second person address forms is determined by the relationship between interlocutors. This largely honors traditional teaching and general practices with address forms. This can be attributed in part to the characters represented, as there were no interactions that may have been interpreted on a gray-scale of formality and familiarity. There was also mixed use of the pronouns in one section of the story that took place in Spain, but in English.

For the on(N) pronoun, the variability is prompted by setting. Hannah uses it liberally across narrator roles and in the voice of different speakers to refer to a range of “we” co-participants in stories that originally took place in French and in a third that took place during her time abroad. In contrast, she uses it but once in the narrative that originally took place in English. This S-P feature is more likely to be acquired in a study abroad period than through classroom learning. Hannah’s usage may suggest that she retained more classroom-style French when recalling an English-language event than one that took place in French or amid French study.

5.2.2 Oral Discourse Features

Between Narratives: As with sociopragmatic features, each narrative contains a broad, though not complete, range of oral discourse features. The preferred and intersubjective strategies are most likely to have been used, while the marked strategies appeared predominantly in the two stories which took place in France.

Setting: The future proche and informal interrogative strategies were used across setting changes. The two most marked oral discourse strategies, dislocation and pronoun pre-positioning
occurred mainly in the two stories that took place in France and were originally in French, although they were used in each story. In this example, from *Anniversaire*, set in the host home during Hannah’s year abroad, there is the juxtaposition of the modifying clause “they’re eating” for the people at the table, while the modifying clause for the forks is relativized. While syntactically this utterance is uneven and cannot be parsed, it is rational in sequence of the narrative.

Ex. 5a: *parataxis*

et j’entends les deux personnes à table, ils mangent et les fourchettes qui font *clank clank clank* comme ça

and I hear the two people at the table, they’re eating and the forks that go *clank clank clank* like that

Hannah, 08.3.3.3

Other features, such as interrogative structures, were more consistently used across the stories.

*Reported Speech:* The future proche was used by a host of characters representing different social constraints, from the host mother and school officials, to Hannah and her friends. The *est-ce que* interrogative structure was used almost exclusively in Hannah’s own rhetorical reported speech. These were passages where she was reporting her internal dialogue as she mediated certain situations. There was additionally one example where her teacher in the United States used it.

In *Imaginaires* the teacher asks Hannah questions during the interview, using intonation and *est-ce que* strategies, as well as fragments. Hannah responds with full clauses and fragments. Example 3.3 here shows an exchange where Hannah is pretending that several country music stars are her siblings.

Ex. 5b: *Interrogative with intonation*


and then she goes Krystal it’s Krystal ? and I go Krystal Gail, she’s a singer too. And then Kenny ah yes it’s Kenny Rogers. Ah yes. Okay. And then uh Conway Twitty I imagine ? Yes that’s him.

Hannah, 08.3.1.4
This kind of running dialogue lends itself easily to fragments and juxtaposition, as well as the intonation interrogative construction. The only other example of dialogue like this is between the host father and his children in *Anniversaire* where they are taunting him with bad words and he is telling the children not to say them.

Hannah used a pre-positioned *moi, je* when speaking to her host father, her teacher and a friend. She did not use it in reported speech of other characters of her stories. The only instance of dislocation within reported speech is in *Imaginaires* where the teacher is talking to Hannah’s mother.

*Narrator Role:* As a narrator participant, Hannah uses the widest range of features. The *est-ce que* interrogative structure was used almost exclusively in descriptive narrator-participant sections. Hannah used subject doubling in narration of events where she was a participant. There were several examples where she introduced her own dialogue, as shown here in ex 3.4, from *Hébergée*.

Ex. 5c: *moi-je*

Moi je fais oh mais c’est bien  
*Me-I go oh but it’s good*  

*Hannah*, 08.2.5.11

The few instances of paratactic fragments are in sections where Hannah is narrating an observed event, and recounting dialogue. Example 3.5 here is a conversation between her mother and teacher in *Imaginaires*.

Ex 5d : *fragment*  
Et ma mère qui fait quoi! Mais c’est pas possible  
*And my mother who goes what! But it’s not possible*  

*Hannah*; 8.3.1.7

The sole example of right dislocation, a marked and especially colloquial aspect of spoken French, is in *Imaginaires*:
Ex. 5e: *right dislocation*

mes parents, ils écoutaient toujours de la musique country et j’adorais et donc à l’âge de trois ans j’avais déjà décidé que j’allais la suivre, Marie Osmond, jusqu’à Hollywood pour chanter avec elle

*my parents, they always listened to country music and I loved [it] and so at the age of three years I had decided that I was going to follow her, Marie Osmond, all the way to Hollywood to sing with her*

Hannah, 8.3.1.3

Hannah uses the narrative device of contextual antecedents across narrator roles when introducing new elements to the story. This device allows her to introduce new information as known without interrupting the flow of her story. Additionally, the technique draws on the assumption that her interlocutor is sharing a contextual frame of reference for the story so does not need. For example, here in example 3.7, it is generally assumed that a child of four or five years would not be out on her own, and that a parent would be nearby. Hannah thus introduces her mother with a (definite) possessive pronoun.

Ex 5f: *contextual antecedent*

Et puis il y a ma mère juste à la porte qui entend tout.

*And then there was my mother just at the door who hears everything.*

Hannah, 8.3.1.6

It would be unlikely to say “There was a woman at the door. She was my mother.” then continue the story from there. While Hannah uses the technique for likely characters and objects (such as a bed in a bedroom; *Architectes*) she does not use if for more abstract cultural objects.

To summarize Hannah’s use of oral discourse features, the broadest range of these features is in her narrative-participant and own reported speech voices. The stories that took place in France also have a broader range of features in part due to the characters, especially the host parents. While Hannah narrates dialogue in the story set in the United States with several oral discourse features, the characters themselves do not employ the same range as do French characters in other stories.
5.2.3 Written Discourse Features

*Between Narratives:* Hannah privileged written discourse features in two narratives which took place abroad, but also from the first interview session. Hypotaxis is used throughout the narratives, but inversion interrogatives, the *future simple* and formal lexical choice are only represented in these first two stories.

*Setting:* Hannah consistently employs formal question formation in formal contexts with formal interlocutors. In *Architectes* she tells of classmates asking strangers for directions, using the inversion interrogative form:

*Ex 5g: interrogative—inversion*
ils posent des questions à des personnes <où se trouve le bâtiment>  
*they are asking questions to some people « where is the building ? »*  

Hannah 08.2.5.12

She uses similar interrogatives in the same narrative when first meeting the host father and asking questions about the house, again set in France and with a formal interlocutor.

There is a significant difference in the range of written features between the two narratives told in the first interview and those told in the second, where the two stories from the second set have instances of hypotaxis and *ne* retention, but not the other written discourse features. This potentially points to a local context not within the narratives but in the interview setting, perhaps a familiarity with either the interviewer or the interview setting, or both. Between *Architectes* and *Anniversaire*, there are also several differences local to the stories themselves, in spite of the same setting and characters. The first is Hannah’s initial meeting with the couple and recounts a conflict between them. The second takes place near the end of her stay and is a story about the couple but not one in which she herself is an actor.

*Reported Speech:* As with oral discourse features, the formality of relationship between interlocutors determines the features that emerge. In *Architectes*, Hannah uses inversion for
interrogatives when speaking to the host father, and as do students when posing questions to strangers on the street. While Hannah had several passages of running dialogue that profiled oral discourse features, she mostly relied on narrated utterances with clear turns and character shifts. The reported speech in these cases often included relativization and explicit antecedents, as seen here where the host mother is telling Hannah that they need to talk about an issue.

Ex. 5h: hypotaxis
Elle me fait euh Pierre et vous et moi il faut qu’on se parle. Et je fait huh ? pourquoi ? Elle me fait il faut qu’on discute pourquoi le matelas est en bas on n’est pas japonais.
*She goes to me uh Pierre and you and I we need to talk. And I go huh ? why ? She goes to me we need to discuss why the mattress is down [on the ground] we’re not Japanese.*

This example also includes an instance of the *ne* particle being used in the voice of the host mother. It is likely for emphasis given that it is also used with the oral *on* for *we*.

**Narrator Role:** As mentioned in the section on setting above, she is more likely to have used the written features in *Architèctes* where she was a participant, than in *Anniversaire* where she was largely an observer. This may be in part because she had more internal background information in the first case over the second.

In summary, Hannah uses written discourse features largely in narrative passages. In contexts where she is a narrator-observer, Hannah uses more hypotaxis as she is elaborating within the speech what she would have otherwise recounted in background narration. She is also likely to use them in reported speech where more explicit language would be appropriate for the interlocutors. The cases of *ne* retention seem to be for emphasis.

5.2.4 Discourse Completion Task Repertoire
The aim of the Discourse Completion Task was to verify a participant’s repertoire as represented in the narratives. As elaborated in Chapter 2, there were twenty prompts that involved a range of imagined interlocutors in different situations. The tasks were coded by register and the responses were coded for linguistic features in the same way the narratives were.

*Overall DCT repertoire:* Hannah’s DCT repertoire is shown in Table 3.7. Overall, the responses provided for the DCT show a comparable range of sociopragmatic features and narrower range of oral and written discursive strategies when compared to those from the oral narratives. Similar to the oral narratives, there were no examples of the *nous* subject pronoun or overgeneralization of *que*. There were no examples of the future, *proche* or *simple*, likely due to the nature of the prompts. There were also no examples of the most marked oral discourse strategies, dislocation and pronoun pre-positioning.

The nature of the DCT should account for the absence of features that were present in the oral narratives on three counts. First, there were only 20 prompts, which provided a very small language sample relative to the narrative set. Second, the responses all followed prompts in which the context, including situation, interlocutor and object, were provided. There was therefore no need to introduce or make relevant these elements in responses, which likely accounts for the lack of relativization strategies. Finally, the lack of dislocation, pronoun pre-positioning, and contextual antecedent is likely accounted for by the fact that these were not narratives but stand alone responses to a pre-contextualized prompt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Register</th>
<th>Formal (3 prompts)</th>
<th>Polite (8 prompts)</th>
<th>Casual (5 prompts)</th>
<th>Informal (4 prompts)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-pragmatic features</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2b: Contextualized DCT repertoire by register for Hannah
Address form: *vous*  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
Nous subject *pn*
On as Nous sub. *pn*  ●  ●  ●  ●
Ne deletion  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●

**Advance/Expert Oral discourse features**

L/R dislocation
Paratactic fragments  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
Juxtaposition  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
Overgeneralization of *que*
Colloquial/informal lexical choice  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
Subject doubling
Futur proche
Interrogation: intonation  ●  ●  ●  ●
Interrogation: est-ce que  ●  ●  ●  ●
Contextual antecedent  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●

**Advanced written discourse features**

Hypotaxis  ●  ●  ●  ●  ●
Formal lexical choice  ●  ●  ●
Explicit antecedent  ●  ●  ●
Futur simple
Interrogation: inversion
Ne retention  ●  ●  ●

*Contextualized DCT Repertoire:* The DCT prompts were categorized by register, based on setting and interlocutor.

*Sociopragmatic features:* Hannah has examples of *tu* and *vous* throughout the DCT, and most uses match both the situation and the tenor of her response. She uses *tu* when addressing friends across all but one of the situations where a friend was the interlocutor, from declining an invitation to coffee to offering a hostess gift at a friendly dinner. Hannah uses *vous* in service encounters (with a hotel receptionist and salesperson), when thanking a stranger and when making a request to a professor. She also uses *vous* in two instances where a good friend was specified as
the interlocutor, and once uses _tu_ with a colleague. Examples 3.10 and 3.11 here illustrate the expected distinction between _tu_ and _vous_.

Ex 3.10 : _tu_ ; _dct_
Tu me dis quand tu ne veux plus cette robe
_Let me know when you don’t want that dress anymore_  
**Hannah, 08dct.17**

Ex 3.11 : _vous_ ; _dct_
Excusez-moi madame. Est-ce que vous avez ça en bleu en 38 ?
_Excuse me, ma’am. Do you have this in blue in 38?_  
**Hannah, 08dct.14**

There is one example of each _tu_ and _vous_ which bear note. When telling a friend she is unable to attend his/her wedding, thus making an excuse and offering an apology to a familiar interlocutor, she uses _vous_. The prompt was designed to provoke delicate wording given the importance of the event (a wedding), yet familiar language given that to be invited to a wedding one is presumably good friends. While the use of _vous_ perhaps matches the formality of an excuse for not attending a wedding, it had been anticipated that formality would be found more in discourse strategies than in the address form. One possibility is that she imagined addressing the couple, and this is thus a plural _vous_. Alternately, Hannah specifically mentions celebrating the next time she is in Alsace in the response, so she may have been invoking a particular acquaintance to whose wedding she could have been invited, one with whom she had an established _vous_-degree of proximity.

As there are no instances of the _nous_ subject pronoun, Hannah by default is using _on_ to refer to a _we_ group. This feature is only present in casual and informal prompts, however, showing Hannah’s attempt to align herself with her interlocutor in these contexts. Here, in Example 3.12 Hannah takes leave from a dinner party with friends, asking after the next rendez-vous.

Ex 3.12 : _on(N)_ ; _dct_
Quand est-ce qu’on se revoit?
When do we see each other again?
Hannah, 08dct.20

The *ne* particle is omitted systematically across registers, from declining coffee with a colleague, to making a request of a salesclerk, to thanking a stranger, to several situations with friends.

**Advanced/expert oral discourse features:** Hannah uses parataxis and juxtaposition to string together clauses throughout the DCT. On the vocabulary level, Hannah has several examples of vulgar vocabulary, as seen in Ex 3.13 here, where Hannah is congratulating a colleague on publishing a paper. She includes a disclaimer in parentheses with her response that it is “a colleague I know well, bien sûr”.

Ex 3.13: *informal lexical choice; dct*
Maintenant j’ai quelquechose d’appétissant à lire aux chiottes.
*Now I have something interesting to read on the can.*
Hannah, 08.dct.06

Informal but inoffensive language is used in several prompts with her friends, but also with a taxi driver and when addressing a class she teaches.

There are multiple instances of contextual antecedents, including example 3.14 here where she compliments a friend’s cake that, in fact, is not good at all. She reprises the topic of the cake from the prompt with the pronoun *ce* rather than explicitly naming it, as she would be obviously tasting it in the situation.

Ex3.14: *contextual antecedent*
Mmm. C’est délicieux. Tu me files la recette pour que je puisse trouver un moyen d’y rajouter du beurre de cacahuète?
*Mmm. It’s delicious. You’ll get me the recipe so I can find a way to add some peanut butter to it?*
Hannah 08dct.19

**Advanced/written discourse features:** Hannah employs explicit written features across registers on the DCT. She uses explicit antecedents in formal and polite contexts, such as here, requesting an extension on the paper. This example also has an *est-ce que* question form with the conditional to make a formal request, and hypotaxis.
Ex. 3.15: *explicit antecedent; dct*
Est-ce que ça serait possible que j’aie un tout petit peu de temps pour remettre mon travail ce semestre? Je viens de tomber sur des idées vraiment fascinantes que je veux vraiment incorporer dans mon projet.

*Would it be possible for me to have a little bit more time to turn in my semester paper? I just came upon some really fascinating ideas that I really want to include in my project.*

Hannah, 08 dct.07

In the DCT, there is a singular example of ne retention, in an casual context, when complimenting a friend’s dress. While it is possible that this was for emphasis, it is not clear.

**DCT Summary:** While the DCT overall provides a wide range of performance features, several distinctly oral features are missing. The widest range of repertoire is shown in polite contexts, but that is also the register with the most number of prompts. The narrowest range was in the formal register. Written discourse features are slightly privileged in formal and polite situations, while oral discourse features are used throughout, although with reservation in formal situations.

Considering pairs of features, such as *ne* retention versus omission, Hannah omits the *ne* in all contexts but formal. The one example of retention, however, is in casual context. She uses the *vous* address form in all four contexts, but the *tu* again in all but formal ones. Hannah favors simple sentences or hypotaxis over conversational fragments. While there is very little parataxis, she does use contextual antecedents as if continuing a conversation in all but formal contexts.

The DCT repertoire distinguishes itself from the repertoire performed in the oral narratives in two ways. First, the two most marked oral discourse features are not used at all, as well as the future tenses. The lack of future may be due to the nature of the prompts. For several references of future time, however, Hannah does use the present tense.
The second, and more noteworthy, difference is that the Hannah is more likely to use oral discourse features in polite situations with interlocutors who are her superior, a colleague or a stranger. Thus, the relationship between Hannah and her interlocutor is less likely to determine the features performed. The overall repertoire of the DCT more closely resembles the meta-narrative voice Hannah used in the oral narratives than the voice she had for her own reported speech or for general narration.

5.2.5 Contextualized Repertoire summary

As shown in Chapter 4, Hannah’s overall repertoire is commensurate with that of an advanced L2 French speaker. She additionally exhibits a large number of colloquial oral discourse features which have been studied in native speakers but not L2 speakers, and uses conventional advanced features often required for written work.

Considered within contexts, Hannah’s language choices seem to be determined by the relationship between participants, Hannah’s role in the narration, or the original setting of the story. There may additionally be a training influence over the course of the two interview sessions. Looking at items discretely, there are utterances where there seems to be a mis-match of context to feature, for example inconsistencies with *tu/vous* address forms. These are not numerous compared to the logical context-feature pairings, so may be slips of the tongue or momentary absent-mindedness away from the narrative.

There are two holistic aspects of Hannah’s repertoire that deserve more attention. The first is the multiplicity of her own voice across the narratives. As Hannah’s own role in the narratives changed, so did the subsets of repertoire she relied on. Second is the combined subsets of sociopragmatic, oral, and written discourse features within the contextualized episodes.
Multiplicity of voices: Hannah has several voices across her narratives. As anticipated, there are Hannah the narrator of background information events, Hannah the participant within the narrative, and Hannah’s own reported speech which allows her to project the internal perspective of other characters. Through the analysis, a fourth voice emerged: Hannah the meta-narrator, used when she was relaying internal commentary on narrated events. Each voice is distinct. Hannah the narrator is the most conventional voice, relying heavily on written discourse features, particularly relativization, to situate events in time and place. Hannah as a participant in an event is the most dynamic, drawing on a full range of strategies, largely in part due to reported speech and the direct voices of other characters. As Hannah the observer, she often compensates in reported speech for information otherwise conveyed by her in contexts where she is the participant.

Hannah’s meta-narrator voice is remarkable in two ways. First, it is distinct from her own voice in reported speech. Second, it is the voice that most closely approximates Hannah’s responses on the Discourse Completion Task. Hannah’s reported speech voice is restrained in comparison to the DCT responses. The meta-narrator, however, is more colloquial and robust in oral conventions.

Subsets of repertoire: What is powerful about the contextualized breakdown of Hannah’s repertoire is that we can see how she intricately weaves together different layers of features. While her performance is not dichotomous, oral-written, it is compensatory, where she shifts from one profile to another across context changes, in particular of the narrator role. For example, in Anniversaire, where Hannah is largely an observer, she relies on reported speech to recount background information. In this situation, she in turn relies heavily on hypotaxis to situate the story. By contrast, in Imaginaires, the reported speech is much more colloquial (in spite of the original setting in the United States) while the descriptive narration more is explicit.
What we additionally see within individual episodes is how Hannah balances the levels of socio-cultural constraints. For example, when she is meeting the host father for the first time, her internal, meta-narrative voice is distinct from the one she verbalizes to him in reported speech.

That Hannah’s French voice is dynamic not only in relation to external contexts but to internal ones as well suggests that she is in fact orchestrating a concert of language to convey the positioning of characters and constraints. This will be discussed further in the following section on Identity and Repertoire.

5.3 Mark

This section presents an analysis of contextualized repertoire on two levels. First are the subsets of repertoire used between each narrative as a whole. As discussed in Chapter 4, the individual narratives were coded for original language, setting, co-participants, and pragmatic functions required. Three of the stories originally took place in France with friends and classmates. There are formal interlocutors in Lunettes and Crise. The differences between each narrative based on these contexts are discussed. The second level of analysis divides the narratives into episodes based on shift in local setting, narrator role, or characters speaking, and considers the subsets of repertoire used within each of these micro-contexts. For each section, the socio-pragmatic, oral discourse and written discourse features are addressed in turn.

5.3a Between narratives: Mark’s repertoire between each narrative is shown in Table 5.3a Within individual narratives, Mark’s use of sociopragmatic features is comparable. He uses the vous form only in Crise because he is speaking on the phone with an unknown interlocutor. The reported speech in the other three stories is with friends, classmates, and family members, hence the use of tu. The use of written discourse features within narratives is similarly comparable. There are the
isolated cases of *ne* retention in two stories (discussed above) and limited use of hypotaxis in narration, as will be elaborated below in the section on narrator role.

The broadest range of oral discourse features is in *Promenade*, which includes the marked features dislocation, overgeneralization of *que*, and pronoun prepositioning. This story takes place in France, and includes both university friends and French acquaintances. By contrast, *Crise* has the narrowest range of features including two marked strategies (pronoun prepositioning and parataxis) in addition to interrogatives with intonation and the *futur proche*. This story is the only one to take place originally in English, at work, and with colleagues and strangers as interlocutors. Unlike the other three stories, there are no examples of *est-ce que* interrogatives nor of colloquial language. However, in spite of the few features represented in this story, those that are present still reflect variety expected of advanced oral speech. Further, that the sociopragmatic and written discourse features are similar to those in the other three stories shows that Mark is favoring other features at the expense of more oral discourse features; the story simply provoked a more narrow range. As will be discussed below, Mark’s responses on the Discourse Completion Task for formal and polite prompts similarly elicited fewer oral discourse strategies compared to casual and informal prompts, but not an increase in written discourse features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Narrative</th>
<th>Narr 1 <em>Rencontre d’une copine</em></th>
<th>Narr 2 <em>Problème d’appareil-photo</em></th>
<th>Narr 3 <em>Promenade au plage de Bayeux</em></th>
<th>Narr 4 <em>Crise cardiaque</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-pragmatic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject Pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: <em>est-ce que</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced written discourse features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotaxis</th>
<th></th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Setting: Setting was marked by changes in time, place, or presence of different characters. Mark does not vary his sociopragmatic repertoire use by change in setting, save the relationship he has with a particular interlocutor, and this only with address forms. He uses *tu* in expected circumstances, such as with peers and friends, and slightly ambiguous ones, such as with newfound French peer acquaintances. The subject *on* is used for Mark and his mother, friends or colleagues. His friend Jasmine also uses it to refer to her plus Mark and friends.

Mark uses marked oral discourse strategies in the two narratives that took place in France with French school peers. Overgeneralization of *que* occurs in both *Lunettes* and *Bayeux*, and dislocation in *Bayeux*. The preferred oral discourse strategies for interrogatives appear across the narratives, and the *futur proche* is in all but *Rencontre*. 
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For written discourse features, there are no differences between location, original language or co-participants on the features used. In *Crise* his narration alternates easily between passages with hypotaxis and fragmented description, just as he does in *Rencontre*.

Overall, setting has two notable influences on language choices. The first is the nature of Mark’s relationship with a particular character determining address form, which is expected. The second is that stories in France and originally in French are slightly more likely to provoke marked oral discourse features, such as subject doubling and overgeneralization of *que*.

5.3.3 Reported Speech: Reported speech includes direct and indirect narration of dialogue or utterances from characters. Mark uses indirect reported speech but once in the narratives, and has generally few passages of direct reported speech. In addition to Mark, other characters that speak are his friend Jasmine, his teacher, and two strangers on the telephone.

Mark speaks in each of the stories, addressing all of the characters previously mentioned. In his own voice, Mark uses some colloquial and vulgar language. In some cases, he includes a mitigator or disclaimer for the benefit of his actual audience, the interviewer. When speaking to a classmate, teacher, or friend, Mark uses different features within the reported utterance, but relies overall on oral discourse strategies. It is here that he uses the moi-je construction, colloquial language and juxtaposition. In *Lunnettes*, Mark has the most explicit passages of reported speech when explaining to his roommate that he will keep the room key. (Example 5.3a):

Ex. 5.3a  

moi je garde la clé parce que je veux pas je veux entrer dans la chambre quand je veux au cas où donc moi je prends la clé. Si tu veux j’ouvre la porte ou je fais quelque chose si tu veux rentrer après pendant le soir mais je veux la clé parce que je veux pas être fermé à clé dehors le uh la chambre

*me-I am keeping the key because I don’t want I want to get into the room when I want in case so me-I am taking the key. If you want I’ll open the door or I’ll do*
something if you want to come back after during the evening but I want the key
because I don’t want to be locked out of the uh the room
Mark, 07.2.5.3

The passage includes omission of the *ne* particle, pronoun pre-positioning and hypotaxis. In the speech, Mark situates his roommate, the scene, and what his point is. In contrast, when Mark unexpectedly meets Jasmine at the beach (Example 5.3b), it is not clear which turn belongs to whom. There are three distinct utterances that are not syntactically connected to or reliant on the others.

Ex 5.3b

puis elle était là on était tous les deux on était choqués, mais qu’est-ce que là c’est bizarre, on s’est pas vus depuis des des mois, des mois et puis tout à coup t’es là

then she was there we were both we were surprised, but what are you doing here, it’s weird, we haven’t seen each other for months, for months and then all of a sudden you’re here

Mark, 07.2.4.4

The differences between these two examples are not limited to who is speaking to whom. As will be discussed in the next section, Mark is providing information about the situation in the reported speech in the first, while in the second he entirely set up the scene before launching into dialogue. Later in *Rencontre*, however, Mark reverts to using an explicit antecedent in Jasmine’s reported speech when she explains why she was without her bathing suit top. Because this takes place at a later time, they are removed from the here-and-now of the actual incident (which was not addressed in reported speech at the time), and definite syntax is needed to point back to the scene. A final point on explicit versus contextual antecedents is that the reported speech that resembles banter, relying on contextual antecedents, in the two stories that took place in France with friends made in France.
Jasmine is featured in two stories. She uses the *tu* address form with Mark and French acquaintances. She also uses the *moi-je* construction when speaking with Mark, and hypotaxis when explaining her choice to take off her bathing suit top at the beach. In both stories, she uses *est-ce que* interrogatives when talking to friends, acquaintances and Mark. As Mark reveals in these and other stories, Jasmine is a good friend who continues to spend quite a bit of time in France. Thus, her reported speech matches their relationships and her reported competence in L2 French.

There are two other characters who speak in Mark’s stories. First is his high school teacher, who responds to Mark’s request to detour the bus to look for a new camera. Her response includes omission of the *ne* particle, *on* to refer to the school group, and two consecutive utterances with neither hypo- nor para-taxis. Finally are two strangers who call via the hospital emergency line to report a suspected heart attack. The first uses hypotaxis to explain the situation, while the second provides a singular simple clause. Both respond to a follow-up question with *je sais pas*.

To summarize Mark’s use of reported speech, he does not capitalize significantly on different voices and characters to realize a subset of repertoire distinct from his own narrative voice. The exception to this is the use of more colloquial-to-vulgar lexical items, which are emerge in recreated dialogue with friends. Sociopragmatic features match the relationship between the two interlocutors, and turns in utterances rely on parataxis. He employs both contextual and explicit antecedents, depending on the topic of dialogue.

5.3.4 Narrator Role: Three types of narrator role were considered. This first is for background information or description, the second for episodes where observed action is being reported, and the third is episodes where the narrator is an active participant. In the case of Mark, sections where
he was directly speaking to the interviewer for clarification or elaboration are also considered separately from these.

Background/description: When providing background information, Mark uses a mix of expected sociopragmatic features (on, ne deletion), preferred and marked oral discourse features (pronoun pre-positioning, overgeneralization of que), and some hypotaxis.

Mark draws on contextual antecedents in two ways. First is the traditional sense of providing new information in a known way. Here, Mark refers to his mother’s visit in Rencontre, immediately using the definite possessive article.

Ex. 5.3c  donc je crois en avril quatre-vingt-dix-neuf, ma mère m’a rendu visite et on voyageait un peu partout
so I think in April ninety-nine, my mother visited me and we traveled a little bit everywhere

Mark, 07.2.4.3

Earlier in the story, Mark introduces another new character, with a sequence typical for new information. In the first utterance, the friend is in the predicate, followed by the nominative place in the second.

Ex. 5.3d  j’ai rencontré cette fille Jasmine là et puis eum elle - elle était là juste pour les deux semaines
I met this girl Jasmine there and then um she – she was there just for the two weeks

Mark, 07.2.4.2

In both these cases, Mark is using utterances that are complete with lexical syntax, just drawing on internal versus external contexts. The second strategy Mark has for contextual antecedents is to introduce a topic or idea in a fragment, then leave the fragment to continue with what seems a non-sequitur or change of course. Later, however, he reprises the topic as if he had fully introduced it to the story. Thus, the original fragment acts a stand-alone clause that adequately connected the topic to the story.
Mark’s preferred narrative strategy relies on neither hypotaxis nor parataxis. He has sequences of short utterances, such as here in Example 4.8 where he is describing the change in setting between two parts of *Promenade*.

Ex. 5.3e  
Et puis le soleil commence à se coucher et devient un- de plus en plus sombre, les magasins se ferment ben les quelques-uns qu’il y avait, et puis on se rend compte qu’on a aucune idée comment on peut rentrer parce qu’il commence à fait nuit.  
*And then the sun begins to set and becomes a- darker and darker, the stores close well the few that there were, and then we realize that we have no idea how we can get back because it’s beginning to get dark.*  
Mark, 07.3.1.7

Observer: In scenes where Mark is reporting observed behavior, he uses explicit antecedents and hypotaxis, as well as colloquial language. The first two strategies convey Mark’s distance from the scenes, while the specific language choices match the register used elsewhere in the stories with the same characters.

Participant: When narrating scenes where he is a participant, Mark is most likely to use fragments. This is in part due to the flow of reported speech, but also occurs in descriptive passages, where a series of fragments are juxtaposed as details are post-hoc added to the description. He also uses the sociopragmatic features *tu, on, ne* deletion, as well as other oral discourse features such as pronoun pre-positioning.

5.3.5 Discourse Completion Task Repertoire

The Discourse Completion Task was included in the study to verify repertoire. The twenty prompts were designed to target different contexts that would require a range of sociopragmatic performance in the event that certain contextual factors were not represented in the narratives, for example, very formal interactions with a boss, service encounters or casual conversations with friends. The prompts were coded in the same way as the narratives, but the contexts were
determined differently. As elaborated in Chapter 2, the prompts were categorized by register: formal; polite; casual; and informal. This was based on the setting, pragmatic act required, and relationship to the interlocutor. Reported here is Mark’s repertoire for each category of feature by different register. This is followed by a synthesis of repertoire within prompts and a discussion of how this compares to findings on contextualized repertoire from the oral narratives. Mark’s DCT repertoire is summarized in Table 4.8.

Table 5.3b: Contextualized DCT repertoire by register for Mark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Register</th>
<th>Formal (3 prompts)</th>
<th>Polite (8 prompts)</th>
<th>Casual (5 prompts)</th>
<th>Informal (4 prompts)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : intonation</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : est-ce <em>que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced written discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Mark’s responses on the Discourse Completion Task are robust in sociopragmatic and oral discourse features. There are no examples of the *nous* subject pronoun, nor of overgeneralization of *que* or pronoun pre-positioning. For written discourse features, there are no examples of *ne* retention, the future simple or formal lexical choice. In contrast, there is systematic omission of the *ne* particle, a use of the *future proche* and moderate use of colloquial (but not vulgar) vocabulary.

Compared to the overall repertoire of the oral narratives, the Discourse Completion Task repertoire is more robust in formal and written features in polite settings. There is more parataxis and colloquial language as well. This is likely due to the relatively small amount of reported speech in the oral narratives. In the oral narratives, there are few formal or polite interactions, save the professional situation in *Crise Cardiaque*. The DCT specifically provokes reported speech, and the patterns of use tying features to context are similar, as are elaborated next.

**Table 5.3c Mark’s DCT sample responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It. #</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C’est la fin de ton semestre à l’étranger et tu te retrouves à dire au revoir à un bon ami, en lui promettant que vous allez rester en contact. <em>It’s the end of your semester abroad and you have to say goodbye to a good friend, promising him you’ll stay in touch.</em></td>
<td>Tu vas me rendre visite, hein?! On s’envoie des mails et des letters, ok? <em>You’re going to visit me, right?! We’ll send emails and letters, ok?</em></td>
<td>Tu On(n) Interr. - inton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tu es dans une boutique et tu aimerais savoir si ils ont ce tee-shirt rose en bleu, taille 38. <em>Hello, do you have this t-shirt in blue. What size?38</em></td>
<td>Bonjour, avez-vous ce tee-shirt en bleu. Quelle taille? 38 <em>You want this t-shirt in blue. What size?38</em></td>
<td>Vous Interr. - inv Ptx frag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You're in a boutique and would like to know if they have the small pink t-shirt in medium blue.

20  Tu passes un très bon moment, mais tu dois partir tôt.  
You’re having a great time, but you have to leave early.  
Eh bien, faut que je parte. Je sais, je m’amuse à fond là – mais je peux pas rester plus longtemps. Passez une bonne soirée.  
Well, have to go. I know, I am having a great time here – but I can’t stay any longer. Have a good evening.

Sociopragmatic features: For sociopragmatic features, specifically address forms, Mark includes both the tu and vous address forms, as well as the on subject pronoun for we. Mark also omits the ne particle throughout. For address forms, Mark uses tu with friends and colleagues, and vous with professors and in service encounters. As a graduate student, his contemporary “colleagues” would be his cohort of other graduate students, hence the choice of tu. The one use of on includes Mark and a good friend; there are no uses of nous.

Oral discourse features: Mark uses a wide range of oral discourse features in the DCT. As mentioned above, this excludes the two marked features of overgeneralization of que and pronoun pre-positioning. Across contexts Mark uses parataxis and juxtaposition. This is, in part, due to imagining responses from his interlocutor. Several responses are strings of short utterances, whether fragments or full clauses. With the exception of formal contexts, Mark draws on the context provided in the prompt without reiterating the antecedent. He uses either est-ce que and intonation to form questions across all contexts.

Written discourse features: Mark overall has few written discourse features throughout the DCT. In formal and polite contexts, he uses the inversion form for questions, as seen in response 14 in Table 5.3c. There is but one example of hypotaxis relativizaion in the entire DCT and no other examples of subordination.
Considering the mix of features within each register, there are three themes to Mark’s Discourse Completion Task responses. First, they largely parallel his performance in the oral narratives. Second, to consider the holistic picture of context plus response, Mark does use more formal and polite features with formal interlocutors, yet maintains an oral structure in his utterances. Finally, in spite of the oral style, there is a lack of marked oral discourse features.

There are two aspects of Mark’s responses that point to his privileging oral conventions on the DCT. First is the actual use of oral over written discourse features. Rather than one complex utterance, his responses were composed of several shorter ones, with only one instance of hypotaxis. The reliance on short clauses and parataxis points to the contexts provided in the prompts. Mark does not explicitly situate his response within the context nor reiterate information from the prompt. Rather than creating a stand-alone response, he provides a segment of conversation that would happen in the situation provided, with the interlocutor sharing the context from the prompt. The second way the DCT repertoire mimics an oral repertoire is how there are imagined responses within his response, where he provide several turns of a conversation. This can be seen in the responses to prompts 14 and 20, listed in Table 4.9 above. In response 14, one can imagine the follow-up question from the salesperson, *Quelle taille?* (*What size?*), which Mark reiterates before responding with the size. In response 20, his second utterance opens with *Je sais* (*I know*) which is acknowledges a comment from his friends after he announces he is leaving. He then continues to mitigate his leaving by saying he’s having a good time but must leave.

Mark maintains the oral tone even in formal situations. For prompt 8, shown here in example 4.9, he needs to request an extension for a paper from a professor. Thus, Mark is in a subordinate situation to a formal interlocutor. The response begins with a formal opener, using the *vous* address form and an inversion question form. As with other responses, between the reported
utterances, there is an imagined response from the professor. He does not combine the utterances where he states the problem and makes his request, rather keeping each a complete separate clause. The final two utterances assume agreement on the part of the professor and Mark transitions to a less formal register. There is a fragment suggesting that he turn the paper in within two weeks, followed by a question formed with intonation.

Ex 5.3f  Je suis désolé de vous déranger, mais puis-je vous parler un instant? Merci. En fait, ce semestre j’ai eu du mal à terminer tous les devoirs. Serait-il possible de rendre le projet final pour ce cours un peu plus tard? Dans deux semaines, peut-être? Cela vous convient?

I am sorry to bother you, but may I talk with you for a moment? Thank you. In fact, this semester I had a hard time finishing all my work. Would it be possible to turn in the final project for this class a little late? In two weeks perhaps? Does that work for you?

Mark, dct08

The lack of marked oral discourse features suggests that the DCT repertoire is somewhat more neutral than the oral narrative repertoire. This is likely due to the fact that it was a written exercise with singular prompts as opposed to elaborate narratives and imagined rather than real interlocutors.

5.4 Meghan

This section pairs the sociopragmatic features used with three levels of local contexts. The first is that of the stories as a whole, and the second is by episode within each narratives. Episode shifts are marked by change in character, setting (time of place) or pragmatic function. Finally, the narrator perspective is considered.

Table 5.4a Summary of Meghan’s repertoire between narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Narrative</th>
<th>Narr 1</th>
<th>Narr 2</th>
<th>Narr 3</th>
<th>Narr 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colocatrice</td>
<td>Premier voyage</td>
<td>Vaux-le-vice</td>
<td>Une Amende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-pragmatic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. Pn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation : <em>est-ce que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced written discourse features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1 Repertoire between narratives

As seen here in Table 5.4a, the narrative *Amende* has the highest prevalence of written discourse features and the least of oral discourse features. The oral discourse features used (fragments and contextual antecedents) mark only narrative cohesion, and not sociopragmatic positioning. This is also the only narrative where the *vous* address form, *future simple* and interrogation `with inversion is used. Two contextual factors set this narrative apart from the others: it took place originally in English; and Meghan was a minor interacting with her parents, a
police officer and a teacher. The formality of conventions may be accounted for because of the experiential translation, or because of the social relationships and situation represented.

The narrative *Vaux-le-vicomte* also shows a higher degree of formality in lexical and syntax choice compared to the remaining two narratives. This story, originally in French, includes a complex, and unsuccessful, service encounter, which is presented through clear, explicit syntax.

Both *Colocatrice* and *Premier voyage* revolve around interactions with near-peers. The stories appropriately include marked oral features such as pronoun pre-positioning and dislocation even though it is unlikely that Meghan used such features at the early point in her French history that these stories represent.

The following three sections consider repertoire features used against more specific contextual aspects within episodes.

### 5.4.2 Sociopragmatic repertoire within narrative episodes

Meghan uses common sociolinguistic variants as expected: varying forms in the oral medium and to reflect relationships between interlocutors. For address pronouns, Meghan uses *tu* and *vous* in reported speech, and varies the forms appropriately to reflect the relationship between speaker and addressee. The informal *tu* is used to represent two relationships in direct reported speech. Once is in *Vaux-le-Vicomte* where the taxi driver and his wife are talking to each other, and the second situation is in *Amende* where Meghan’s parents are talking to her over the phone. The *vous* form is used twice in *Amende* in direct reported speech: once where Meghan is explaining the situation to her teacher, and once again when her parents are chastising her for getting a speeding ticket. These reported incidences of *vous* were in an English-language context. Meghan additionally uses *tu* with the interviewer, Sabine, whom she knew socially.
An inconsistency is that Meghan employs *tu* and *vous* in the same utterance where her parents are talking to her on the phone.

*ils ont dit rentrez a la maison tout de suite, tu te debrouilleras,*  
*they said [you-v]come to the house right away, you[-t]'ll work it out*  

Either form could be justified in this situation, given that parents most often use *tu* with their children but she was in trouble. There is no clear flag to explain the switch between the two, other than that it was an intense emotional event which could provoke disfluency.

Meghan consistently uses the *on* pronoun to refer to her co-participants: from high school classmates to her apartment-mate; from her host family to colleagues. That *nous* is not used as a stand-alone subject pronoun may be explained by the lack of reference with more formal counterparts. It also may reflect an indiscriminate propensity to use oral features, although this rationale is less fitting with the overall profile of Meghan’s repertoire. More likely is that the collective *on* obscures individual action and responsibility. The *ne* particle is omitted consistently through the narratives.

*Advanced oral features within narrative episodes*

For interrogatives, Meghan uses the *est-ce que* formation in two of the narratives. In *Colocatrice*, she uses it to prompt her memory, asking herself a question. In *Vaux-le-vicomte* she uses it in indirect reported speech recalling a question she asked the taxi driver.

For subject doubling, the construction *nous on* is employed when Meghan is referring to herself and a friend in Limoges, and to herself and colleagues in *Vaux-le-vicomte*. She uses *moi-je* frequently in her personal language history, but not in the narratives. While she begins utterances with the *je* in *Colocatrice* and *Amende*, most uses of *je* are part of the formulaic expressions *je sais pas*, or *je je pense*. For personal narratives, there are remarkably few utterances where she presents
herself as the actor *je*. More predominantly the first-person references are entwined in the collective, or effacing, *on*.

There is a singular example of juxtaposition in *Colocataire*, where she appends a phrase at the end of an utterance for emphasis. Meghan consistently uses contextual antecedents to introduce characters and places within a story, for example with the apartment and a landlord in *Colocatrice*. This indicates efforts at intersubjectivity with her interviewer. In a similar strategy, Meghan repeatedly opens and closes segments with parataxis. The first is to establish and clarify information through co-construction with the interviewer. The second is to invoke unuttered predicates that the speaker was to infer from the narrative. In the excerpt here, Meghan concludes with juxtaposed unit (*les infos a la radio*) that refers back to the original topic (*on ecoutait la radio*)

M : on faisait des petits trucs ensemble, on faisait à manger chaque soir, on parlait français, on écoutait la radio, on est allées au marché. J’avais-
S : vous écoutiez la radio ?
…
M : il y avait un petit poste dans l’apartement mais donc on pouvait mettre des cd, elle a apporté des cd de chez elle et finalement j’ai commencé à en acheter, mais les infos à la radio :

*I had –
S: you listened to the radio?
…
M: there was a little player in the apartment but so we could put on cd’s, she bought some cd’s from home and finally I started to buy some, but the news on the radio:

Meghan, 3.2.3.2-3

Overall, the oral features are used sparingly, and most likely provoked in the few instances of reported speech and when establishing intersubjectivity with her interviewer, rather than through narrative sequencing.
Advanced written discourse features within episodes

The *ne* particle is retained in two instances. The first is when she is describing her parents’ reaction to the *Amende*, and the second while explaining why it was so hard to find a taxi at *Vaux-le-vicomte*. The first represents a formal situation, and the second a complication with a service interaction.

There is an example of inversion question formation in a rhetorical word search (*Comment dit-on?*) in *Amende*, where she is asking herself how to say “speeding ticket”. The sole example of *futur simple* is in directed reported speech where her parents are talking to her on the phone. This is combined with the *vous* address form earlier in the utterance, but she switches to *tu* for the future form.

Discourse-level oral conventions were used in opening and closing sections of the narratives, where Meghan was establishing and clarifying information with her interviewer. Within the body of the narratives, as a participant or an observer, Meghan did not evoke particular subsets of repertoire.

Contextualized DCT responses

Repertoire features used in responses to the DCT prompts divided by context are shown in Table 4.4h. The strongest concentrations of socio-pragmatic and oral discourse features are in the responses to Polite and Informal prompts, with a slightly more narrow range of repertoire in the Informal responses. Written discourse features are more robustly used in responses to the Polite and Formal prompts than in the Casual and Polite responses.

*Table 5.4b: Contextualized DCT repertoire by register*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Register</th>
<th>Formal (3 prompts)</th>
<th>Polite (8 prompts)</th>
<th>Casual (5 prompts)</th>
<th>Informal (4 prompts)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-pragmatic features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>tu</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form: <em>vous</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous subject <em>pn</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On as Nous sub. <em>pn</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne deletion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance/Expert Oral discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/R dislocation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic fragments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization of <em>que</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial/informal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject doubling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur proche</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: intonation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: est-ce <em>que</em></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced written discourse features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal lexical choice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur simple</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation: inversion</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne retention</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the lack of written discourse features in Informal contexts, and likewise for oral register socio-pragmatic and discourse features in Formal contexts.

*Subsets of Repertoire*

The contextual picture is not complete without consideration of how the contextually-sensitive use of a feature compares to that of its alternative form(s). There are in fact at least three
choices: variant style \( A \), variant style \( B \), and the null or alternative choice. The third option is particularly interesting to cognitive and socio-linguistic perspectives because these alternatives necessarily change the positioning of the participants and shift the degree of responsibility and social implication.

**Interrogatives:** There are few interrogatives overall, but a preference for the *est-ce que* construction in narratives. The sole example of inversion is a formulaic question. Passages of indirect reported speech which recount questions were used in *Vaux-le-vicomte* and the scenario with the belligerent taxi driver.

**Futur simple/Futur proche:** The singular use of a future tense in the narratives (simple, in a formal interaction) suggests no schema. The DCT, however, has additional examples, including one where both the immediate and simple futures are used in the same imagined utterance to a friend:

\[
\text{Tu vas me manquer, tu sais … enfin c’est pas comme si on ne se reverrait jamais et en tout cas on va garder le contact ! Tu as déjà vu ma page sur Facebook [etc]…} \\
\text{I’ll miss you, you know. Well, it’s not like we will not see each other ever again and in any case we’ll stay in touch! You already saw my Facebook page [etc] …} \\
\text{Meghan, DCT1}
\]

These three examples align with Gadet’s interpretation of using the immediate future for more probable future events (I’ll miss you and we’ll stay in touch) versus the simple for hypothetical (we won’t not see each other).

There were more frequent occurrences of future and question forms in the DCT prompts, likely because they were necessarily imagined reported speech while she had only three brief instances of reported speech in the narratives.
**Hypotaxis/Prarataxis/Juxtaposition:** Meghan limits the use of parataxis and juxtaposition to the opening moves of a narrative when setting the scene with the interviewer. The bodies of the narratives rely on hypotaxis for internal cohesion.

**Address forms/subject pronouns:** As discussed above, Meghan varies forms based on relationship and context. There is a predominance of *on* over both *nous* and *je*. The inconsistency between *tu* and *vous* represents a moment of disfluency, but it also shows an awareness of multiple interpretations of the same situation as either would have been justifiable.

**The ne particle:** The ne particle is omitted throughout, and retained in formal and formulaic utterances.

**Summary of Meghan’s contextualized features**

Meghan’s repertoire is consistent with that of an advanced learner of French, and exhibits awareness of expert oral conventions, if not reticence to widely use them. Her narratives show that she uses fewer advanced oral conventions when recounting events that originally took place in English, and that more formal participants in her stories provoke more formal conventions.

There are relatively few examples of reported speech. While this accounts for few uses of interrogative and future constructions, it also maintains Meghan in a narrator-participant role, rather than switching perspectives to narrator-observer. While there were no other observable differences between these role shifts from participant to observer, there were shifts, however into the narrator role. Warm-up and wind-down sections establishing the background and implications of a story included more oral conventions and co-constructed intersubjectivity. Responses from the Discourse Completion Task were complementary to the narrative repertoire.
5.5 Summary

This chapter presents three distinct realizations of advanced oral French repertoire. All three participants vary repertoire to match changes in context or co-participants. Hannah and Mark both rely significantly on oral discourse features to structure their narratives and play with repertoire subsets in realizing different participants in reported speech. Hannah additionally shifts her participation in the narratives to mark changes in tone and register. Meghan, in contrast, while exhibiting at least in token instances a full range of repertoire, uses a much narrower range most consistently as a narrator. Within her narratives she rarely shifts to an observer or invokes participants in reported speech. For his part, Mark relies on intersubjective strategies to move his narratives forward.

All three use written discourse features in establishing the background of narratives. Meghan, however, relies extensively on hypotaxis and third person narration while Mark and Hannah use reported speech of participants to open up register options.

Contextualized repertoire reveals differences in the speakers’ relationships with varying contexts, both aspects of people and settings. In Vaux le Vicomte, Meghan recuses herself of responsibility by hiding in the subject on, shifting from inclusive to exclusive as the trouble begins in the story. Hannah enables herself to display the accomplished academic French in her narration and to perform a colloquial self meta-commentary. Mark’s narratives evince integrity of identity, in the singular positioning of self against challenges.

Chapter 6, Repertoire and Identity, will investigate how these repertoire shifts constitute discursive instantiations of second language identity.
Chapter 6
Identity and Repertoire

6.1 Introduction

Having presented overall and contextualized repertoire in the previous two chapters, this chapter concludes the case studies with an examination of the relationship between the realization of second language repertoire and language history, motivation and objectives. The findings reported here support the argument of this project that second language identity can be evinced in agentive discursive choices by advanced learners. To address the question of second language repertoire and identity, information from the language history, findings on contextualized repertoire, and perspectives represented in the metalinguistic interview are drawn together.

The aim is to establish connections between the historical experiences of language learning, the local contexts of the narratives, and the learner’s perception of what language performance should be on actual language choices. For this study, these connections, as evinced in consistent, purposeful language choices, constitute agentive identity construction. To this end, this section first reprises the identity framework elaborated in Chapter 1. Following this, the case studies continue with summaries findings from Chapters 4 and 5 on contextual repertoire and motivation and access from the language history. Next, perspectives on second language proficiency and performance shared in the metalinguistic interviews are presented. Finally, the three strands are brought together as examples from section 4.6 (Contextualized Repertoire) in light of the historical and situationally local contexts.

6.1.1 Second language identity framework

While the contextualized repertoire analysis establishes a link between local contexts within the narratives and language choices, examining identity provides the underlying rationale
for such choices. From a sociocultural perspective, language experiences beget language resources through internalization. These resources are not merely lexical items, but indexed exemplars of time, person, and place. Instantiation of identity is thus at the nexus of historical and local contexts, where presentation of self, such as through narrative performance, represents a tension of social constraints at the time of learning and those at the time of use.

This interpretation is supported by both cognitive and second language sociolinguistics. To the first, language variation (formal variation) may be due to shifts in speaker or situation (situational variation) or concept, theme or topic (conceptual variation). While the speaker remains the same physical being throughout narration, she takes on different character roles and invokes different local contexts. Highly stylized speech as identified in advanced second language speakers, heretofore considered individual variation, may thus be attributed to the contextual ground, which is not only the immediate speaker-situation link, but also the deep background of language experiences.

This mapping of form-concept-speaker/situation overlays with Tarone’s (2007) interpretation that individual sociolinguistic variation is the revoicing of experiential exemplars. Each language instance is indexed with referents to speaker, time, place, and use; none of which can be separated from the lexical item. A second language speaker is choosing a particular indexed position and revoicing (selecting from her repertoire) the sequence that will best convey this intent.

The following sections explore the historical context which may inform indexical choices of contextualized variation by advanced L2 French speakers in narrative performance

6.2 Hannah

*Repertoire:* This study considers Hannah’s repertoire from several perspectives: overall, within narrative contexts, and by narrator role. As summarized by the overall features shown in
Tables 3.5 and 3.6, Hannah’s repertoire matches that of an advanced L2 French speaker’s socolinguistic features (Dewaele, 2006), and an expert French speaker’s sociolinguistic and lexical features (Gadet, 2003), and an advanced L2 speaker’s semantic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competencies (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). On all levels, Hannah’s repertoire generally well represents features one would expect in advanced second language French for both Type 1 and Type 2 sociolinguistic variation, which are the presence (or absence) and usage patterns of features relative to those of native speakers (Mougeon et al. 2004). For this study, these include not only traditional sociolinguistic features such as address forms (tu/vous), but also expanded categories in syntax (question formation), and pragmatics (intersubjective discourse strategies). There were two features not represented in Hannah’s overall repertoire: the nous subject pronoun and overgeneralization of the relative pronoun que in subordination.

In usage, Hannah has an overall style in speaking L2 French. This style aligns with what has been described in other studies of advanced speakers where certain features have been acquired but the usage thereof eludes systematic categorization (e.g. Dewaele, 2007; Sax, 2003). While her repertoire is representative of an advanced speaker, Hannah relies more heavily on written discursive strategies that create cohesion than oral discursive strategies that forge intersubjectivity and co-construction. As both categories represent a certain “display” of L2 French, Hannah’s narratives profile book-learned French more than the street-acquired variety.

A more refined look at how the contexts within the narratives pair with the use of features suggests that style is more systematic, if not agentive, than has been previously thought. The overall repertoire shows that Hannah has sociopragmatic options. Subsets of repertoire emerge through several contextual cross-sections, showing that Hannah is pairing certain features with specific sociocultural constraints. Considering her repertoire between entire narratives, those that
took place in France in French provoked a broader range or oral and written discourse features overall. Considering context by episodes within each narrative reveals that Hannah’s relationship to an individual is the most prominent contextual factor that determines her choice of features in reported speech.

Throughout the narratives, Hannah herself has three different voices, as defined by her role and perspective at the time. First is her as a participant, second is her as the objective narrator (describing background, for example), and the final is a category that emerged in the analysis, as a subjective meta-commentator. These voices also allow distinct repertoire profiles to emerge. The most colloquial language features are most prominent in Hannah’s meta-narrative commentary. Her participant voice, found in reported speech, is modulated in part by her relationship to her interlocutor, but nonetheless overall is more formal and refined than the other two roles. This voice also includes pronoun pre-positioning. As an objective narrator, Hannah is most likely to use oral discourse conventions such as fragments, pre-positioning of pronouns and dislocation.

Language History: Experiences in Hannah’s language history and her reflections on such indicate a high degree of initiative in pursuing opportunities to learn and practice. While living in Strasbourg, she often used German on trips across the French-German border. Hannah also has a consistent history of blended foreign language experiences whereby she would be mediating a foreign language through another foreign language (LXa:LXb), not just through her first language English (L1:LX).

Perspectives on and Positioning in the French language: Hannah takes two distinct, polar stances of linguistic and social agency in her narratives. The first is an active stance of linguistic agency, where Hannah is a linguistically and culturally savvy speaker who is aware of expected norms and the impact of unexpectedly violating them. She talks about her actions and language
choices and their impact on or role in a particular scene. Hannah switches perspectives in moments of cultural inconvenience or linguistic criticism, portraying herself as the recipient of circumstance rather than the agentive force bringing out the situation.

*Linguistic agency:* Hannah describes French in utilitarian and objective terms. Her academic identity is as a phonologist, and to her French is her first phonological love. She posits the French language as a “tool”, but one to which she is particularly “attached”, describing how she appreciates what it has afforded her professionally, but also the experiences and relationships it has allowed her to have.

In spite of the fact that Hannah began studying French at the university level she says she felt she “owned” the French language about halfway through her study abroad semester. This is the same stay during which she had a difficult relationship with her host family. In a narrative that took place during this time, Hannah writes that at the outset she and her peers knew how to speak French but not necessarily in the most appropriate way.

> on on savait parler le français mais pas vraiment dans le bon contexte.

> *we we knew how to speak French but not really in the right context.*

A08.2.5.4

In a later segment, Hannah recounts the initial face-to-face meeting with the host father. She uses direct reported speech to quote him using *vous* to address her. She then says,

> il utilisait le vous mais je dis okay bon ça commence bien

> *he was using vous but I say okay good it’s beginning well*
These two comments show that from the outset of her time abroad she was listening critically and aware of register.

**Social agency:** As noted in Hannah’s linguistic narrative, she exhibited a great deal of agency in learning French (as well as other subsequent foreign languages), not just in classroom experiences, but in forging relationships and in pursuing language immersion experiences. Nevertheless, she often positions herself as a subject of circumstance. It is a contradiction that Hannah claims to have come to “own” the French language during the semester abroad, but did not “own” the experiences of it. From the program administration to the host Family to the ethos of French being, Hannah places herself in narratives from this time period as one whose experiences were chosen for and happen to her. This is in contrast to experiences from her stay as a teaching assistant, where Hannah clearly places herself in an action role where she creates and pursues experiences. In this passage, Hannah describes arriving to a meeting the first morning of classes in Paris (emphasis added):

> et j’arrive très en retard, mais ça allait **parce que c’était le but que que on soit en retard**. Ils ont fait ça exprès, je devais changer trois fois et puis tout le monde est en retard puis euh je suis là dix heures, toujours pas arrivée, puis je suis là ahh tout – je vois il y a des personnes dans la dans la rue qui regardent, ils ils ils posent des questions à des personnes <où se trouve le bâtiment>, je fais ey ouais je te connais, donc on est arrivé ensemble **mais c’était vraiment pour ça ils ont fait ça exprès, comme tout dans ce programme**

*and I get there very late, but it was okay because it was the goal that we be late. They did that on purpose, I had to change [subway stops] three times and then everyone is late then um I am there ten o’clock, not yet arrived, then I am there, ahh all - I see there are*
In the situation, Hannah and her classmates, newly arrived in Paris, are struggling to navigate transportation and orientation. She pins the difficulties on how the administration structured the situation, rather than on language difficulties that come with intermediate proficiency (as she presumably had after only two years of undergraduate study) in the period of cultural acclimation. This pattern repeats itself in several situations with the host family and in service encounters.

Identity and Repertoire

In addition to the repertoire profile Hannah presents across her narratives, evidence of L2 Identity is found in three agentive aspects of Hannah’s narratives: positioning of self; multiplicity of voice; and metalinguistic commentary. Hannah sees herself foremost as an accomplished colloquial speaker for social means. She has a familiar speaking repertoire replete with discourse markers and oral syntax. Yet, she also mentions in her interviews her linguistic academic credentials and meta-knowledge of the French language. In her narratives, she manages to perform both roles. The first is most prominently shown in meta-commentary, or the equivalent of an internal dialogue. The second is seen in self-reported speech and the overall eloquent narrative syntax.

In Hannah’s narratives there is clear evidence of several character repertoires, including Hannah’s multiple voices and those of her participants in the stories. Her range of repertoire and
its realization is impacted by several disempowering relationships she had, in particular early on with her host family. In contrast to later relationships forged as a social equal or knowledgeable colleague, the relationship with her host family was disinterested and awkward. This likely links Hannah’s self-perception of colloquial with the actual restraint shown in the majority of her narratives.

6.3 Mark

*Repertoire:* As established in the previous two chapters, as an advanced learner of French, Mark has acquired the range of a sociopragmatic and discursive repertoire similar to that of an expert French speaker. He uses sociolinguistic features as situationally appropriate. In narration, he relies on oral discourse strategies that are preferred, marked and intersubjective. These show that Mark is cognizant of co-construction of oral discourse. Written discourse strategies, long privileged in L2 French classes as markers of advancedness, are overly explicit to account for the absence of the speaker (or writer) to explain himself, and not necessarily expert-like in actual oral discourse. Mark uses these as one would expect to elaborate scenes more removed from the immediate story line or interaction with the interviewer. Throughout the narratives, Mark clearly favors oral discourse strategies at the expense of written ones, although does use certain features deliberately for emphasis, and again to match the register indicated by the relationship between interlocutors, or to elaborate certain scenarios.

*Language History:* By the time of the study, French study had been a part of Mark’s life for over 17 years. He began studying French, motivated by the opportunity to travel to France and to communicate in French. He continued through undergraduate and graduate studies, as well as two working sojourns and additional research trips to France. With each experience, there was an
ever-increasing degree of interaction through access, as well as agency in seeking out communicative opportunities through relationships. He fostered long-term relationships with people, visiting and corresponding with them when possible. These specifically include American and international friends who studied abroad with him, a sponsor family from his undergraduate time in Caen, and colleagues and friends from his two years as an English language instructor.

*Perspectives on and Positioning in the French language*: Questions in the metalinguistic interview focused on Mark’s relationship with the French language. Mark’s responses reveal that part of why French grew to have a primary role in his life is simply because he is good at it and makes him happy. As he discusses here in Excerpt A, the competence he enjoys in the language has afforded relationships and experiences, and using the French language therefore invokes said happy memories of places and people.

*Q: Describe your relationship with the French language*

*R: I guess I joke it’s like one of the few things I think I’m good at? So, it’s kind of very much I wouldn’t say it’s you know hugely linked to my identity, but it’s definitely a part of who I am. Umm it’s something that makes me happy, it’s something I enjoy, you know. … and it also just brings back memories as well for me because it you know it’s obviously linked to my experiences in France and the people I’ve met and- jokes and music and all that kind of stuff so you know I- it is something that really really makes me happy.*

Mark, 07fin, excerpt A
Mark continues to describe his on-going endeavor with French language learning. He finds that there is a duality of challenge and frustration because language itself changes in everyday use, and because it is embedded in cultural practices which also change.

Sometimes people make the analogy that learning languages is like math because … but I think it’s infinitely more complicated because there are so many ways you are able to say things, and it’s also a challenge, you know I always say it makes me happy but it’s also a challenge you know because language isn’t static it’s always changing and you know sometimes I get this – it’s frustrating as well I guess because sometimes I get this xx you know I’ve been studying it for so long and yet I’m still making mistakes or there’s always something more to learn, or you know French cultures changing and it’s not just French culture but you know other places where it’s spoken you Québec and stuff like that, like there’s always something new to learn, to read, and so sometimes it’s actually kind of frustrating.

Mark, 07fin, Excerpt B

Mark’s journey with the French language, however, has not been all “roses”. He had several narratives where he encountered frustrating if not difficult situations in France. These include the broken camera and glasses in Appareil-photo and being stranded at Bayeux in Promenade from this analysis, as well as a car accident in a rental car. In his stories, Mark portrays himself and his friends as débrouillards, full of linguistic and cultural resourcefulness to disentangle themselves. When questioned on this ever-positive and successful attitude, Mark responded that to an extent he had expected challenges. He continues that these are in part
universals of second language learning, and in part unique to expectations of the French and how they interact with less-than-proficient foreigners.

Well, no, I’ve had a couple really negative experiences, and I’m not saying when I was in France everything was rosy, either, there were, and I think this is true for anyone who’s learning another language, I don’t know I’m just privileging the French, but I just had this idea that everybody who’s studied abroad in France kind of had the same experiences because the French are so ready to critique, and you know it’s because I understand now, you know at first it’s scary as an American, especially from the Midwest, you know you don’t ever critique anybody and everything’s rosy, xx there’s perfect strangers on the street who’re going to tell you you’re speaking wrong, you’re ordering a sandwich and they’re like non, c’est pas UNE sandwich, c’est UN sandwich, you know it’s that stuff and it’s like it takes you back because you’re not expecting stuff like that.

Mark, 07fin, Excerpt C

From here, Mark goes on to tell another story of trying to resolve a dispute with the French telephone company during his undergraduate study abroad. He makes several calls trying to get an explanation for extra charges, when he eventually ends up speaking to a company representative who is less than helpful. In Excerpt D, Mark describes how he decides to acknowledge that perhaps the difficulty is due to his language competence, expecting that this would mitigate frustrations. Rather than diffuse the tension, the French representative only confirms Mark’s amateur competence, still refusing to be more helpful.
it was like okay I’m not being able to make myself ex- understood, so actually do the humble thing and be like I’m sorry sir I’m not French I know I’m having a hard time making myself understood, you know I’m not you know French isn’t my first language and he’s like right off the bat well I can tell that, it was so unbelievably rude that I finally was like, can I please talk to somebody else because you’re not going to help me.

Mark, 07fin, Excerpt D

Mark’s actions here highlight his degree of persistence and resourcefulness in interacting with people. It also shows how his expectations of language learning motivate him to take a cooperative and problem-solving stance.

To summarize, in his view, Mark’s overall relationship with the French language is a positive one, largely due to his achieved competence with the language. He derives happiness from the French language, thanks to the people, the experiences, and the satisfaction of embracing challenges. He also finds it somewhat frustrating to keep up with as it changes over time. The next section will tie together Mark’s L2A perspectives with his L2A history and narrative performance to show how these realize Mark’s French language identity.

Identity and Repertoire

This section connects Mark’s narrative performance with his intended representation of self and language competence, and then grounds these in experiences from his language history.

Drawing together Mark’s language history and metalinguistic interview, Mark has had rich, meaningful experiences with French people, which he credits to language competence. There is also a parallel between the degree of engagement he had during various sojourns and his attitude
and expectations for these experiences. Mark expected some challenges, culturally and linguistically, and did not let those he encountered discourage him to the point of defeat. Rather, he embraces the challenge of connecting with people to resolve an issue, just as he embraces the frustrating challenge of keeping current with French language and cultural practices.

Mark is not merely self-aggrandizing when portraying himself as resourceful in difficult situations; he sincerely considers it his responsibility to try to the best of his ability to make himself understood in a culturally respectful way, all in personal, professional and service situations. For him, “good” French should reflect linguistic and cultural knowledge and honor relationships.

Mark’s actual language performance in the narratives shows an integrity of self, from actual interactions with the interviewer, to reported interactions with friends, to his narrative voice. That he is deferential based on the relationship with a particular individual echoes not only sociolinguistic competence but Mark’s perception of good French. This is also reinforced in situations where he specifically addresses the interviewer in utterances that involve a jump in register, acknowledging that it is a language choice of the situation in the narrative and not of his relationship with her.

6.4 Meghan

*Repertoire:* As with Hannah and Mark, Meghan’s repertoire is representative of an advanced learner in expected ways. She performs a full range of repertoire in all categories, and the overall patterns of use for these features conform generally to expected contexts, with the occasional mismatch. Her use of repertoire is the most superficially consistent across narratives: she relies most heavily on the narrowest range of features. She performs a full range of sociopragmatic and
oral discourse features, although she uses the latter sparingly. With token examples of oral
discourse features, she relies instead on those predominantly reserved for written discourse to
maintain explicit internal, rather than co-constructed, cohesion. Her narratives are compact and
webbed with relatives, rather than linear with juxtaposition, paratactic interjections, and
dislocation for clarification and emphasis.

Language History: Meghan noted in the interviews that she had been with the French
language longer than she had been without it. The long relationship was continued following a
series of default decisions to continue with what she knew rather than move on to something
new, from middle to high school, and from undergraduate to two graduate study programs. There
was no particular driving force until just before the interviews took place, when a goal coalesced
for her and she acknowledged finally having a determining purpose for language study and use.
She maintained no long-term relationships other than occasional contact with her first host
family, thanks to holiday cards exchanged by the parents. In her *resumen* of French in her life,
she repeatedly acknowledges that the dropped contact was her responsibility and that she could
have or should have made an effort or looked someone up on Facebook, for example.

Perspectives on and Positioning in the French language: Meghan professes to most enjoy
the ability to express herself in French. It becomes clear that this is an aesthetic of expression, not
a communicative function. She first says that her relationship with the French language is

Long hehehe and torturous. No. I wouldn’t say I’m in love with the French
language, but I really like it and I like being able to express myself in both.

Meghan, 5.1.1

She continues to say that the process of learning for her has been very “organic” and mainly by
“absorbing” from reading and listening in French, from being in France, and from courses where
the emphasis was more on global production than accuracy. Yet, when asked to what extent she owns French, the response reveals a strong value for accuracy and the ability to convey her underlying education in French:

pretty well, […] but as far as speaking, what’s difficult for me is that I feel like in situations where it’s most important to express myself correctly, nerves still make me make more mistakes, and that’s just really frustrating for me, to xx like a situation like that where it’s not just important to get a message across but it’s important to sound educated hehe you know that that’s when I’m most likely to mix up genders and and make stupid you know like just little mistakes that are annoying

Meghan, 5.3.1

Another part of the interview exemplifies the value for correctness:

sometimes though if I’m unsure of a noun gender if I’m being lazy I’ll just Google it and you know in quotation marks le whatever and la whatever and just see which gets more hits, which is terrible, but it it’s always kind of reassuring that it’s like okay so maybe the correct answer gets four million hits, but there’s still like eighty-eight thousand people who get it wrong hehehah

Meghan, 5.1.6
The terms “lazy” and “terrible” here reveal her strong value for hard work in French study. Her value of accuracy is underscored by the entire anecdote, which centers on noun gender. While this is a grammar feature that is one or the other, it comes with low salience and comprehension valence. It is an error that, if made, is unlikely to deter comprehension. Yet, for her it distinctly falls into the category of frustrating and stupid mistakes.

In discussing her own style, she differentiates between being colloquial, which she believes to have fairly well accomplished through imitation, and what are limits for non-native speakers. She then recounts a story where her host family reviewed offensive swear words with her. Several weeks later she tried out *chiant* at the dinner table only to discover she had crossed a line. She continues to say that there are norms for non-native speakers and that, for her, a second language self approximates that of her first language self. For Meghan, however, her French self is largely professional, which frames much of her language use.

Thus, the metalinguistic interview confirms what Meghan says in the content of her narratives and what she reveals in her language history: that she enjoys the cultural affordances of the French language, and the language play of expression, but that the linguistic performance is just that: performative language play rather than for social communication.

**Identity and Repertoire**

While Meghan’s efforts at linguistic mastery are for different ends than the more overtly social ones of Hannah and Mark, her linguistic identity is no less distinct or intentional. She appreciates oral fluency and proficiency, more to the extent that it gives her academic credibility than in how it allows for social relationships. Thus, her discursive choices mark and meet her professional purposes with the language.
Meghan repeatedly refers to several strategies for learning French on the ground, either in passing in the narratives or explicitly in the interviews. These include observing, listing, imitating, and reading, which she says lead to just absorbing the language, a term she uses several times. The passive promise of absorbing is beyond the scope of this study, but Meghan’s repertoire nonetheless shows features that are shown to have been learned almost exclusively through ethnographic efforts in study abroad (sociopragmatic features) as well as those distinct to oral native speaker French (marked oral discourse features).

Her choice to position herself as an academic researcher, namely in her two most recent trips to France, likely shades the low proportion with which she uses marked oral conventions. Even though Meghan sees her French language self as a fair equivalent of her English language self, her French self acts almost exclusively in professional contexts. This certainly marks limits of register appropriate for much of her French language use. Further, the narratives are densely structured with written discourse features, where complex relatives link ideas and pieces rather than the linear syntax more common of spontaneous speech.

Meghan is perhaps wise to say she likes expressing herself in French, rather than communicating, as that is clearly a more appropriate term. Meghan’s narratives illustrate an awareness of a full range of sociopragmatic and advanced oral syntax features, but chooses those that represent her in a professional tone.

6.5 Summary

The final sections of the case study here present evidence for discursive instantiation of identity in narratives. Three participants have evinced that their realization of discursive features are commensurate with primary and secondary agenda for representation of self. These identity
agendae have been shown to be the product of a learner’s social and historical circumstances, as well as the immediate circumstances of the narrative. Influencing factors include relationships, study opportunities, and cultural experiences. Two of the participants, Meghan and Hannah, additionally used position to remove themselves from responsibility in linguistic and cultural breakdown.

The realization of repertoire in the narratives shows not just knowledge of and facility with lexical and syntax forms. More complex, the speakers are orchestrating subsets of repertoire to give voice to different positions and persona. Each participant had a voice, or several, that are distinct to themselves and from their other characters. This shows that advanced language learners do in fact manipulate repertoire in ways similar to bilinguals.
Chapter 7

Discussion

7.1 Summary of study objectives and findings

7.1.1 Theoretical ground

Confounded by the attribution of otherwise inexplicable variation in L2 French sociolinguistic studies to *stylistic choice*, this study set out to examine narrative performance of very advanced L2 French learners. Grounding notions of L2 development and competence in cognitive sociolinguistics and sociocultural theory, the analysis brings together the historical development of L2 resources and realized language repertoire within personal narratives of three very advanced L2 French speakers. Cognitive sociolinguistics advocates mutually reconsidering social variation from a perspective of cognitive schematization, and expanding interpretations of cognitive schema (historically formed) to include social indexicals (Geeaerts et al. 2010). Within sociocultural theory, (mediated) experiences foster development (of language resources) (Wertsch 2007), which is evinced in sustained performance as competence moves from relying on explicit mediation to agentively, implicitly, mediating subsequent experience.

Second language identity involves not just the social profile of the learner, but his position within the L2 community, whether a pedagogical, social, or professional context. Norton (2001; 2013) advocates evaluating the role of the individual within the environment. She terms this dialectal investment, because the metaphor accounts for both the learner contributions and contextual constrains of the learning and use situation. More broadly, Bucholtz & Hall (2004) elaborate a framework for identity analysis that includes ideological, indexical, performance and practice planes of influence. In this model, a momentary instantiation of language performance
cannot be separated from greater spheres of indexical referents (direct or semiotic), norms of practice, and socio-political forces.

That identity is the positioning of self in a given socio-cultural discursive moment dovetails with the developmental perspective of sociocultural theory and schematization of cognitive sociolinguistics. The language resources a learner uses represent at once the social and historical context of development, as well as the immediate, local positioning within the discourse. Identity can then be accessed through contextualized discourse analysis triangulated with language histories and development.

### 7.1.2 The advanced learner: definitions and competences

The advanced learner has been characterized in disparate terms with disparate competencies across literature. Four common evaluations, neither mutually exclusive nor necessarily complementary, are: institutional status (placement of progress within a program); standardized test forms; acquisition of late-acquired features; or sophisticated language (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). For the L2 French learner, each category presents its own conundrum at odds with actual L2 performance. Learners may move in to “advanced” coursework fairly early in a sequence, and graduate-level curricula presume advancedness, rarely offering coursework to target language development, only applications in literature, civilization or eponymous conversation courses. An acquisitional model of L2 French, based on analysis of oral L2 French corpora, dedicates three of six levels to advancedness, suggesting that advancedness is the midpoint of L2 development (Bartning & Schlyter 2004). Yet, when revisiting this model, Bartning (2008) found a notable discrepancy between the “high advanced” learner and near-native speakers. Likewise, ACTFL recently added a distinguished level to top off its scale.
Recent studies show that late-acquired features may be acquired early on, especially so when pedagogically targeted (vanCompernolle 2012). At the same time, use of what is perceived to be sophisticated language may wane with advanced L2 development (Dewaele 2002).

From narrative and sociopragmatic competences, to scores on standardized tests, the notion of advanced competence is ripe for reconsideration, both in second language performance and the native-speaker benchmark it so often compared to. Advanced is clearly mid-state on the continuum of development, no longer a pedagogically-targeted endpoint of vocabulary and grammar. Additionally, the composition of advanced repertoire needs to be re-evaluated in light of current appreciation of actual oral practices and performance of the advanced L2 learner, specifically at the very advanced to near-native level.

A more cohesive understanding of L2 oral French repertoire, as it aligns with actual oral performance of L1 French speakers and grounded in a socio-cognitive understanding of language development, may better advance L2 French advancedness. Studies by Gadet (2003) and Blanche-Benveniste (2007) offer new descriptions of spoken French as it is used in everyday contexts. They reveal features that are historically thought to be stigmatized as, in fact, mundane and integral to French oral communication. These features, often untaught, are at the crux of a nascent line of inquiry to the very advanced to near-native speaker of L2 French. Bartning and her colleagues have now targeted discursive and narrative competences as markers of the next triad of advanced levels (2009). Donaldson (2011a; 2011b; 2008) has likewise begun to explore Type 1 variation of pragmatic-syntactic features such as dislocation and interrogatives in the near-native L2 French speaker.

The present study argues that for the advanced L2 speaker, identity should be reflected through sophisticated manipulation of repertoire, reflecting both knowledge of practice norms
and implicit positioning of self among other contextual factors. Thus, an advanced L2 French speaker would perform repertoire that represents the range of L1 French oral discourse strategies available, and do so by orchestrating suites of repertoire within utterances for convey stance of self.

7.1.3 Summary of Findings

There were three lines of inquiry in this study. The first expanded previous considerations of advanced L2 French repertoire to include oral discourse strategies as described by recent accounts of everyday oral French language (such as dislocation, parataxis, and overgeneralization of *que* as a relative pronoun). Findings include that the three advanced learners performed most of the formal discourse and sociopragmatic features. Performance of oral discourse strategies, however, was sporadic and sparse for two of the participants and only slightly more robust for the third.

The second stage of analysis evaluated the use of discourse strategies through context, including co-participants, setting, original language of the narrated event, and speaker role. Results included that there was some affinity for marked oral features to contexts relevant to a francophone experience. Speakers used voices of others, whether through reported speech, or in multiple layers of their own voice, to convey different degrees of formality and proximity. Each participant had an individual voice marked by different composition of features.

Finally, the analysis considered the link between the realization of advanced L2 repertoire and identity. Connection between early relationships in study abroad may be particularly formative, in particular with people at different levels of a power hierarchy. This self may continue to replicate itself and shade how the learner experiences subsequent relationships and language experiences. For example, Hannah, with a distant and disempowered position with
her host family continued to note distance created by address forms, and considered it as something to come from the other rather than something she could initiate. Several sojourns later, in the midst of doctoral coursework, she continued to see the French language as full of syntactic opportunities, but limited herself predominantly to formal display in narration. The language history -instances of experience and acquisition - influence realization of repertoire in tandem with immediate contexts of use.

7.2. Representations of L2 advancedness in focal participants

As reported in other studies on advanced L2 learners and language, the primary challenges of assessing and representing advancedness are the diversity of the advanced L2 learner profile and his accompanying L2 language resources, as well as a lack of a coherent definition and cohesive descriptors of advanced L2 language.

The advanced learner

In spite of their varied L2 histories, by three of the four common measures of advancedness (Byrnes & Ortega, 2008), the three learners profiled here represented advanced learners. The institutional status for all was at least post-candidacy in a doctoral program. For late-acquired features, the performed narratives evinced advanced-level features of Bartning & Schlyter’s (2004) model (including discourse markers, a range of tenses for tense concordance, complex negation and multi-propositional sequences). The study task itself required narrative competence, a marker of sophisticated language. Additionally, the elicited narratives as well as the DCT showed sociopragmatic competence. The fourth, standardized test scores, was not specifically evaluated in this study
The participants also matched the profiles of peer groups assessed in other L2 French sociolinguistic studies of advanced learners (e.g., Dewaele 2002; Sax 2003). They were university learners who had studied abroad: Hannah and Mark had served as language assistants abroad representing their departments, and Meghan had received a prestigious research grant. Two of the participants had a high degree of engagement with L1 French speakers during their sojourns and all had at some point had close (if not lasting) relationships with L1 French speakers. All three reported French as part of their professional and personal identities. Compared to the cohort of other research participants, these three had not only the most diverse repertoire, but the most extensive L2 histories and among the highest degree of engagement with French.

There are several markers in these above categories that set Hannah, Mark and Meghan in the realm of very advanced learner. They were in advanced degree programs rather than in an “advanced” course within an undergraduate curriculum, ostensibly using French for professional means. Beyond the requisite undergraduate study abroad, they had all had at least two sojourns during graduate study. They meet criteria in Bartning & Schlyter’s model (2004) for the advanced L2 French speaker, as well as the range of features identified as L1 French oral discourse strategies for this study. Although a standardized test was not given, their narrative performance qualifies them within the high-advanced to superior rating by the OPI rubric. Finally, the sociopragmatic variation is marked by notable exceptions explained by stylistic agency that approximates NS variation, rather than paradigmatic prescriptions. This last point is further discussed in the following section on Contextualized Repertoire.

7.3 Advanced capacities: L2 oral repertoire
This study aims through the first line of inquiry on advanced L2 French repertoire to expand the categories of descriptors for late-acquired features. The set of features analyzed drew on three sources: Bartning & Schlyter’s model (2004) of oral L2 French acquisition; L2 French sociolinguistic studies, and descriptions of contemporary oral NS French. The model developed by Bartning and Schlyter for L2 oral French development focuses primarily on verb tense and aspect, negation, object pronouns, and subordination. For the advanced to very-advanced L2 French speaker, stabilized language features include complex negation (rien, jamais), discourse markers (enfin, donc), use of the prepositional relatives (dont) and multi-propositional utterances (see Table 1.1 for the full list). These were used as a point of departure to anchor Formal (traditionally written) discourse features.

Nascent L2 French sociolinguistic studies include a cannon of features traditionally understood to mark social variation. Those most frequently studied include tu/vous second person address pronouns, nous/on variation for the first person plural subject pronoun, and omission of the ne particle from the standard compound negative form. As expected, all three focal participants used these variants in ways commensurate with that of peer groups as represented in previous literature. An exception is that there were zero tokens of the nous subject pronoun. Given that usage rates are very low in oral French (less than four percent), this is not unreasonable. While a participant may have chosen to include it for a number of stylistic manoeuvres, it is not considered required or more appropriate than on in any conversational setting. In fact, its absence also serves to confirm the comfortable, conversational nature of the elicited speech samples.

Relatively new descriptions of oral French language identify highly marked features, such as dislocation and subject doubling, as well as interdependent syntax, which relies on the
presence of an interlocutor to “complete” the utterance. These may include juxtaposition or parataxis, as well as contextual antecedents. Research on the use of these strategies in learner discourse is limited. Near-native speakers (self-identified as such and having lived abroad at last three consecutive years) have been shown to use dislocation but not at rates of native speakers (Donaldson, 2011a, 2011b). Advanced L2 French speakers are more likely to use co-dependent strategies for elaboration of detail rather than correction, as compared to novice speakers (Bigler & Tyne, 2007). Findings from this study show that advanced learners do incorporate oral discourse strategies but that they are not dominant resources realized in narration. Perhaps because of the narrative medium and interviewer style, they rely heavily on traditionally written discourse strategies for sequencing and elaboration. This shows that the very advanced developmental trajectory continues beyond semantic features to include oral syntax in narrative discourse but that the performance remains fragile even at the very advanced stage.

7.4 Advanced capacities: sociopragmatic competence and suites of repertoire

Once a range of repertoire is established, previous work on sociopragmatic features has turned to usage rates for different features, comparing learners and native speakers. In contrast, the present study explores contexts of use for such features, revealing a largely rational schema for instances of varying features. From address forms to dislocation, advanced speakers are shown to match the pragmatic level of discourse to the speaker or interlocutor. At the same time, speakers maintain a different level of discourse as the narrator. Thus, usage rates for these features depend highly on evoked contexts and medium of conversation.

7.5 Advanced capacities and Identity development in the L2
Previous work in second language sociopragmatics has aligned second language performance against a native speaker norm. This inquiry on second language identity aligns a speaker against herself, exploring the individual voices realized through narration and connecting them to the learner’s socio-cultural history.

Identity is a crucial aspect of a usage-based framework. The individual voices a learner encounters create the repertoire of exemplars she later revoices (Tarone, 2007). This agentive performance is not found in co-variation of feature-to-context any more than two features are likely to be paired together in NS speech (Coveney 2000). Rather, it is a unique indexed link at once to the immediate narrative context as well as the experiential history a learner’s repertoire is grounded in.

Bilinguals have been shown to use different voices for different characters, allowing the use of “off-limits” features in different characters (Koven, 2007). Likewise, advanced learners perform a different range of repertoire through their characters than they do in narration, and even in meta-narration. Advanced learners display a wide range of repertoire, but the usage depends upon not only sense of self (which crafts the predominant narrative voice), but upon the contexts evoked in narratives. Thus, individual style is an agentive display and manipulation of resources that conveys second language selves.

7.6 Limitations

Several particulars of the data limit the interpretations one can draw to descriptions of performance. These include the lack of comparable native-speaker data, the role of the interviewer in narrative elicitation, and the nature of the Discourse Completion Task.
Without a corpus of comparable native speaker narratives, the analysis is limited to a description of advanced L2 speech. While the study explores the use of known marked oral discourse strategies, it is not possible to understand the range of difference between the two groups. Traditional second language sociolinguistic studies explore variation between learner speech and that of the “target” language. In an effort to validate advanced learner speech in its own right, as an agentive production of individual speech, a comparison to native speaker norms was not entirely necessary here. It would, however, inform implications of the study, in particular with respect to pedagogical opportunities for expanding the teaching canon of sociopragmatic variation.

It bears noting here that the oral discourse strategies are not entirely akin to sociopragmatic variants. Sociolinguistic and pragmatic studies rely on variations of forms that are otherwise assumed to be semantically identical. In the case of subject doubling and dislocation, for example, the variant is a null form. These are embellishments rather than variants. There may, therefore, be questions about extending sociopragmatic literature to include these strategies.

There are two situationally dependent limitations: one with the narratives, and one with the discourse completion task. Markers of cohesion may be over-represented due to the instructions given to the interviewer, who were explicitly told to remove themselves from the narrative as much as possible. So, while the narratives were told to an engaged audience, the elicited speech is not wholly representative of interactive conversation, which may rely more on strategies of co-construction. Participants may have responded to this situation by producing more monologically constructed narratives, which may in turn have provoked some of the syntax traditionally favored by written means.
The Discourse completion task is, admittedly, awkward, with the directive to *write* what one would *say*. This hybrid task was designed with two objectives: the first was to present the participant with a range of situations and interlocutors that might not have naturally emerged through his personal narratives; the second was to collect a comparable set of language across all participants. Although the DCT succeeded on these two counts, the written production of hypothetical speech is undeniably problematic, and not entirely suitable for comparison to oral repertoire. Golato (2003) argues that DCT language is not suitable for describing naturally occurring speech, citing data differences in responses to German compliments in natural speech and DCTs. The analysis presented here was mindful of such discrepancies, limiting the interpretation to representative of repertoire, not *in situ* language use. This limitation does not preclude comparison of language production across categories within the DCT and between speakers to map repertoire. While the DCT responses confirmed the repertoire of sociopragmatic features, there were differences in performance on written and oral discourse. While this may be that the variability reflects the written nature of the task, it may confirm the developmental fragility of advanced oral discourse strategies at this stage, which otherwise appeared in the narratives.

### 7.7 Implications for future research

This study opens several questions for future inquiry. These include better understanding the developmental time frame for oral discourse strategies, expanding markers of L2 French advancedness as related to identity, and pedagogical opportunities to foster advanced capacities. Analysis of repertoire for these focal participants evinces performance of highly marked oral discourse strategies, but at limited rates. Further analysis of these focal participants’
narratives, along with those of other participants in the larger study. This may map the developmental emergence of such features as subject doubling and dislocation.

Second, a primary objective of this study was to re-evaluate the notion of style, a common descriptor of advanced-level learner language that eludes categorization. By linking language choices to immediate contexts in narratives, and further connecting these patterns to a learner’s language history, highly individualized style may now be seen as individually systematic. Learner language need not be measured against a benchmark of near-nativeness, but by degree of agency exercised to assert one’s own stance rather than a pedagogically prescribed one. Considerations of advancedness may include this aspect of agentive variation.

The findings of this study also implicate an opportunity for L2 French pedagogy beyond the 300 advanced-level coursework. Courses at this level traditionally have focused on domain-specific inquiry, but could incorporate some of these as-yet untaught oral features. Learners could also be made aware of them pre-study abroad as part of other sociopragmatic instruction.

7.7 Conclusion
Advanced second language learners have been identified as challenging to teach and research because of their diversity, yet have been singularly described as stylistic in their speech. This study aimed to refine the descriptor of style by connecting repertoires to contexts of use. These patterns were subsequently tied to contexts of learning and experience. Findings include that learners exert individual voices within narratives, with particular sensitivity to characters in the narrative, descriptive narration, and meta-narration. Second language identity, an ever-changing instantiation of self, may be particularly evident in the contrast between voices of characters and voices of the narrator.
Appendix A: Language History

Mary Kathryn Malone, ABD
Department of Applied Linguistics

Discursive Representation in L2 Narratives
Language History

Please provide as much detail as possible about your language learning and use.

What is your first language?
____________________________________

Do you consider this your “native” language? If not, which language?
____________________

Is this the language you use most often at home? If not, which language?
____________________

Is this the language you use most often at work/school? If not, which language?
____________________

Please describe how you have learned and used other languages you speak or know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
<th>Length of study</th>
<th>Other:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yrs in school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate semesters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesteres:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you studied abroad? Where, for how long? Where did you live (with host family, on campus, etc)?

In what ways and how often (hours per week/month) do you still use this language (newspapers, radio, film, conversation with friends, etc)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in school:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you studied abroad? Where, for how long? Where did you live (with host family, on campus, etc)?

In what ways and how often (hours per week/month) do you still use this language (newspapers, radio, film, conversation with friends, etc)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in school:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you studied abroad? Where, for how long? Where did you live (with host family, on campus, etc)?

In what ways and how often (hours per week/month) do you still use this language (newspapers, radio, film, conversation with friends, etc)?
Please describe any extensive (2 weeks or more) travels you have had, including whether or not it involved a second- or foreign-language experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Approximate dates</th>
<th>Purpose of travel</th>
<th>Language experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Narrative interview worksheet**

You will be asked to tell two sets of personal narratives, and to tell each set in French and in English. Thus, there will be a total of four interviews, two in French and two in English, and the order of the language will alternate.

While any story of personal significance to you would be appropriate, we are most interested in stories that involve other people, be they friends, family, colleagues or strangers. People generally find it easiest to tell stories that were remarkable in some way or that involve deep emotions. These may be shocking (i.e., a car accident) or eye-opening (i.e., a new cultural experience or a significant first experience), or an everyday experience that one time took on new meaning.

To help the interviewer facilitate each session, you are being asked to consider the following categories and to provide prompts for several stories. Think about events from each listed below, and list one or two events that were noteworthy in some way.

1. **Life-defining events**
   
   Childhood:
   a. 
   b. 

   Adolescence
   a. 
   b. 

   Early adulthood
   a. 
   b. 

   Adulthood
   a. 
   b. 

2. **French language study**
   
   Classroom
   a. 
   b. 

   Study abroad
3. Education

Elementary
a.
b.

High school
a.
b.

Undergraduate
a.
b.

Graduate
a.
b.

4. Other

Work
a.
b.

Friends
a.
b.

Family
a.
b.
### Discourse completion task

For this task, you are asked to think about the contexts and scenarios provided. Take some time to imagine that you are part of the scene. Then, provide a response that reflects what you might say in these situations.

**Situation 1:** C’est la fin de ton semestre à l’étranger et tu te retrouves à dire au revoir à un bon ami, en lui promettant que vous allez rester en contact.

Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 2:** En tant qu’étudiant(e) en troisième cycle/ en maitrise, tu ne pourras pas te rendre à Hawaï au mariage de ton ami(e).

Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 3:** Hier, tu as oublié d’appeler ton amie pour son anniversaire et tu l’appelles maintenant.

Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 4:** Ton collègue de travail, que tu n’aimes pas vraiment, te propose d’aller prendre un café.

Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

**Situation 5:** Un bon ami te propose d’aller prendre un café, mais tu as déjà quelque chose de prévu.

Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________
In your department

Situation 6: La première publication d’un de tes collègues a été acceptée.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 7: Le semestre a été difficile et tu as besoin de demander à ton directeur de recherches, avec lequel tu t’entends bien, un peu plus de temps pour remettre ton travail.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 8: Le semestre a été difficile et tu as besoin de demander à un professeur que tu trouves intimidant, une échéance supplémentaire pour remettre ton travail.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 9: Tu as oublié d’enclencher ton réveil et tu arrives en retard à ton cours de 8h
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 10: Tu as oublié d’enclencher ton réveil et tu arrives en retard au cours que tu donnes à 8h.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Traveling in France

Situation 11: Tu arrives à la réception de ton hôtel, qui n’a pas de réservation à ton nom. Tu es quasiment sûr qu’il y a une erreur.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 12: Tu es surchargée et tu essaies désespérément de monter ces escaliers étroits avec ton énorme valise. Un gentleman t’offre son aide.
Tu dis:
___________________________________________________________________________

Situation 13: Tu te retrouves avec un rhume et tu expliques au pharmacien que tu aimerais des médicaments.
Tu dis:


Situation 14: Tu es dans une boutique et tu aimerais savoir si ils ont ce tee-shirt rose en bleu, taille 38.
Tu dis:


Situation 15: Tu es en retard pour l’aéroport et tu demandes au chauffeur de taxi d’accélérer, tout en lui expliquant pourquoi.
Tu dis:


A dinner with good friends

Situation 16: Tu arrives chez une très bonne amie qui t’as invité à dîner, des fleurs à la main. Elle ouvre la porte.
Tu dis:


Situation 17: Tu adores la robe que porte ton amie et tu penses qu’elle lui va à merveille.
Tu dis:


Situation 18: Durant le dîner, tu renverses accidentellement du vin rouge sur la table.
Tu dis:


Situation 19: Ton amie nous annonce que ce gâteau est sa spécialité, mais tu le trouves fade.
Tu dis:


Situation 20: Tu passes un très bon moment, mais tu dois partir tôt.
Tu dis:
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Discursive Representation in L2 Narratives
Discourse completion task (English outline)

For this task, you are asked to think about the contexts and scenarios provided. Take some time to imagine that you are part of the scene. Then, provide a response that reflects what you might say in these situations.

Situation 1: It’s the end of a semester abroad, and you say good-bye to a good friend, assuring him that you’ll stay in touch.

Situation 2: As a graduate student, you won’t be able attend your friend’s wedding in Hawaii.

Situation 3: You forgot to call your friend for her birthday yesterday, and call her now.

Situation 4: Your officemate, whom you don’t like very much, asks you to have coffee.

Situation 5: A good friend asks you to coffee, but you have something scheduled for the time he suggests.

In your department

Situation 6: One of your colleagues has had her first publication accepted.

Situation 7: It’s been a hard semester and you need to ask your advisor, with whom you have a good working relationship, for an extension.

Situation 8: It’s been a hard semester and you need to ask a senior professor, whom you find intimidating, for an extension.

Situation 9: You forgot to set your alarm and you arrive for the 8am class you attend.

Situation 10: You forgot to set your alarm and you arrive for the 8am class you teach.

Traveling in France

Situation 11: You arrive at your hotel and the front desk has no record of your reservation. You are quite sure that there is a mistake.

Situation 12: You’ve over-packed and are struggling to get your extra-large suitcase up the narrow stairs. A gentleman offers to help.

Situation 13: You’ve come down with a cold and you explain to the pharmacist that you’d like some medicine.
Situation 14: You’re in a boutique and would like to know if they have the small pink t-shirt in medium blue.

Situation 15: You are running late to the airport and tell the taxi driver that he needs to hurry and why.

A dinner with good friends

Situation 16: You arrive, with flowers for the hostess, a very good friend. She opens the door.

Situation 17: You love the dress your friend is wearing and think it suits her quite well.

Situation 18: Over dinner, you accidentally spill your red wine across the table.

Situation 19: Your friend has pronounced the cake her specialty but you find it tasteless.

Situation 20: You’re having a great time, but you have to leave early.
Appendix E: Meta Linguistic Interview Sample Questions

Describe your relationship with the French language

Why did you use T/V with the interviewer?

Describe your relationship with Sabine (when applicable)

When you told the story xx and were quoting xx, could you hear his/her voice in your head?

How would you describe your general register in the French language?

How do you think your written and spoken French are different?

At what point in your French history would you say you “owned” the French language?

What were your language objectives for each of your study/work abroad experiences?

How did you view your French language skills during each of your study/work abroad experiences?

What role with the French language play in your future career?

Follow-up questions as necessary from the Language History form
Appendix F: Transcription Conventions

. falling intonation with brief pause
, continuing intonation
? rising intonation
+ brief pause (generally the time for an intake of breath)
++ moderate pause
+++ long pause
(2.5) timed pauses of more than 2 seconds
(xx) inaudible or indecipherable
((italics)) transcribers notes
(…) break in transcribed discourse
>< notable drop in speech volume
<> notable rise in speech volume
{voice} change in speech quality to denote voicing of other character in story
  - cutoff of speech with no change in intonation
[ overlapping speech
Appendix G: Coding Schema for Sociopragmatic Features and Discursive Strategies

**Discursive Linking: DL**
- **PTX** Parataxis – coordinating conjunctions
- **HTX** Hypotaxis – subordination; relativization
- **JXP** Juxtaposition - fragments
- **OQ** overgeneralization of que (equivalent of other relativizing pn)
- **LDis** Left dislocation
- **RDis** Right dislocation

**Question Formation: QQ**
- **Q-INV** inversion
- **ECQ** est-ce que
- **QEC** qu’est-ce qu
- **Q-INT** question through with intonation
- **QQ** standard interrogative pronoun (qui, quoi, quand, pourquoi, comment)

**Vocabulary: VOC**
- **FML** formal
- **CLQ** colloquial; conversational
- **VLG** vulgar

**Future tenses**
- **FutS** futur simple (*je ferai*)
- **FutP** future proche (*je vais faire*)

**Negation: NEG**
- **NE+** Ne deletion
- **NE+** Ne presence

**Pronouns (Subject and Dislocated Disjunctive): PN**
- **T** tu
- **V** vous
- **On(n)** on for nous
- **On(i)** on for indefinite
- **SD** subject doubling
### Appendix H: excerpts from Narrative Set and Translations

**Hannah**

Paris is closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J : et tu as connu aussi Paris qui était fermé</td>
<td>J : and you also met Paris when it was closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A : ça c’était pendant les grèves</td>
<td>H: that that was during a strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J : ah oui</td>
<td>J: ah yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A : tu étais déjà à Paris pendant les grèves ?</td>
<td>H: you were already in Paris during a strike?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J : évidemment partout en France pendant les grèves c’est catastrophique</td>
<td>J: obviously everywhere in France during the a strike is catastrophic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: ben pour nous on n’a pas trop les grèves donc pour moi c’était vraiment pas seulement apprendre à vivre en français mais aussi dans une grande ville et aussi dans une grande ville qui aime se manifester</td>
<td>H: well for us we don’t have too many strikes so for me it was really not only to learn how to live in French but also in a big city and also in a big city that likes to demonstrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H : donc c’était ha ha non mais ça va c’était juste une nouvelle expérience et donc je je- eum j’avais une amie donc eum pendant ma première année à Alistair il y avait je crois je veux dire cinq camarades de chambre et il y en avait une qui était française et puis l’autre elle venait de la Floride et en fait c’était elle qui était avec moi dans la chambre. Donc on se connaît très bien euh on se connaissait très bien. On se connaît toujours très bien, et eum elle est partie en Espagne pendant ce semestre donc elle est – elle était à Barcelone et, elle me fait ouais il faut que tu viennes il faut que tu viennes moi j’ai fait okay ouais, il faut que tu viennes il faut que tu viennes parce que je détestais Paris ha ha donc. Donc elle est venue en je crois que c’était en avril</td>
<td>H: So it was ha ha no but it’s okay it was just a new experience and so I I- um I had a friend so um during my first year at Alistair there was I think I want to say five roommates and there was one who was French and then the other she came from Florida and actually it was she who was with me in the room. So we know each other really well uh we knew each other really well. We still know each other really well, and um, she left for Spain during this semester so she is – she was in Barcelona and, she goes to me yeah you have to come you have to come me I go okay yea, you have to come you have to come because I hated Paris ha ha so. So she came in I think it was in April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Barcelona it’s big</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**J : Barcelone c’est grand**

H: et eum ouais, j’avais pas trop envie d’y aller parce qu’il faisait chaud mais elle m’a pas obligée. Donc je suis allée et c’était bien. Donc je suis allée, je crois que c’était, deuxième ou troisième weekend de mai, donc euh au milieu de des grèves en France, toujours à Paris et ils ont fermés les trains et le métro, et je suis partie, je crois que c’était le jeudi et c’était juste en train de commencer, il y avait des gens sur des rouleurs, et des gens sur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J : des vélos,</th>
<th>H : oui, he oui.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Et donc. Je suis partie, pas de problème, en partant, et puis j’arrive euh en Espagne, pas de problème là, on était là, je fais ooh je veux aller à la plage, je veux aller à la plage, c’était pour ça que je suis allée, elle me fait non, tu es pas venue ici pour aller juste à la plage, on va faire des musées, on va voir des sites historiques, blah blah blah machin je m’en fou, et puis parce qu’elle est ce genre de personne elle veut toujours voir ça et ça et ça, moi, je fais okay mais je veux aller à la plage, moi je dis tchoos, he he et c’est pour ça que je suis venue et donc, c’était vraiment le dernier jour je crois c’était un mardi ou un mercredi et eum alors je suis, je suis-je lui ai dit que je voulais aller à la plage, je fais okay, maintenant aujourd’hui on va aller à la plage, mais j’avais l’avion qui partait le soir donc on est allé à la plage, genre midi + on était là je- on s’est dit au revoir, okay on se revoit, on est d’accord, oui, ça va ça va,

| J : And um yeah, I didn’t have too much interest in going there because it was hot but she made me. So I went and it was fine. So I went, I think it was, second or third weekend of May, so uh in the middle of the strikes in France, always in Paris and they were closed the trains and the subway, and I left, I think that it was Thursday and it was just in the middle of starting, there were people on roller blades, and people on bikes, |
| H : yes, ha yes. |
| And so. I left, not a problem, in leaving, and then I arrive uh in Spain, not a problem there, and we were there, I go ohh I want to go to the beach, I want to go to the beach, that was why I came, she goes to me no, you didn’t come here to just go to the beach, we’re going to the museums, we’re going to see historic sites, blah blah blah whatever I don’t care, and then because she the kind of person she always wants to see this and this and this, me, I go okay but I want to go to the beach, me I say tchoos, he he and it’s for that that I came and so, it’s really the last day I think it was a Tuesday or a Wednesday and um so I am, I am- I said to her that I wanted to go to the beach, I go okay, now today we’re going to go to the beach, but I had the plane that was leaving in the evening so we went to the page, like at noon, we were there I- we said goodbye, okay we’ll see each other again, we’re okay, yes, it’s okay, it’s okay, |
okay donc, je suis partie, j’ai pris le train, j’arrive à l’aéroport, et puis il y a la dame qui prend mon billet qui prend mon passeport, et qui me regarde.

Elle voit le visa de France, elle voit que je suis américaine et elle voit que je suis à Barcelone. Elle me regarde comme ça, elle s-regarde encore l’ordinateur, et elle me fait en anglais, est-ce que tu veux que euh est-ce que tu veux que je te dise la nouvelle en espagnol ou en français ou en anglais? Et je fais mais quelle nouvelle? qu’est-ce qu’il y a en anglais, et donc elle m’a répondu okay donc ah Paris est fermée. Ha ha en anglais comme ça. Paris is closed. J’ai fait huh? et je voulais dire, mais j’étais en train de penser est-ce que ça c’est quelque chose de grammatical? en espagnol genre pourquoi est-ce qu’elle dit ça comme ça, paris est fermée on-on dit pas ça même en anglais même pas en français, et j’ai dit pardon? Paris est fermée, et je fais, uh huh, mais qu’est-ce que ça veut dire paris est fermée.

Elle me regarde, elle me fait- et je crois qu’elle qu’elle répétait quelque chose en espagnol mais je qu’est-ce que ça veut dire, donc elle a dit uh oui en fait ils sont en grève, les aéroports sont fermés, ils acceptent plus- ils acceptent plus d’avions. J’ai xx mais qu’est-ce que ça veut dire exactement ils acceptent plus d’avions? C’est pas une question d’accepter des avions, elle avait expliqué très calmement, oui en fait, en fait, ils permettent pas que les avions maintenant aillent à Paris parce qu’il y a personne là pour recevoir les passagers blah blah blah

okay, so I leave, I took the train, I get to the airport and then there is the lady who takes my ticket who takes my passport, and who looks at me.

She sees the visa from France, she sees that I am American and she sees that I am in Barcelona. She looks at me. Like this. She s- looks again at the computer, and she goes to me in English, do you want that uh do you want me to tell you the news in Spanish or in French or in English? And I go but what news? What is it – in English, and so she answers me okay so ah Paris is closed. Ha ha in English like that. Paris is closed. I go huh? And i wanted to say, but I was in the middle of thinking is that something grammatical? In Spanish like why is she saying it like that, Paris is closed we- we don’t say that even in English not even in French, I said Excuse me? Paris is closed, and I go uh huh but want does that mean Paris is closed.

She looks at me, she goes to me – and I think that she that she repeated something in Spanish but I want does that mean, so she said uh yes in fact they are having a strike, the airports are closed they are not accepting any more – they are not accepting any more plans. I have xx but what does that mean exactly they are not accepting any more planes? It’s not a question of accepting plans, she had explained very calmly, yes, in fact, in fact, they aren’t allowing the planes now to go to Paris because there isn’t anyone there to receive the passengers blah blah blah
Je fais mais qu’est-ce que je vais faire j’ai un avion à cinq heures et demie et elle me regarde et je suis tout euh un peu brûlée par le soleil elle me fait je vous conseille de repartir à la plage.
Et je fais huh elle me fait il y a il y avait des casiers de l’autre côté elle fait tu peux prendre un casier comme ça puis um repartir à la plage et puis revenir le lendemain. Et je fais mais mon avion. Elle me fait Oh oh on peut redonner un billet pour l’avion de demain. J’ai fait mais okay.

Donc uh j’ai texté mon amie je fais ouais donc euh je re-arrive ha parce que paris est fermée et puis euh donc je suis repartie et en fait on est allé un peu à la plage mais mon amie elle voulait pas y retourner. Donc je s- j’ai fait ça j’ai pris le casier puis je retournais sur Barcelone, dix minutes - dix minutes de train

J’étais à la plage mais uh oui c’était pas pour tout le soir parce qu’il faisait cinq heures ou six heures.
J : ah oui
H : on est revenue à la plage.
J : et le lendemain tu as pu repartir/ ?
H: oui, le lendemain je suis revenue et puis il y avait des avions mais en fait le problème c’était que ils acceptaient des avions ce jour-là mais eum [quand
J : le métro
H : je suis arrivée oui c’est ça, j’arrive à Paris, je crois que c’était à Orly, c’était c’était le catastrphe parce qu’il y avait trop de monde qui voulait repartir sur Paris on était comme ça mais

---

I go but what am I going to do I have a plane at five thirty and she looks at me and I am all uh a little burned from the sun she goes to me I advise you to go back to the beach.
And I go huh she goes to me there are there were lockers on the other side she goes you can get a locker like this and um go back to the beach and then come back the next day. And I go but my plane. She goes to me Oh oh we can give you a ticket for the plane tomorrow. I go but okay.

So uh I texted my friend I go yeah so uh I am arriving again ha because Paris is closed and then uh so I left again and actually we went a little to the beach but my friend she didn’t want to go back there. So I s- I did that I took the locker then I returned to Barcelone ten minutes – ten minutes on the train.

I was at the beach but uh yeah it was not for all evening because it was five or six o’clock.
J: ah yes
H: we went back to the beach
J: and the next day you were able to leave?
H: yes, the next day I came back and then there were plans but actually the problem it was that they were accepting planes that day but um [when
J: [the subway
H: I arrived yes, it’s that, I arrive in Paris, I think it was at Orly, it was, it was a catastrophe because there were too many people who wanted to come back to Paris and we were like that but really we
vraiment on pouvait pas bouger et c’était dégalace. J’aime pas du tout ça parce que j’aime pas trop xx
donc uh ouais Paris était fermée.
et puis après j’ai essayé d’expliquer tout ça à mes parents, parce que ils comprennent pas du tout cette idée de grève déjà et ils croyaient que je voulais pas travailler.
couldn’t move and it was awful. I don’t like that at all because I don’t like too much xx
so uh yeah Paris was closed.
and then after I tried to explain all this to my parents, because they don’t understand at all this idea of a strike and they thought I didn’t want to work.

Mark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Promenade aux plages de bayeux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: le contexte c’est avec l’école?</td>
<td>J: The context it’s with the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: oui euh c’est pas en fait avec l’é- c’était la première fois que j’étais en France donc comme la dernière fois j’ai dit que j’ai eu en voyage avec le lycée et puis tout ça c’était pendant l’Université donc c’est la troisième année de l’université où je suis partie pour la Normandie. Donc c’était pour une année d’échange ou quelque chose comme ça. je suivais des cours à l’université</td>
<td>M: Yes, uh Actually it’s not with the sc-.. It was the first time that I was in France so like the last time I said that I took a trip with the high school and then all that, it was during the university, so that’s the third year of university when I left for Normandy. So, that was for an exchange year or something like that. I was taking courses at the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: à Caen.</td>
<td>J: In Caen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M: à Caen oui. justement et donc il y avait ces stages au début à l’école de langues pour les étrangers pour savoir leur niveau et après tout le monde partait un peu partout et moi je restais. Um. Donc c’était tout | M: In Caen. Yes. That’s right. And so there were some training programs at the language school for foreigners to learn their level and after everyone left for everywhere and I stayed. Um. So, that was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>au début, tous les strangers, donc j’ai rencontré je n’sais pas combien de personnes comme ça: euh des étrangers</td>
<td>right at the beginning, all the “étrangers”, so I met I don’t know how many people like that. Um foreigners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: comme Jasmine</td>
<td>J: Like Jasmine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: oui. Exactement comme Jasmine par exemple. C’est c’est avec elle en fait que j’ai fait ce promenade</td>
<td>M: Yes. Exactly like Jasmine for example. It was with here in fact that I took that walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: oh</td>
<td>J: Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: à la plage. Oui. Donc elle euh elle était très bavarde. Elle connaissait tout le monde toute de suite. Elle avait ce rêve je crois – il y avait autre chose aussi- oui. Il y avait un film Saving Private Ryan qui venait de sortir</td>
<td>M: On the beach. Yes. So, she uh was very talkative. She knew everyone right away. She had this dream I think - there was another thing too – yes. There was a film Saving Private Ryan that had just come out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: oh</td>
<td>J: Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: donc il y avait ça aussi à l’esprit. Et puis. En tant qu’américain on voulait voir les plages.</td>
<td>M: So there was that vibe. And then. Being American we wanted to see the beaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et Jasmine. Un jour. Elle a elle a demandé q quelques-uns d’entre nous est-ce que vous voulez je sais pas aller à la plage un samedi ou- est-ce que c’était un samedi? Oui, donc. Un samedi on est libre on n’a pas de cours on va faire prendre le train peut-être jusqu’à Bayeux et puis on n’avait même pas une carte. C’était vraiment pas un road trip</td>
<td>And Jasmine. One day. She asked s some of us : do you want to I don’t know go to the beach one Saturday or was it a Saturday? Yes, so. One Saturday we’re free we don’t have classes we’re going to do to take the train maybe to Bayeux and then we didn’t even have a card. It wasn’t really a road trip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J : à pied</td>
<td>J : on foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: oui he ha ha donc on a pris on a décidé oui on va partir, donc il y avait quatre- non. Moi, Jasmine, Richard. Non Alex il est parti et maintenant j’ai oublié son nom. Je crois que son nom était Keith. Donc il y avait quatre personnes qui sont parti de Caen.</td>
<td>M : Yes. Haha. So we took we decided yes we’re leaving, so there were four—no. Me, Jasmine, Richard. Not Alex he’d left and now I forget his name. I think he was Keith. So there were four people who left Caen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On est allé à la gare et:: on a dû attendre je sais pas je crois on s’est levé pas de bonne</td>
<td>We went to the station and:: we had to wait I don’t know I don’t think we got up early</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
heure déjà, Donc on est arrivé probablement à la gare vers dix heures onze heures je sais pas. Et puis on a dû attendre le train pour Bayeux parce qu’il y avait pas de trains plus loin que Bayeux pour aller à la plage. Um il y a des bus mais on savait pas. Donc on a on a on a pris le train pour Bayeux. On est arrivé à Bayeux et on s’est dit quand même c’est Bayeux il y a la cathédrale c’est énorme
J: la tapisserie
M: oui exactement la tapisserie. On a pas vu la tapisserie mais on a visité un peu le château et centre ville pendant je sais pas une heure deux heures quelque chose comme ça.

already. Then we arrived at the station about 10 or 11, I don’t know. And then we had to wait for the train for Bayeux because there weren’t any trains further than Bayeux to go to the beach. Um. There are some buses, but we didn’t know. So we we talk the train to Bayeux. We arrived in Bayeaux and we told ourselves anyway it’s Bayeux. There’s a cathedral it’s enormous.
J : The tapestry
M: Yes, exactly, the tapestry. We didn’t see the tapestry but we visited a little bit the château and city center for about I don’t know an hour two hours. Something like that.

on arrive maintenant vers je sais pas 2 heures de l’après-midi et on se dit il faut quand même peut-être partir pour la plage. On a on pensait que la plage c’était peut-être un peu à côté, c’est pas vraiment à côté. En fin de compte. Donc on a commencé à marcher. Il faisait beau: donc c’était une promenade incroyable dans la campagne de Normandie c’qui est très très belle. Oui ça fait res xxx et il y avait des châteaux: au bord de la route par exemple
J:xx
M: des chevaux: dans les prés. C’était il faisait très beau il y avait quoi d’autre?
J: il y avait beaucoup de pommiers, des fermes

We’re getting now to around I don’t know 2 in the afternoon and we say we’ve got to leave anyway for the beach. We we thought the beach was just a bit outside the town. It isn’t just right there. In the end. So we started walking. It was nice out. So it was an incredible walk in the countryside of Normandie that was really really pretty. Yes, it was. xx. There were chateaux along the road for example
J :xx
M: horses in the meadows. It was.. It was really pretty. What else was there ?
J : There were lots of apple trees, farms
M. Yes, exactly. So it was nice out. It was beautiful. It was really very very pretty.

Donc on était en train de marcher et tout d’un coup: Jasmine. Tombe. Comme ça, et elle

So we were in the middle of walking and all of a sudden : Jasmine falls. Just like that.
s’est fait mal au genou. Donc elle a dû maintenant on a quelqu’un qui est blessé et Ça devient de plus en plus tard. Um elle a du mal à marcher donc on doit ralentir un petit peu donc on ne peut même pas marcher aussi vite qu’on veut. Déjà je crois je crois que il y a à peu près quinze – la route qu’on a prise c’était entre dix à quinze kilomètres pour arriver à la plage de Bayeux ou quelque chose comme ça. donc on est un peu stupide quand même. On était jeune. On était je sais pas uh on était un peu stupide. Oui. Ça c’est le mot. naïve

And she hurt her knee. So she had to now We have someone hurt and it’s getting late. Um it hurts her to walk. So we need to slow down a little bit and we can’t even walk as fast as we want. Already I think I think it’s about fifteen- the road we took it was between ten to fifteen kilometers to arrive at the beach of Bayeux or something like that.

So we’re a bit dumb anyway. We were young. We were I don’t know uh. We were a bit stupid. Yes, that’s the word. naive.

M: oui exactement. Donc on est arrivé à je me rappelle même pas le nom de la ville mais on est arrivé enfin à la plage vers l’après midi et on a décidé d’aller à une épicerie pour manger des choses. d’acheter je sais pas des tranches de de jambon ou quelque chose comme ça avec du fromage pour manger un petit peu. On a acheté une bouteille de vin je crois quand même. On est là pourquoi pas

J: abaisser la douleur
M: oui c’est ça. je crois pas que soit vraiment arrivé à la plage d’embarquement. Je crois qu’on est plutôt dans un juste un petit village à côté de la mer mais on bon c’était fantastique. On est arrivé bon on a un peu uhm uhh qu’est-ce que je veux dire. Um

J: xx-
M: conquéri un peu ou
J: profiter des jeux ou
M: oui exactement. Um. Et maintenant () ugh qu’est-ce qui se passe

M : yes exactly. So we arrived and I don’t remember the name of the town but we arrived finally at the beach towards the afternoon and we decided to go to a grocery store to eat something. To buy I don’t know some slices of of ham or something like that. With some cheese to eat a little bit. We bought a bottle of wine I think anyway. We’re there why not

J: to lessen the pain
M: yes that’s it. I don’t think that we really arrived at the embarkment beach. I think that we were rather just in a little town next to the sea but we well it was fantastic. We arrived well we were a little umm uhh what do I want to say. Um

J xx-
M: conquer* a little or
J: to take advantage of the games or
M: yes exactly. Um. And now () ugh what happened
Et puis le soleil commence à se coucher:: et devient un- de plus en plus sombre, les magasins se ferment ben les quelques-uns qu’il y avait, et puis on se rend compte qu’on a aucune idée comment on peut rentrer parce qu’il commence à fait nuit. Um Jasmine a de plus en plus mal avec son genou. Ça lui fait très mal je crois en ce moment-là et eum donc on est un peu paniqué parce qu’on se rende compte que ben c’est samedi soir on n’ya pas l’emploi pour le bus ben il y avait pas de train parce que ah Jasmine a dit je peux pas marcher jusqu’à Bayeux encore ça c’est pas possible. On a trouvé donc en Normandie ça s’appelle les bus Vert ou quelque chose comme ça alors on a regardé l’horaire pour les bus vert. I y a pas de bus le samedi soir quelle surprise il y a pas de bus non plus le dimanche. Donc même si on a pris une chambre d’hôtel le bus ben le dimanche ha ha. Donc on est là, Je crois qu’on on rigolait un peu après un ou deux bouteilles de vin sur le banc dans un petit village on est un peu perdu dans la Normandie. Mais um je crois qu’après je sais pas trente minutes on s’est rendu compte qu’on est un peu dans la merde quand même. Comment rentrer à Caen. On a pas d’argent. Pas vraiment je crois moi j’avais pas vraiment une carte, est-ce que j’avais une carte de crédit? Peut-être. Mais c’était un très

Mais heureusement Jasmine. En tant que bavarde, la petite qu’elle est. Um elle a déjà rencontré deux mecs dans un bar quelque part. Et par hasard, heureusement, elle a appris par cœur ou elle sait, qu’est-ce que je veux dire, J: mémoriser
M: mémoriser leur numéro de téléphone. Donc . . . elle a dit zéro trois .. il y avait quelqu’un qui avait une carte téléphonique mais quand même si on sait pas le numéro qu’est-ce qu’on fait? Mais heureusement elle a retenu ce numéro de téléphone de ce mec c’est elle était au téléphone oui bonjour bon soir c’est Jasmine on est un peu perdu à je sais pas si c’était Luc-sur-mer ou il y avait un petit village a côté la mer- à côté de la mer est-ce que tu peux viens nous chercher? On est un peu perdu on a pas d’argent quoi que ce soit et heureusement les deux sont venu nous chercher à la plage comme ça parce qu’ils avaient une voiture et donc il y avait les deux les deux les deux mecs avant et puis il y avait nous quatre derrière dans ce petite bagnole je me rappelle plus la marque mais j’imagine que c’était probablement un super 5 exactement on était un peu on avait un peu peur que la police mais heureusement non. je crois que les deux mecs voulaient

But happily Jasmine. As a talkative person, the little one that she is. Um she had already met two guys in a bar somewhere. And by chance, thankfully, she had learned by heart or she knows, what do I want to say, J: memorize
M: memorize their phone number. So, … she said zero three .. there was someone who had a telephone car but even still if we didn’t know the number what do we do? But thankfully she had retained this telephone number of this guy and she was on the phone yes hell- good evening it’s J: memorize
M: memorize their phone number. So, … she said zero three .. there was someone who had a telephone car but even still if we didn’t know the number what do we do? But thankfully she had retained this telephone number of this guy and she was on the phone yes hell- good evening it’s
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parler un peu à côté avec Jasmine … mais c’est pour ça qu’ils sont venus nous chercher.</th>
<th>a little on the side with Jasmine … but that’s why they came to get us.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mais bon ça c’est un peu la grande histoire de de notre petit voyage à la aux plages de Normandie</td>
<td>But well that it’s a little the big story of our little trip to the to the Normandy beaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meghan

#### 6 Vaux-le-vicomte

| .1 Ça c’était l’année dernière quand je faisais des recherches des jardins. Donc on avait, oui on avait décidé de - il y avait un groupe de - de filles qui voulait aller à vaux le vicomte avant de avant de partir parce qu’on était tous fin on était tous sur le même emploi de temps pour partir | This it was last year when I was doing research on the gardens. So we had, yes, we had decided to – there was a group of – of girls who wanted to go to vaux-le-vicomte before leaving because we had all, well we had all the same time frame for leaving |
| .2 Et donc ce qui s’est arrivé, c’est - S donc là attend. Quand tu étais en France en ce moment-là tu étais là-bas pour des recherché, c’est ça M oui S tu n’enseignais pas M non xx en fait là il y avait des gens que j’avais rencontré pendant cette année- il y avait d’autres, il y avait une fille, deux trois autres qui : qui je pense qui avaient tous le même bourse et aussi Susan Green ahh donc hehehe | And so what happened, it’s – S: so wait there. When you were in France at the time you were there for research, right M yes S you weren’t teaching M non xx actually there there were people I had met during the year – there were others, there was a girl, two three others who : who I think who all had the same fellowship and also Susan Green ahh so hehehe |
| Donc on allait à vaux le vicomte, c’était elle qui avait organisé le voyage et : c’était très bien mais c’est un peu difficile pour y aller. Il faut prendre le train ahh je pense que c’est le RER en tout cas c’est le train, un train de banlieue. Donc et alors il faut trouver un moyen pour aller de la gare, si | So we went to vaux-le-vicomte, it was she who had organized the trip and : it went very well but it was a little difficult to get there. You have to take the train ahh I think that it’s the RER in any case it’s the train, a suburb train. So and well you have to find a way to get to |
on n’a pas de voiture il faut prendre un taxi, ou bien en principe ils ont une navette de la gare jusqu’au vaux-le-vicomte. Mais nous on arr on est arrivée et il n’y avait qu’une navette par heure, un truc comme ça donc on a pris un taxi, ahh et donc on a passé une journée vraiment super bien xx on a fait la visite du château, on a fait ils avaient il y avait un truc de de ils jouaient des extraits de des pièces de Molière, dans le jardin. Donc c’était très marrant d’avoir tous les, tous les scènes les plus connus de Molière, et c’était aussi l’idée de le weekend on faisait, on allumait le château et les jardins au chandelles, donc on pouvait rester jusqu’à la nuit, et voir les jardin illuminé, etc. ça, c’était - la journée ça s’est très bien passe, on s’est beaucoup amusé. Et puis, à la fin, il fallait, il fallait regagner le la gare et retourner à paris.

Et donc là ça a commencé à fxx un petit peu. Parce que on avait appris qu’en fait il n’y avait pas de navettes parce que c’était trop tôt dans la saison, et on avait fin, on avait vérifié sur le site web c’était pas indiqué qu’il n’y a pas de navettes, jusqu’à telle date. Donc, et normalement il y aurait eu des taxis mais je sais pas pourquoi il y avait un problème de peut-être il y avait un autre évènement dans la région, donc il y avait qu’un seul taxi qui qui travaillait sur tout la cette petite, fin entre oui. Donc on a commencé à s’inquiéter parce que on est reste croyant qu’il y aurait une navette et puis un train, on est reste jusqu’à dix heures peut-être le soir, onze heures S c’est quel période de l’année ?

Et donc là ça a commencé à fxx un petit peu. Parce que on avait appris qu’en fait il n’y avait pas de navettes parce que c’était trop tôt dans la saison, et on avait fin, on avait vérifié sur le site web c’était pas indiqué qu’il n’y a pas de navettes, jusqu’à telle date. Donc, et normalement il y aurait eu des taxis mais je sais pas pourquoi il y avait un problème de peut-être il y avait un autre évènement dans la région, donc il y avait qu’un seul taxi qui qui travaillait sur tout la cette petite, fin entre oui. Donc on a commencé à s’inquiéter parce que on est reste croyant qu’il y aurait une navette et puis un train, on est reste jusqu’à dix heures peut-être le soir, onze heures S c’est quel période de l’année ?

And so there it began to fxx a little bit. Because we had learned that actually there weren’t any shuttles because it was too early in the season, and we and well, we had checked on the website that it wasn’t indicated that there weren’t any shuttles, until such date. So, and normally there would have been taxis but I don’t know why there was a problem of maybe there was another event in the area, so there was only one taxi that that was working on all this little, well between yes. So we began to worry because we stayed thinking that there would be a shuttle and then a train, and we stayed until maybe ten o’clock in the evening, eleven o’clock S it’s what time of the year?
M ahh juin. Début juin. Donc on a commencé à demander aux gens s’il voulaient nous ramener à la gare, mais les gens sont venus, fin c’était p-des voitures avec plusieurs autres personnes alors il y avait pas de place ou de la place mais pas de la place pour cinq personnes, le taxi est venu : mais il a f-bizarrement ça a mal tourné avec le le taxi parce qu’il acceptait d’emmener quatre d’entre nous et on était cinq, ou trois et on était quatre un truc comme ça mais il av maintained son assistante qui était en fait sa femme dans la voiture, et donc elle elle a commencé à dire mais non, tu me laisse ici le temps de les ramener tous à la gare, et puis tu tu viens me chercher il y a pas de problème, mais lui il voulait pas du tout je sais pas pourquoi. Et puis, il a commencé à dire qu’on parlait anglais entre nous, nous on disait du mal de lui d’entre nous en anglais, donc c’était super bizarre, et sa fille um il y avait un vendeur dans les dans la boutique du château qui nous a ramenées finalement. Et donc ça il a fallu, c’était peut-être minuit, tout ça s’est passe, on a essayé de parce que on a essayé de faire comprendre à l’homme qui conduisait le taxi qu’on était pas du tout mal polies, etc et pourquoi est-ce qu’il pouvait pas comprendre qu’on allait pas laisser une fille seule xx tout ça donc, et puis on est arrivé à la gare, il y avait plus de trains pour paris, il y avait que le bus de nuit, le xx bus a trois heures du matin, et donc on a passé genre deux heures dans la gare, pour attendre, et puis une heure et demie de plus à faire, dans le bus qui faisait un peu je sais comment tous les détours pour aller à paris, et
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>paris on est arrivé à la gare de Lyon, après il fallait retrouver la maison, donc c’était.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S est-ce que tu gardes quand même un bon souvenir de vaux-le-vicomte ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M je garde un bon souvenir de vaux-le-vicomte, c’était - après avoir suivi tous les cours de x\textsuperscript{x}, d’avoir lu pas mal de choses sur vaux-le-vicomte, ahh c’était vraiment bien de le voir,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S do you still have anyway a good memory of vaux-le-vicomte ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I have a good memory of vaux-le-vicomte, it was – after having taken all these courses of xx, having read quite a bit of things on vaux-le-vicomte, ahh it was really good to see it,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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