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This thesis reports on a study that sought to support intermediate-level US university learners of French (N = 8) in developing advanced second language (L2) sociopragmatic capacity through concept-based instruction. Although a number of studies have explored the teaching of pragmatics, such research typically focuses on speech act realizations in relation to social conventions of appropriateness. Sociopragmatic information, if provided to learners, is limited to such factors as the formality of context and the relative age and/or status of one’s interlocutor. In the present study, an alternative approach—concept-based instruction—is proposed in order to focus on the underlying sociopragmatic meanings instantiated by linguistic resources. Concept-based instruction derives from Vygotsky’s claim that the goal of formal education should be to lead students to internalize scientific concepts in order to promote abstract thinking, and then to link scientific knowledge to practical activity. Drawing on the work initiated by Galperin and Davydov, and extended to the L2 field by Negueruela and others, the study focused on promoting the internalization of sociopragmatic concepts (e.g., indexicality, social distance, power hierarchies) that were linked to specific communicative practices (e.g., second-person address forms). Through the analysis of verbalization tasks, appropriateness judgment questionnaires, and spoken strategic interaction scenarios, the study documents (1) the development of concept-based sociopragmatic knowledge; (2) the development of spoken performance abilities; and (3) the relationship between sociopragmatic knowledge and performance abilities. The results show gains in sociopragmatic knowledge and spoken performance abilities. It is also argued that the learners’ sociopragmatic knowledge provided a systematic orienting basis for choosing the pragmatic forms that fit their communicative needs. In addition, the analysis highlights the role of cooperative interaction between a tutor and the learners in mediating concept development and gains in control in spoken performance.
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Preface: Some History and Context

The impetus for the study reported in this dissertation was my desire to make language learning better for my students. Most textbooks and pedagogical materials provide descriptions and explanations of the language learners are studying that are far removed from reality. The variety of French presented in most US textbooks is a myth, an idealized version of French that conflates some aspects of the standard spoken language with formal written registers, and one that is native only to students who study it in the foreign language classroom. When I began teaching French, I often found myself telling my students that nobody talked like this or that, that they’d probably hear X, Y, or Z instead of A, B, or C. For obvious reasons, this became confusing and frustrating for both my students and me. My students were constantly dealing with the discrepancies between the (real) French I brought into the classroom through various sorts of authentic materials and the variety presented in the textbook. My efforts over the past several years have increasingly focused on developing more effective ways of presenting the wide range of registers, or language variants, to my students than my early attempts at explaining such variation whenever something happened to come up in the classroom.

Many of the ideas for a pedagogy that is sensitive to the sociolinguistic and pragmatic needs of language learners presented in this dissertation have evolved from a fruitful collaboration with Lawrence Williams. We first replicated a number of studies on learners’ use of stylistic variation as a means of identifying a pedagogical need in the spring of 2006 (see van Compernolle & Williams, 2009a, b). Not surprisingly, our results aligned with previous research showing that classroom language learners typically use a relatively formal level of discourse. We then began investigating how to teach sociolinguistic variation in the fall of 2006, when I was teaching two sections of a fourth-semester French course. We devised a mid-semester intervention with the aim of raising learners’ awareness of the stylistic value of a number of
linguistic variables, and of comparing simple exposure with more explicit instruction. We found no difference in sociostylistic performance between the two groups, but we did observe a significant difference in terms of metasociolinguistic awareness: the explicit instruction group outperformed the nonexplicit instruction group in a number of metasociolinguistic tasks (see van Compernolle & Williams, 2011). Explicit instruction (a whole-class instructional conversation), we argued, helped the group move through its Zone of Proximal Development, thus allowing its individual members to develop their understandings of variation in French (van Compernolle & Williams, 2012). Such was not the case for the nonexplicit instruction group, which was—as a whole—not capable of independently accomplishing the task. Following these results, we developed a sociolinguistically responsive pedagogy (van Compernolle, 2010a) that incorporated awareness-raising and performance tasks throughout an academic term. Our results have shown that sociolinguistic and pragmatic features of language can be explicitly taught in the classroom, and that metasociolinguistic awareness can be an important and powerful mediating artifact in the development of performance abilities (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a, c).

This dissertation is—as my advisor, Celeste Kinginger, once told me in a meeting—the logical next step in my research agenda. And it is. This study is the result of a continuous and dynamic investigation in which both theory and practice have informed each other throughout. Its history is rooted in my previous investigations as well as those of others, and its future is paved by the findings reported here. For as many questions are answered in this dissertation, new ones have emerged. There will always be a logical next step.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Point of Departure

Readers of this dissertation will surely be familiar with the extensive body of research into second language (L2) pragmatics that has amassed since the 1980s, and they may therefore wonder why they should read yet another study of L2 pragmatic development. These same readers will no doubt also recognize that, despite the many insights into the nature of L2 pragmatic development provided by such studies, this research has not systematically investigated how language instruction itself may promote more advanced L2 pragmatic abilities. This is not to say that pedagogical research does not exist—it certainly does (see, e.g., Ishihara, 2010; Taguchi, 2011; Takahashi, 2010). However, research into instructional pragmatics has been primarily limited to investigations of the teaching of specific language forms and speech act realizations in relation to social conventions of appropriateness. And appropriateness—though fundamental to any theory of pragmatics or pragmatics instruction—is itself, however, often vaguely operationalized as idealized, norm-based rules for proper social behavior. Instruction centered on broader concepts such as social distance and power, though ubiquitously cited throughout the literature as independent variables influencing performance, has not, to my knowledge, made its way into pedagogical programs. Instead, it seems that pragmatics instruction is typically limited to illustrations of the actions achieved by forms and, in turn, how variation between available forms may fit into extant social conventions of use. The result is that while many language learners may develop advanced pragmatic performance abilities that align with perceived conventions of proper social behavior (Kasper & Rose, 2002), they do not necessarily develop the
capacity to assign meaning and significance to pragmatic choices, nor are they able to manipulate their linguistic resources to create the meanings they want to create.

The instructional program illustrated in the present study focuses, first, on the abstract concepts (meanings) relevant to sociopragmatics and, second, on illustrative forms through which these meanings are indexed in situated discourse. In this way, the approach is a cognitive linguistic one wherein meanings are mapped onto forms rather than the more traditional line of thinking in instructed L2 and pragmatics acquisition research wherein the goal is to map acquired forms onto meanings (Lantolf, 2011). The rationale for such an orientation is rooted in the very real difficulty that learners have in appropriating the social meaning potentials afforded by the L2, even if they already understand the functions of pragmatic forms (e.g., speech acts, address forms). As Kasper and Roever (2005) write:

The challenge that learners face in acquiring the pragmatics of a second language is considerable because they have to learn . . . not only how to do things with target language words but also how communicative actions and the “words” that implement them are both responsive to and shape situations, activities, and social relationships. (p. 317)

As argued throughout this study, to assist learners in developing their sociopragmatic capacity in an L2, instruction ought to focus primarily on the meanings—the concepts—that pragmatic forms instantiate in order to provide learners with a coherent, systematic orientation to using language.

This dissertation therefore represents an initial step toward designing pedagogies targeting L2 pragmatics around conceptual meanings rather than focusing predominately on the forms that instantiate them, an approach derived from Vygotsky’s (1997) writings on the significance of scientific, or theoretical, thinking for the artificial (i.e., intentional) development of mind in schooled contexts. The study reported here documents the results of a six-week concept-based pedagogical program in which university learners of French were provided with coherent, systematic explanations of the meaning potential of sociolinguistic and pragmatic variability. The concepts presented to these students centered on the indexical nature of language
(Eckert, 2008; Silverstein, 1992, 2003), intentionality in designing meanings (van Compernolle, 2011), and how these meaning potentials can be called upon to create, maintain, and transform identities, social relationships, and constructs of power in concrete communicative activity. Language forms were introduced not as the focus of instruction but instead as illustrative examples of how these broader concepts play out in actual language use. This focus on the appropriation of *categories of meanings* is meant to develop in learners the ability to intentionally control their use of language and to manipulate their semiotic artifacts (i.e., language forms) to meet their communicative goals (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Negueruela, 2008). As such, there is an emphasis on promoting learners’ critical awareness (van Lier, 2004) of what they are doing and why they are doing it as a means of developing their agentive capacity to use linguistic variants.

### 1.2 Social Appropriateness in Language Learning and Language Teaching

Sociopragmatics is fundamentally about social meaning in language use. It entails an understanding of the relationship between language and the sociocultural contexts in which it is used, as well as of the social actions accomplished through the use of language. This emphasis on the relationship between language and society/culture stands in stark contrast to formalist approaches to linguistics and language learning and teaching, which tend to abstract language as a formal system of rules separate from language users and contexts of use.

For the first half of the 20th century, the field of linguistics—and, by extension, the domain of language learning and language teaching—focused almost exclusively on studying language as an abstract system that was separable from the people who used it and the social contexts in which it was used. Saussure (1913/1969) proposed a distinction between *langue* (the abstract system) and *parole* (the actual use of language). He argued that if linguistics were to
become a true science on par with physics, biology, chemistry, and so forth, its object of study must be limited to the objective truths about the abstract system (*langue*) and, thus, must exclude what he saw as the often flawed and variable performance of language (*parole*). Chomsky (1965) made a similar argument as he was developing a generative theory of syntax—*linguistic competence* (the innate, deep semantic knowledge of the linguistic system that allows native speakers to formulate and process well formed sentences) was pitted against *linguistic performance*, with the former being heralded as the objective and, therefore, the proper object of study in linguistics.

In the 1960s, however, there emerged a number of alternative, functional-pragmatic perspectives on language. These included Austin’s (1962) doctrine of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, and Searle’s (1969) reinterpretation of Austin’s proposals as speech act theory. This perspective holds that language not only has a referential or semantic meaning but in fact accomplishes social actions through its use. Halliday’s (1973, 1978) systemic-functional linguistics, which adopts a sociological-semiotic perspective (as opposed to an innatist psychological-semantic perspective, cf. Chomsky, 1965), also puts contextualized language use at its center. The then-emerging field of sociolinguistics (e.g., Gumperz & Hymes, 1974; Hymes, 1964, 1972; Labov, 1972) provided insight into the nature of actually performed language with an emphasis on appropriateness and its relationship with a variety of sociocultural factors.

Within the field of language teaching and language learning, insights from these functional and sociolinguistic perspectives were quickly adopted. In particular, Hymes’s (1964, 1972) work on the ethnography of communication, and his concept of *communicative competence*, received much attention as a potential framework to broaden the scope of the field beyond well formed, or formally accurate, sentences to include communication and social appropriateness (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983). As will be fleshed out below, Hymes’s
ideas were appropriated and reinterpreted as the bases for communicative approaches to language teaching and testing.

1.2.1 Foundations of communicative competence

As noted above, the notion that social appropriateness constitutes an important aspect of (first or additional) language learning derives from the work of Dell Hymes (1964, 1972). Hymes was unhappy with the way that formalist approaches to linguistics had abstracted language from its sociocultural context of use and, in many cases, had even gone so far as to disqualify analyses of language-in-use from the field of linguistics proper. Although Hymes recognized that the ability to understand and produce grammatical utterances was important, he argued that linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1965) was never enough. Instead, he insisted that as children acquire language, they also acquire the sociocultural knowledge required to use language appropriately. As Hymes (1964) wrote:

> it is not enough for the child to be able to produce any grammatical utterance. It would have to remain speechless if it could not decide which grammatical utterance here and now, if it could not connect utterances to their contexts of use. (p. 110)

Hymes referred to the ability to use language appropriately as communicative competence. To investigate language acquisition and use from the perspective of communicative competence, he developed a set of empirical research questions to be carried out in ethnographic studies that centered on four “parameters,” or criteria: whether, and to what extent, a particular use of language is formally possible, feasible, appropriate, and actually performed.

Hymes’s first criterion engages with more traditional schools of linguistics that focus on the grammaticality of possible sentences or utterances, particularly Chomsky’s (1965) work on transformational grammar. By formally possible, Hymes meant whether, and to what extent, the
linguistic system allows a given combination of sounds or words to be judged as grammatically acceptable. In this sense, Hymes’s term is similar to Chomsky’s notion of linguistic competence. However, Hymes’s possibility parameter differs in two important ways. First, he included not only linguistic grammaticality but also other culturally significant forms of nonlinguistic behavior, which, like language, have their own sets of “grammatical” rules (e.g., when, where, and with whom to shake hands). Second, Hymes was not interested in an abstract, idealized speaker-hearer as Chomsky was, but instead he was firmly committed to understanding what people can actually do in and with language. In this sense, Hymes’s possibility parameter is “dependent both upon (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use” (1972, p. 282). Importantly, for Hymes, what is possible to do in and with language is not co-equivalent with what is deemed to be correct usage in normative reference grammars. Instead, the possible encompasses what may be done and understood between people who share a common and conventionalized, yet malleable, semiotic system. This is a crucial distinction between Hymes’s conception of the possibility criterion and traditional views of grammaticality because it recognizes that language users are able to creatively manipulate their semiotic artifacts.

The three remaining criteria are related to the actual performance, or production, of language. Feasibility refers to the psycholinguistic dimension of a speaker’s capacity to process formally possible utterances either in production or comprehension, including “memory limitation, perceptual device(s), [and the] effects of properties such as nesting, embedding, branching and the like” (Hymes, 1972, p. 285). The feasibility criterion holds that not all formally possible utterances can be feasibly processed. Canale and Swain (1980) illustrate this point with the following sentence: “the cheese the rat the cat the dog saw chased ate was green” (p. 4). The sentence is formally possible (i.e., grammatical) because it follows the rules of English for embedding relative clauses. However, it cannot feasibly be processed automatically. Indeed, it takes quite a bit of conscious processing to understand the relationship between the main clause
(i.e., *the cheese was green*) and the embedded relative clauses (i.e., *the rat ate the cheese, the cat chased the rat*, and *the dog saw the cat*). To be sure, Hymes (1972) underscored the fact that feasibility was a relative notion that was dependent upon the “means of implementation available” (p. 281). For example, Canale and Swain’s illustrative sentence can be more feasibly processed in written form, where a material artifact (i.e., a written text) is produced, than in spoken interaction, where language is ephemeral. In fact, it is doubtful that many people would be able to spontaneously produce or automatically process such a sentence in spontaneous speech.

*Appropriateness* entails the sociocultural and pragmatic effectiveness of a given utterance that is formally possible and feasible “in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated” (Hymes, 1972, p. 281). Just as not all formally possible utterances are feasible, not all feasible utterances are appropriate in all contexts. Instead, the appropriateness of a given utterance depends on its relationship to specific sociocultural activities. Hymes therefore argued that the *speech event* ought to serve as the minimal unit of analysis rather than the utterance or sentence in isolation. For this, he developed a mnemonic device to describe the elements of a given speech event known as the SPEAKING model (Hymes, 1974), shown in Table 1.1. By using the SPEAKING model, Hymes sought to understand what forms of linguistic (and nonlinguistic) behavior constituted specific speech events or social activities. In this way, Hymes’s notion of appropriateness is not about predefined or static judgments of what constitutes “proper” and “improper” social behavior but instead addresses the way in which language simultaneously reflects and shapes activity types (Levinson, 1992). Put another way, speech events are in large part determined by the qualities of the elements described in the SPEAKING model, which in turn come to be associated with what is recognized as appropriate language in the context of a particular type of speech event. It is important to note that Hymes’s conception of appropriateness does not exclude the possibility that unconventional language use can be entirely appropriate. Rather, unconventional uses of language can be socially significant and meaningful, for instance
when speakers diverge from conventional patterns and meanings to initiate or respond to a shift in activity types, sarcasm, humor, and so forth (van Compernolle, 2011).

**Table 1.1.** Hymes’s (1974) SPEAKING model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Setting and Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Act Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Instrumentalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth criterion—whether, and to what extent, something is actually performed—goes to the heart of Hymes’s theory of communicative competence as a theory of language use. As Hymes (1972) noted, “something may be possible, feasible, appropriate and not occur” (p. 286). In other words, there may exist many imaginable possible, feasible, and appropriate utterances, but it does not mean that all of them will actually be performed at some point in time. Instead, there are probabilistic conventions of language use that determine which subset of formally possible, feasible, and appropriate utterances will be used during a given speech event. At the time Hymes was developing a theory of communicative competence, this particular claim was largely speculative (Cook, 1999, p. 65); findings from quantitative sociolinguistics in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Labov, 1972) and, later, in corpus linguistics (e.g., Biber, 2006) have
provided evidence of the probabilistic nature of language-in-use. It is important to note, however, that Hymes did not intend to disqualify low-frequency or non-occurring utterances from his research program in favor of only those utterances that could be frequently observed. Instead, for Hymes, this was a research question to be explored through empirical investigations.

The four parameters of language advocated by Hymes represent a solid theoretical foundation for explorations of communicative competence. However, it should be kept in mind that Hymes’s intent was not to develop a strict or formalist doctrine for language analysis but instead to promote an approach that sought to investigate the relationship among the four components of communicative competence and, by extension, “the circumstances in which the demands of one may outweigh the demands of another” (Cook, 1999, p. 65). There are certainly times when the use of some instance of language that is not formally possible is perfectly acceptable, just as there are times when it is perfectly appropriate to use a form of language that has never before occurred. Authors, poets, and comedians, for instance, frequently use language in unconventional ways for stylistic effect. Such is also naturally within the capacity of everyday language users whose communicative competence enables them to intentionally and meaningfully manipulate their semiotic artifacts to meet their communicative needs.

1.2.2 Communicative competence in L2 teaching and testing

The rise of communicative competence within the field of L2 teaching and testing emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as language educators and researchers became increasingly frustrated with traditional pedagogical approaches, namely grammar-translation and audiolingualism. Hymes’s socially-oriented perspective on language-in-use proved to be a welcome alternative for those interested in foregrounding communicative ability in language pedagogy. One early example is provided in Savignon’s (1972) study of the coping strategies...
employed by learners of French to achieve successful communicative interaction. Savignon argued that the ability to express, interpret, and negotiate meaning in context was ultimately more important than one’s formal knowledge of grammatical rules in isolation, because knowledge of a grammatical rule does not necessarily imply the ability to use that rule for communication.

In an important reinterpretation of the concept of communicative competence, Canale and Swain (1980) outlined the theoretical bases for communicative approaches to L2 teaching and testing. Engaging with, and expanding upon, Hymes’s (1972) work, Canale and Swain proposed a three-part model of communicative competence, which included grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence (comprised of two subcomponents, sociocultural competence and discourse competence), and strategic competence. Importantly, Canale and Swain eliminated Hymes’s notion of feasibility “since perceptual strategies, memory constraints, and the like would seem to impose themselves in a natural and universal manner” (Canale & Swain, p. 16). In short, they argued that knowledge of feasibility was irrelevant for L2 teaching and testing in practice because language users typically neither produce nor encounter instances of language that are not feasible.

*Grammatical competence* refers to knowledge of and ability to use the linguistic system, including lexis, phonology, morphosyntax, and semantics. In other words, grammatical competence is the knowledge of what is *formally possible* in Hymes’s terms. The role of a speaker’s grammatical competence, according to Canale and Swain (1980), is “determin[ing] and express[ing] accurately the literal meaning of utterances” (p. 30). It is noteworthy that Canale and Swain did not endorse any particular linguistic theory to describe grammatical competence, nor did they maintain that “a theory of grammar is directly relevant to [L2] pedagogy” (p. 29).

*Sociolinguistic competence* addresses the social meaning of utterances, and in this way articulates with Hymes’s notion of *appropriateness*. As noted above, sociolinguistic competence is comprised of two subcomponents. *Sociocultural competence* refers to the appropriateness of
utterances “within a given sociocultural context depending on contextual factors such as topic, role of participants, setting, and norms for interaction” (ibid.). In addition, sociocultural competence entails knowledge of and ability to use particular grammatical forms to convey an appropriate register or style of language (e.g., sociostylistic and pragmatic variation). Discourse competence refers to knowledge of and ability to create cohesion and coherence in language. Canale and Swain’s definition of sociolinguistic competence thus resonates with the components of Hymes’s SPEAKING model (see above).

Strategic competence encompasses communication strategies used “to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence” (ibid.). In this way, strategic competence articulates with the survival or coping strategies identified by Savignon (1972), which included a speaker’s ability to cope with momentary lapses in memory, inattention, miscomprehension, and so forth as well as gaps in one’s lexical and grammatical knowledge during communicative interaction. In their model, Canale and Swain highlighted two categories of communication strategies: those related to grammatical competence (e.g., strategies used to compensate for insufficient control over grammatical forms) and those that relate to sociolinguistic competence (e.g., strategies used to compensate for insufficient sociocultural knowledge).

The components of communicative competence identified by Canale and Swain (1980) have served as the basis for discussions of communicative approaches to L2 teaching and testing. Canale (1983) slightly modified the original model by separating discourse competence from sociolinguistic competence as a distinct fourth component of communicative competence. Savignon (1983, 1997) contributed to discussions of classroom practices for communicative language teaching, and Bachman (1990) formally developed a communicative approach to language testing based in large part on the models presented in Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983). Although these models (among many other discussions; see Widdowson, 1989,
2003) contributed to further defining the individual components of communicative competence, they did not substantially contribute to operationalizing a functional model of the interrelations among them. It was not until an influential paper by Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell (1995) that the individual components were respecified, elaborated, and reorganized into a relational model.

Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model of communicative competence refines and elaborates the four components presented in Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983): (1) grammatical competence, redubbed linguistic competence, (2) discourse competence, (3) sociolinguistic competence, which they renamed sociocultural competence, and (4) strategic competence. Importantly, they also added a fifth component, actional competence, to reflect the notion that communicative competence is a theory of language use. They defined actional competence as “competence in conveying and understanding communicative intent, that is, matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force (speech acts and speech act sets)” (p. 17). Although pragmatic ability was present in the Canale and Swain model under sociolinguistic competence, Celce-Murcia et al. distinguished it as actional competence in order to separate actional intent from sociocultural factors.

While Celce-Murcia et al.’s discussion and elaboration of the constituent components of communicative competence is enlightening, the real contribution of their paper is the organization of the components into a functional-relational model. As noted above, previous discussions of communicative competence focused primarily on defining the domains of competence but there was no real attempt to operationalize how they related to one another. At the center of Celce-Murcia et al.’s model is discourse competence, which reflects the importance that the authors ascribe to issues of discourse cohesion and coherence, deixis, genre (formal schemata), and conversational structure. Discourse competence itself then both shapes and is shaped by
sociocultural competence, linguistic competence, and actional competence. As Celce-Murcia et al. explain:

our construct places the discourse component in a position where the lexico-grammatical building blocks [i.e., linguistic competence], the actional organizing skills of communicative intent, and the sociocultural context come together and shape the discourse, which, in turn, also shapes each of the other three components. (p. 9)

Strategic competence, then, links all of the other components, which is meant to suggest that it is “an ever-present, potentially usable inventory of skills” (ibid.) enabling speakers to negotiate communicative actions and cope with problems as they arise. Celce-Murcia (2007) has further refined this functional-relational model communicative competence to include interactional competence, which integrates actional competence from the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) and conversational competence using insights from conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), as well as formulaic competence to emphasize the importance of routines, collocations, idioms, and lexical frames in discourse.

As discussed above, models of communicative competence have focused primarily on what is formally possible in language (grammatical or linguistic competence) and what is appropriate in context (sociolinguistic or sociocultural competence, discourse competence). The criterion of what is actually performed (probability) underlies each of the various components. In addition, as we have seen in the discussion of Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model, the ability to use language (actional competence) has also emerged as a distinct component of communicative competence (see also Widdowson, 1989). However, as elaborated in the following section, Hymes’s original ideas—which were developed in the form of empirical research questions—have been reindexed to fit the (perceived) needs of language educators. In many cases, the original concept of communicative competence as potentiality and ability has been replaced by a rather strict doctrinal approach to pedagogy (Leung, 2005; Widdowson, 2007). This is particularly relevant for discussions of appropriateness, both in the sense in which Hymes used
the term to refer to sociocultural conventions (e.g., the SPEAKING model) and in relation to what is deemed appropriate for teaching and learning in a classroom context.

1.1.3 Critical perspectives on the notion of appropriateness

Cook (1999) notes that models of communicative competence, while welcome alternatives to traditional grammar-centered approaches to language competence, led to a tendency to over-emphasize appropriateness at the expense of what is formally possible, feasible, and actually performed. Likewise, the rise of corpus linguistics led to an over-emphasis on what is actually done (i.e., authentic uses of language attested in corpora), “which can be at the expense of developing knowledge of what is possible and appropriate” (p. 65). What Cook points to is a reconceptualization of Hymes’s ideas—originally conceived as empirical questions—for the purposes of language pedagogy that centers on the identification of a clearly defined set of linguistic practices that count as “the language,” and which can be standardized and codified for use in normative reference grammars and learner textbooks (see also Widdowson, 1989).

Leung (2005) argues that when applied to English language teaching, the original meanings of Hymes’s ideas vis-à-vis a set of ethnographic research questions were reindexed for language teaching professionals concerned with what to include in teaching materials and curricula. As he writes, “Hymes’s research-oriented ideas have gone through an epistemic transformation: from empirically oriented questions to an idealized pedagogic doctrine” (p. 124). The source of such a transformation, according to Leung, is that language teachers and materials developers are not directly concerned with situated, ethnographic research into the processes by which communicative activity is achieved. Instead, “they are more directly concerned with what information or content should be included in the curriculum and how such content should be worked on in the classroom” (p. 125). Leung continues:
The need to specify what is to be taught and learned inevitably turns research questions, which allow the possibility of both instability in existing knowledge and emergence of new knowledge, into pedagogic guidelines and principles which have to assume a degree of stability, transparency and certainty in existing knowledge. (ibid.)

In short, curricula and materials designed around communicative approaches to language teaching came to be based on an idealized native speaker. There is some irony in this transformation inasmuch as Hymes’s original ideas were themselves part of a critique of Chomsky’s (1965) idealized speaker-hearer living in a homogenous speech community and highly abstract notion of linguistic competence. The result is that appropriateness in language is no longer judged on the basis of observation and ethnographic research but “according to some normative assumptions of language practice set in an imagined social exchange” (Leung, 2005, p. 131).

In response to the influence of corpus linguistics in language teaching, Widdowson (2007) argues that Hymes’s (1964, 1972) four interrelated principles of whether, and to what extent, some instance of language is formally possible, feasible, appropriate, and actually performed have been abandoned in favor of a view of language that privileges only the attested utterances of native speakers. In essence, the creativity and meaning potential of the possible has been left by the wayside, having been deemed incorrect or inappropriate for learning if not attested as having actually been performed. The result, writes Widdowson, is that “[s]uch conflation disregards the obvious fact that the reality of actually performed language depends on its appropriate relationship with context, and that a use of language can be entirely appropriate without being attested as having been actually performed [italics added]” (p. 219). Elsewhere, Widdowson (2003) has suggested replacing the notion of communicative competence, associable in many ways with the Chomskian notion of linguistic competence (cf. Chomsky, 1965), with the concept of communicative capacity. Communicative capacity does not entail “replications of native speaker realities” (Widdowson, 2007, p. 218) but instead refocuses attention on the meaning-making possibilities offered by the language, even if such possible utterances do not
reflect probabilistic native speaker conventions. In short, communicative capacity entails a
critical awareness (van Lier, 1988) of the relationship between Hymes’s four kinds of judgments
and the ability to act upon them to create meaning.

Dewaele (2008) offers an insightful discussion of appropriateness from an emic, or user-
relevant, perspective based on opened-ended questionnaire data elicited from bi- and
multilinguals. In line with the arguments presented by Leung (2005) and Widdowson (2007),
Dewaele insists that a purely etic framework of what counts as appropriate and inappropriate
language use can never fully capture the dynamic nature of how appropriateness is negotiated and
evaluated in situated communicative activity. In other words, Dewaele recommends
complementing more static assessments of appropriateness, which may be motivated by doctrinal
pedagogical or curricular factors (cf. Leung, 2005), with L2 users’ own perspectives on, and
explanations of, what they consider to be appropriate. In this sense, although conventions of use
may be observable from the outside, appropriateness actually entails locally constructed and
dynamic evaluations of, and orientations to, what is being said and how it is being said from
moment to moment within a given communicative interaction.

It should by now be clear that the notion of appropriateness, while central to every
discussion of communicative competence, is one of most ambiguous terms used in the L2
learning and teaching literature. In fact, the notion of appropriateness has become polyvalent
within discussions of communicative approaches to language teaching. On the one hand, and in
relation to Hymes’s original use of the term (see above), there is the question of what counts as
appropriate language use in particular sociocultural contexts—that is, how contextualized
language use can be judged as appropriate or inappropriate. On the other hand, there is concern
regarding what is appropriate for teaching and learning, or put another way, what the inclusion
and exclusion criteria may be for developing curricula, syllabi, language teachings materials,
tasks, and so forth.
As will be further elaborated in this chapter, the perspective I take on judgments of social appropriateness—as Hymes used the term—centers on two fundamental parameters:

1. The degree to which a particular instance of language use—whether conventional or unconventional—is interpretable by one’s interlocutor(s) or audience given the discourse situation in which language is being used.

2. The degree to which a particular instance of language use—whether conventional or unconventional—is effective in reflecting and (re)shaping activity types, social relationships, and/or social identities.

The phrasing “the degree to which” in both criteria is meant to suggest a continuum, and in this way foregrounds the fact that the appropriateness of language-in-use is rarely—if ever—a binary appropriate/inappropriate, right/wrong dichotomy. Instead, there may be many varying degrees of appropriateness, judgments of which will undoubtedly vary from individual to individual. In addition, I opt to use the terms “conventional” and “unconventional” as replacements for Hymes’s grammatical/formally possible criteria to reflect the contingency of language-in-use (van Lier, 2004), meaning that what is possible in language depends on both the design (speaker intention) and interpretation of an utterance. Conventionalization (i.e., regularization of patterns of language use) provides speakers with resources for designs of meaning, but speakers need not always reify conventionalized patterns of language and meaning (van Compernolle, 2011).

These two criteria also depend on the specific activity type in which language is used, which necessarily implies an interlocutor or audience, whether physically present (as in the case of face-to-face spoken interaction) or physically and/or temporally displaced (as in the case of writing). In this sense, appropriateness is interactional—a particular instance of language cannot be judged without reference to what is going on, what other participants are doing, how language is being interpreted, and so forth. The point here is that “appropriateness” cannot be reduced to rules of use in a doctrinal, norm-referenced, way (e.g., rules of thumb, prescriptivism, formulas for use). This is why concepts (meanings) are important for language pedagogy. By promoting the internalization of categories of meanings, and how these meanings in turn map onto linguistic
forms, there is the potential avoid prescriptivism and unsystematic pragmatic knowledge (e.g.,
rules of thumb) in favor of sociopragmatic creativity and intentionality that is performed on the
basis of meaning. To be sure, this implies that some consideration of unconventional uses of
language is also needed, whether this entails grammatically/structurally unconventional language
use (i.e., diverges from linguistic conventions) or simply unconventional in the sense that a
particular grammatical form, word, topic, and so on is not typically used in some context (i.e.,
diverges from social-context-specific conventions).

1.3 An Introduction to Pragmatics from the Perspective of Sociocultural Theory

As noted earlier in this introduction, the study reported in this dissertation was an initial
tempt at organizing a pedagogy of L2 sociopragmatics around the proposals of Vygotsky (1997)
and his followers (Davydov, 2004; Galperin, 1989, 1992). One of the challenges that this
presented was developing an understanding of pragmatics, appropriateness, conventions, L2
sociopragmatic abilities, and so on from the perspective of sociocultural theory, and how these
concepts might fit into a concept-based pedagogical program. In the following sections, I provide
a brief sketch of pragmatics from the perspective of sociocultural theory.

1.3.1 Pragmatics, pragmalinguistics, and sociopragmatics

At its most basic level, pragmatics focuses on the way people accomplish actions through
language. For example, a common area of inquiry focuses on the realization of speech acts such
as invitations, apologies, and requests. Inviting someone to a party, apologizing for being late,
and requesting to borrow a book are all actions that can be—and are more often than not—
accomplished at least in part through written or spoken language. Other actions accomplished
through (or at least fundamentally shaped by) language include problem-solving, teaching, reflecting particular world views, creating and maintaining interpersonal relationships, performing social-relational roles and identities, and so on. How these actions are accomplished—that is, the language choices made by speakers—and their effects on other people are in turn subject to various communicative constraints and affordances. In this respect, Crystal (1997) offers a useful definition of pragmatics as a user-centered perspective on language-in-use.

[Pragmatics is] the study of language from the perspective of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication. (p. 301)

Crystal’s definition is particularly well suited for research into L2 pragmatics because it allows for any instance of language use, learning, and development to be studied from the perspective of pragmatics (Kasper & Rose, 2002), as long as the focus of investigation remains on users’ choices, constraints, and effects of language use during communication.

From the perspective of sociocultural theory, the ability to accomplish actions through language is mediated by the sociocultural resources available to a person. Mediation in this sense refers to Vygotsky’s (1978) proposal that higher forms of human cognition are accomplished through the integration of cultural tools, including language, cultural scripts, and concepts.

Recalling Hymes’s (1972) model of communicative competence, these resources—or mediational means—include possible and feasible language forms as well as a person’s knowledge of which forms may or may not be appropriate for a given speech event. Also relevant here is Leech’s (1983) and Thomas’s (1983) now-classic bifurcation of pragmatics into pragmalinguistics—the intersection of pragmatics and grammar—and sociopragmatics—the intersection of pragmatics and society or culture. Both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge mediate social action.
Pragmalinguistics entails knowledge of the conventional linguistic means—in Hymes’s terms, the formally possible and feasible instances of language—through which social actions can be accomplished (e.g., the various ways of requesting the loan of something such as *Give me that book* vs. *Could I borrow that book?* vs. *I was wondering, if it isn’t too much of a bother, whether you might consider loaning me that book, just for a little while*). In this way, pragmalinguistics are the conventional tools used to mediate social action. However, speakers do not simply use any and all pragmalinguistic resources randomly or inconsequentially. Instead, sociopragmatic knowledge intervenes to mediate the choices speakers make from among these pragmalinguistic resources given present goals for the course of action and potentially changing circumstances. Sociopragmatic knowledge involves an understanding of the conventions of “proper” or “appropriate” social behavior, including what to say to whom and when, as well as an understanding of the social consequences of conforming to or breaking those conventions.¹ In short, sociopragmatic knowledge mediates the choices speakers make in implementing the available pragmalinguistic resources in the accomplishment of social action. This relationship is depicted in Figure 1.2 as three interlocking ovals. In this respect, Cole’s (1996) conceptualization of context as the interweaving of goals, means of implementation, and schema for deciding from among the means of implementation is particularly insightful (see also chapter 2). Social actions are goals to be accomplished (e.g., inviting someone to dinner), and these actions are mediated by the means available to speakers (pragmalinguistics), the selection of which is in turn mediated by speakers’ knowledge of sociocultural schema, concepts, and social relations (sociopragmatics).

¹ This is true for discrete linguistic forms (e.g., speech act realizations, address terms) and for such broader categories as interactional routines and preference organization in conversation.
In sum, as with any cultural-historical (Vygotskian) perspective on human activity, mediation lies at the center of a sociocultural conceptualization of pragmatics. Social actions, pragmalinguistics, and sociopragmatics are interwoven facets of goal-directed activity. As language users, we employ linguistic resources with an objective in mind, and we use our knowledge of sociocultural schema to choose the resources that can be used to achieve our goals the way we want to achieve them. While this view certainly includes conventional patterns of meaning and language use, the emphasis on agentive language use leaves open the possibility that the way in which we want to accomplish a given goal may break social conventions. In other words, we can choose to conform to or reject conventions of appropriate social behavior every day because we know what the consequences of doing one thing or another may be given present circumstances. It is this information—clear, systematic sociocultural schema—that is often missing from L2 pragmatics instruction.

1.3.2 From conventions to conceptual meanings

Prevailing ideas of what constitutes sociosituational appropriateness in communicative language teaching have relied almost exclusively on frequently occurring, and often idealized,
conventions of language (Cook, 1999; Dewaele, 2008; Leung, 2005; Widdowson, 2007). The result in L2 pragmatics instruction has been a rather doctrinal approach to teaching pragmatic features of language in relation to these conventions. However, little attention is paid to broader sociocultural, conceptual schema of meanings.

The perspective I take in this dissertation does not favor a priori the replication of NS conventions—at least not in the sense of attaining a so-called “perfect” acquisition of NS sociopragmatic conventions, which are all too often conceived of as a set of rules governing appropriate (correct, proper) language use. Instead, sociopragmatic capacity entails a critical understanding of the sociopragmatic (social) meaning potential of language, and the ability to deploy sociopragmatic features of discourse consciously and deliberately for meaning-making purposes. This line of thinking is, in essence, an extension of what van Compernolle and Williams (forthcoming a) have labeled as sociolinguistic agency:

Sociolinguistic agency can . . . be defined as the socioculturally mediated act of recognizing, interpreting, and using the social and symbolic meaning-making possibilities of language. It consists of an understanding of how the use of one linguistic variant or another simultaneously reflects and creates the context in which it is used, is a performance of one’s social identity at the time of utterance, and affects one’s environment and interlocutor(s). Sociolinguistic agency is neither a trait characteristic nor a property of an individual. Instead, it is enacted from moment to moment, from utterance to utterance, between people at the local, contextualized level.

This is not, to be sure, an argument against incorporating conventional patterns of language use into language pedagogy (van Compernolle, 2010a). Conventional patterns and meanings of language are important resources for the active design of meaning (New London Group, 1996; van Compernolle, 2011). However, pedagogical interventions that rely exclusively on conventional patterns and meanings of language as the basis for promoting learners’ use of sociopragmatic features of discourse may miss a great deal of the local, contextualized, and discourse-sensitive aspects of language.
[C]onventions, while based on empirical evidence (e.g., language corpora), are merely probabilistic patterns of language use. When introduced into language pedagogy, sociolinguistic conventions often become confused with invariable rules (e.g., a deterministic ‘either/or’ application of a rule) and, thus, are detached from their probabilistic underpinnings as well as any notion of the meanings created through their use. (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming c)

A pedagogical approach aiming to develop sociopragmatic capacity in L2 learners requires an alternative perspective on the relationship between social appropriateness and language. Most previous research exploring instruction in the domain of pragmatics has focused on, first, the teaching of pragmatic forms (i.e., pragmalinguistics) and, second, social meaning and appropriateness (i.e., sociopragmatics). This traditional pragmalinguistics-to-sociopragmatics approach assumes—at least implicitly—that the acquisition of forms must precede the development of one’s understanding of and ability to use language in relation to its social-interactive, discourse-pragmatic, relational, and identity-relevant functions. The perspective taken in the present study, however, is that in order to develop sociopragmatic capacity in an L2, instruction should focus on the concepts relevant to sociopragmatics. The main rationale for such an approach is that many concepts are relevant to a wide array of sociopragmatic features of language. For instance, the concepts of self-presentation, social distance, and power relationships—and how they are conceptualized among different groups of people—are pertinent to virtually every instantiation of language, including forms of address, directness and

---

2 To be sure, Kasper and Rose (2002), among others, consider the relationship between pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, and pathways connecting the two, to be open for empirical investigation. In other words, while most research in the L2 pragmatic competence tradition has focused on pragmalinguistics first and, second, how sociopragmatic competence may then develop through socialization, whether sociopragmatic development may precede the acquisition of pragmalinguistic forms is an empirical question. Evidence presented in van Compernolle and Williams (forthcoming a) suggests that form acquisition need not precede the development of the ability to make meaningful sociolinguistic or sociopragmatic choices.

Also pertinent to this discussion are studies investigating the relationship between grammatical competence or general language proficiency and pragmatic competence (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Geyer, 2007; Matsumura, 2003; Pearson, 2006; Xu, Case, & Wang, 2009). Findings reported in this research suggest that classroom language learners typically develop grammatical competence and general proficiency before sociopragmatic knowledge or competence. However, this is not surprising given the tendency to focus on formal aspects of language (e.g., grammar) without reference to sociopragmatics in most language learning contexts.
indirectness, register variation, and so on. Thus, an emphasis on the social meaning of such concepts followed by instruction on forms has the potential to develop in students an understanding that language is not simply a collection of unrelated or isolated forms and functions. Instead, language is a functional sociolinguistic, semiotic system in which forms, functions, speech acts, registers, and so on together produce, reproduce, and transform social meanings. It is through the internalization of sociopragmatic concepts that learners may remediate their ways of accomplishing social actions through the pragmalinguistic resources available to them.

1.3.3 Reindexing sociopragmatic competence as sociopragmatic capacity

Throughout this chapter, I have used sociopragmatic capacity to replace the more common term sociopragmatic competence. This follows Widdowson’s (2003) proposal to replace communicative competence with communicative capacity or capability. This move is not a mere superficial renaming of sociopragmatic competence, but an attempt at fundamentally reconceptualizing sociopragmatics in an additional language as a “doing” rather than a “thing” or property of a learner (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a). Sociopragmatic capacity is not something (some “thing”) that is acquired and then remains within the learner’s brain or as part of linguistic competence; it is a doing reflected in the concrete form of communicative activity. Sociopragmatic capacity is situated in discourse and always moving, not abstracted or static. To be sure, any nominalization of a “doing” risks objectifying it as something to be acquired, possessed, but for readability sociopragmatic capacity seems to be a preferable alternative to the possible verb forms of it (e.g., to sociopragmatic, sociopragmatics-ing, sociopragmatic capacitizing).
This alternative terminology also reflects an expanded understanding of L2 sociopragmatics from a cultural-historically grounded but always future-oriented perspective on development. The term *competence* reflects a static, inside-the-head state that is too focused on a linear developmental trajectory leading toward nonconscious replication of native speaker norms and, at the same time, ignores the creative and situated nature of language-in-use. It is always backwards-looking, as most L2 pragmatics research indicates, in that assessments or evaluations of pragmatic competence are typically concerned with where learners have been (i.e., what they have acquired) but not where they might be going (i.e., what capacities are in the process of developing). In addition, the focus on *developing* sociopragmatic capacity is more commensurable with the Vygotskian notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978; see chapter 2). In essence, sociopragmatic capacity includes not only what learners can do independently (i.e., actual developmental level, where they have been) but also what they can do with external forms of mediation (e.g., cooperative interaction with a teacher, use of pedagogical diagrams)—that is, their *in-the-process-of-developing* capacity to use language.

### 1.4 Clarifications about the Framework

So far, this introduction has laid the groundwork for the remainder of this dissertation in terms of a general orientation to the teaching of L2 sociopragmatics. Before continuing, however, I believe it is important to preview a number of key points about the framework within which this dissertation is situated and to clarify some of theoretical and empirical underpinnings of the research. Some of the points about L2 sociolinguistics and pragmatics have been made elsewhere in greater detail (e.g., van Compernolle, 2010a; van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a, b, c). Other issues more generally related to L2 development and consciousness find their origins in Vygotskian L2 pedagogical research (e.g., Lantolf, 2007; Negueruela, 2003;
Negueruela & Lantolf, 2006) and neurolinguistics (e.g., Paradis, 2009). The details of the framework are also discussed in Chapter 2.

The most basic claim of the present study is that instructed L2 development—including the development of sociopragmatic capacity—is fundamentally a conceptual process (Negueruela, 2008). Culturally constructed concepts—whether spontaneously acquired in the everyday world or intentionally developed through formal schooling—mediate cognition (Karpov, 2003; Kozulin, 1995; Vygotsky, 1986). Concepts are not merely the content of thought but in fact frame thought such that we “think through” concepts. Because concepts are culture specific, a large part of L2 development entails “acquiring new conceptual knowledge and/or modifying already existing knowledge as a way of re-mediating one’s interaction with the world” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 5). Here, Agar’s (1994) neologism “languaculture” (p. 60) is important. In Agar’s view, the notion of languaculture reflects the union of language and culture, traditionally treated as independent of each other, as a dialectic that “re-establishes the unity between people and their fundamental symbolic artifact” (Lantolf & Thorne, ibid.). L2 sociopragmatic development may therefore be conceptualized as the appropriation of languacultural concepts and patterns of meaning. In other words, sociopragmatics is not simply about language in its cultural context—where culture is external to language and impacts upon it from the outside—but, instead, implies the union of the two, where language-in-use is simultaneously an expression of culture and a resource for the reification and transformation of culture.

At the same time, while some concepts may be more or less similar across various cultures, how they are enacted in and through social interaction and communicative activity can be highly variable. For instance, although both American and French cultures have similar conceptions of power-distance relationships, only French has a second-person (i.e., tu or vous)
distinction to encode such aspects of social relationships linguistically.\textsuperscript{3} Thus, learning to say “you” in French is about much more than mastering a few rules-of-thumb and the morphosyntax of second-person verb phrases; it also entails learning to operate within a new conceptual framework, namely that namely that \textit{tu/vous} choice in French both reflects and creates the qualities of social relationships and points to aspects of one’s own social identity (see Morford, 1997; Silverstein, 2003; van Compernolle, 2011; for L2 French, Kinginger, 2008; van Compernolle, 2010a).

Another important tenet of the framework is that the value of conceptual knowledge is directly linked to its relationship with practical activity—that is, \textit{use} (Vygotsky, 1997, 2004). It is never enough to acquire new conceptual knowledge detached from its context of use, and pedagogies that value explicit knowledge of the object of study (e.g., language) must include learning activities that link this knowledge to action. This not only has the objective of applying knowledge but also to transform it because knowledge and use, theory and practice, form a dialectic in which each dynamically exerts an influence on the other. Vygotsky was clear that this dialectic, \textit{praxis}, was fundamental to any theory of education and cognitive development.

The first two broad claims find support in Paradis’s neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism and L2 acquisition (Paradis, 2004, 2009). Paradis presents evidence that a great deal of adult SLA is subserved by the declarative memory system and, as such, is fundamentally a declarative or conscious process. This includes not only explicit metalinguistic knowledge developed through explicit forms of teaching but, as Paradis argues, includes such seemingly less conscious processes as noticing, deduction, and so on that, while perhaps not always at the level of awareness, are part of conscious learning processes. The result, he contends, is that adult L2 learners rely extensively on whatever form(s) of conscious knowledge they have when using the

\textsuperscript{3} Of course, English speakers can encode types of relationships through other means, such titles and honorifics, use of last names versus first names, and so forth. However, the pronoun \textit{you} does not itself encode information about social relationships as do the French pronouns \textit{tu} and \textit{vous}. 
L2. Through use of the L2, access to this knowledge can be sufficiently “speeded up” (i.e., accelerated) to be perceived as automatic. Paradis’ theory complements Vygotskian pedagogies that assign great significance to the quality of conscious (conceptual) knowledge in adult L2 development. In short, if adult L2 learners rely extensively on declarative knowledge, the quality of that knowledge becomes a central pedagogical concern (Lantolf, 2007).

1.5 Specific Research Questions and Organization of the Dissertation

This study aimed to address three questions related to the development of sociopragmatic capacity among instructed L2 learners of French:

(1) In what ways, if any, does concept-based language teaching (CBLT) affect the development of learners’ conceptual understanding of sociopragmatic variation?

(2) In what ways, if any, does CBLT affect the development of learners’ sociopragmatic performance?

(3) What is the relationship, if any, between learners’ conceptual understanding and use of sociopragmatic variation?

Figure 1.2 depicts the relationships between the research questions.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.2.** Relationships between research questions (RQs).
Including the introduction, this dissertation comprises five chapters. Chapter 2 delves into further detail about the theoretical, empirical, and methodological underpinnings of the preceding discussion as well as a description of the research design. Chapter 3 and 4 together form the analytic portion of the dissertation. In Chapter 3, I present a formal assessment of learners’ sociopragmatic development by comparing a variety of preenrichment and postenrichment data sources. Chapter 4, then, presents a qualitative treatment of developmental processes during the enrichment program. Chapter 5 concludes the dissertation by discussing the results of the study in relation to the research questions posed above, the implications of this research, and several directions for future research.
Chapter 2
Research Design

2.1 Introduction

The study reported in this dissertation draws from a variety of theoretical and methodological traditions that engage sociocultural and historical perspectives on language and cognitive development. Of these, Vygotskian sociocultural theory (SCT) of mind (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1985), and its extension to education in general and second language development in particular (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), serves as the primary theoretical foundation for the study. Central to the orientation to the teaching of scientific concepts related to sociopragmatics advocated here are the writings of two of Vygotsky’s adherents, P. Galperin (1989, 1992) and V. V. Davydov (2004). Their conceptualizations of concept-based approaches to instruction have framed the study in terms of materials design and the nature of artificial (i.e., intentional) cognitive development. Paradis’ (2009) account of the declarative and procedural determinants of second languages has provided additional support for the promotion and internalization of consciously learned metalinguistic knowledge from a neurolinguistic perspective.

Approaches to language analysis that emphasize contextualized communication and meaning rather than abstracted or derivational formalist approaches have shaped the pedagogical materials used in this study (i.e., concept explanations and pedagogical diagrams) as well the treatment of the data. These include emergentist and usage-based perspectives on the nature of language (Bybee, 2006; Bybee & Hopper, 2001; Hopper, 1987, 1998; Tomasello, 2003), theories of language and its relation to social activity (Garfinkel, 1967; Levinson, 1992; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), theories of indexicality and the construction of social relationships
(Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990; Silverstein, 2003), theories of language that recognize speakers’ active role in the design of new meanings (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; New London Group, 1996; Leontiev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1986), and the linguistics of communicative activity championed in sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

One of the consequences of turning to usage-based, meaning-centered theories of language and communication is a different understanding of the word “concept” in relation to its use in traditional linguistics, where linguistic concepts such as “pronoun” or “verb” center around linguistic forms. In addition, traditional linguistic concepts are simply definitions of terms used for linguistic research—they do not necessarily have meaning for everyday language users. In this study, such linguistic concepts are only a small part of what was required, namely some requisite terminology (e.g., “pronoun”), but the term “concept,” as used here, refers to the meanings instantiated through the use of language. As discussed in greater detail below, the concepts (i.e., meanings) presented in this study centered on the qualities of social relationships and identities indexed by the use of specific linguistic forms.

As highlighted in chapter 1, the approach to teaching sociopragmatics illustrated here took as its starting point that the concepts relevant to sociopragmatics in general (e.g., orders of indexicality, self-presentation, social distance, and power hierarchies) should form the basis for pragmatic instruction. In other words, instead of beginning by introducing learners to various forms, instruction should start with concepts that are relevant to a wide array of forms (see also Negueruela [2008] for a similar argument on the teaching of grammar). This approach—which I refer to as a sociopragmatics-to-pragmalinguistics approach—has as its objective to orient learners to the concepts that can guide their use of multiple features of language. To be sure, forms are important, but they may be meaningless if they cannot be connected to the concepts— the meanings—that they produce, reproduce, and transform during concrete communicative activity (van Compernolle, 2010a; van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a, c). The study
reported here sought to map conceptual meanings onto forms, which reverses more traditional approaches to SLA and L2 pragmatics, which seek to map acquired forms onto meanings.

This study therefore aimed to promote learners’ internalization of concepts relevant to sociopragmatics in general and three sociolinguistic features of French in particular: (1) the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous*; (2) the pronouns *nous* and *on* used for first-person plural reference; and (3) verbal negation with and without the proclitic negative morpheme *ne*. The motivation for selecting these three features as illustrative examples of sociopragmatic concepts was threefold. First, each has been extensively explored among both native and nonnative speakers of French, so there is ample evidence of sociolinguistic conventions, patterns of use, and patterns of development in the existing literature. This existing scholarship provides a solid background for the present investigation, including in materials development and in analyzing development. Second, these three features are highly frequent in a wide range of discourse situations. As such, learners are likely to hear and have to use one or more of them in any interaction in which they participate. Third, each feature is extremely salient in discourse. Using an unexpected variant (i.e., breaking with conventions of use, whether intentionally or unintentionally) draws much attention to one’s talk, and infelicitous use of these sociopragmatic variants can result in negative social consequences. Breaking conventions, however, is not necessarily undesirable; nonetheless, a conceptual understanding of the potential consequences of pragmatic choices may enable learners to purposefully converge with or diverge from conventions in full knowledge of the effect such choices may have on their interlocutors.

The students who participated in this study took part in a six-week extracurricular enrichment program. The enrichment program consisted of six one-on-one meetings with the researcher (tutor) during which participants engaged in a number of different tasks all aimed at promoting the development of their sociopragmatic capacity. Such tasks included language awareness interviews, appropriateness judgment questionnaires, and spoken-interactive tasks in
French modeled, in part, after Di Pietro’s (1987) strategic interaction methodology. In addition, pedagogical materials (e.g., concept explanations and pedagogical diagrams) were developed to guide the enrichment program.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Mediated mind

The central tenet of Vygotskian sociocultural theory is that the human mind is mediated by culturally constructed artifacts. In contrast to dualistic, reductionist accounts of human mental functioning, which assume that mental processes either originate in one’s environment (“upward” reductionism, behaviorism) or are biologically specified within the mind/brain of the individual (“downward” reductionism, innatism) (see Valsiner & van der Veer, 2000), Vygotsky posited a dialectical (i.e., organic, unitary) relationship between the biologically endowed and the culturally constructed. Human consciousness, for Vygotsky, emerged from the unity of biologically specified mental abilities and the internalization of culturally constructed mediational means. The integration of mediational means in cognitive activity effectively reorganizes and reshapes biologically endowed cognitive processes into higher forms of specifically human psychological functions. In short, “biology provides the necessary functions and culture empowers humans to intentionally regulate these functions ‘from the outside’ (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 55)” (Lantolf, 2006, p. 70). The human mind, therefore, is not coterminous with the brain but incorporates culturally based mediational means and extends to the physical body and the environment (Wertsch, 1998).

For Vygotsky, humans interact with the world through indirect or auxiliary (mediational) means. Thus, whereas the leading psychological theories of Vygotsky’s time posited a direct stimulus-response relationship between subject and object, Vygotsky insisted that cultural
artifacts allowed humans to create their own indirect, auxiliary, relationship with the world.

Through mediational means, “the direct impulse to react is inhibited, and an auxiliary stimulus [i.e., a mediating artifact] that facilitates the completion of the operation by indirect means is incorporated” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 40). He continued:

this type of organization is basic to all higher psychological processes. . . . [The auxiliary stimulus] transfers the psychological operation to higher and qualitatively new forms and permits humans, by the aid of extrinsic stimuli, to control their behavior from the outside [italics in original]. The use of signs leads humans to a specific structure of behavior that breaks away from biological development and creates new forms of a culturally-based psychological process. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 40)

Figure 2.1. Vygotsky’s mediation triangle.

*Note:* Adapted from Vygotsky (1978, p. 40); see also Lantolf and Thorne (2006, p. 62)

Vygotsky (1978) represented this indirect (mediated) relationship between subject and object as a triangle (Figure 2.1) in which the subject acts on the object via tools and signs. It should be noted, however, that Vygotsky never argued that direct stimulus-response processes did not exist in humans. Rather, he insisted that such processes belonged to a class of lower (i.e., not culturally based) psychological functions that humans shared with other animals, especially primates. Higher forms of culturally based psychological processes, however, incorporate cultural tools (i.e., mediational means), which allow humans to control their lower (i.e., natural or
biologically specified) psychological processes. As Cole (1996) points out, “natural” (i.e., unmediated) functions are located along the base of Vygotsky’s triangle in that there is a direct stimulus-response process, whereas “cultural” (i.e., mediated) forms of cognitive activity “are those where the relation between subject and environment (subject and object, response and stimulus, and so on) are linked through the vertex of the triangle (artifacts)” (Cole, 1996, p. 119). Higher or culturally based forms of mental activity include such processes as voluntary attention, intentional memory, and logical thought and problem solving, which of course rely on biologically specified functions in the brain but which are formed through the integration of mediating artifacts. For instance, intentional memory depends on one’s working and long-term memory capacities (i.e., biology) but also on artifacts (i.e., culture) allowing for the intentional control over these functions—that is, remembering what one wants to remember when one wants to remember it, and how one wants to remember it. Tying a string around one’s finger, writing a reminder note, or telling oneself to remember to run an errand are all examples of culturally based ways of intentionally controlling memory through the integration of physical and symbolic artifacts.

It is important to note that, within Vygotsky’s theory, artifacts are understood to be much more than physical objects isolated from human activity. Instead, artifacts can only be understood as a constitutive aspect of the activity in which they are incorporated (Cole, 1996). Understanding an artifact thus entails an understanding of how its use fulfills some aspect of human goal-directed activity and in turn comes to constitute that activity. In this regard, Wertsch (1998) offers the useful concept of the human-agent-acting-through-mediational-means to describe the unity of
human activity and artifacts. In other words, artifacts are not simply instrumental or supplementary material objects that humans can use to accomplish some action (e.g., the concepts of “cultural toolkit” or “person-plus” proposed by Wells, 1999 and Perkins, 1993, respectively). Human goal-directed activity and integrated artifacts cannot be truly understood independently of each other because “artifacts assume their character from the activities they mediate” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 67).

Although Vygotsky’s (1978) own research focused primarily on the mediating potential of tools and signs (e.g., physical objects and symbolic artifacts, such as language) introduced during the course of activity (cf. Vygotsky’s method of dual stimulation; see Wertsch, 2007), other scholars have expanded the notion of mediational means to include less explicit forms of mediation. Wartofsky (1973; as cited in Cole, 1996), for example, distinguished a three-level hierarchy that includes primary artifacts (e.g., tools and signs), secondary artifacts (e.g., modes of action using primary artifacts), and tertiary artifacts (e.g., imagined worlds that influence how we perceive the material world). For his part, Cole (1996) highlights the importance of cultural models, schemas, and scripts (which he categorizes as secondary artifacts following Wartofsky’s 1973 model) in structuring thinking processes and how we integrate primary artifacts into the activities we participate in. Wertsch (2007) distinguishes among explicit forms of mediation, which are intentionally introduced during the course of activity (e.g., physical objects, adult assistance), and less transparent, or implicit, mediating artifacts, such as internalized concepts. For the purposes of the present study, I simply wish to identify three broad categories of mediational means or artifacts: tools and signs, concepts, and activities. It should be kept in mind

---

4 Lantolf and Thorne (2006) argue with Wertsch’s (1998) use of agent in this term. As they write, “in our view, there are no uniquely human actions that are not mediated. . . . human agency appears once we integrate cultural artifacts and concepts into our mental and material activity” (p. 63). For this reason, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) enclose agent in parentheses. In essence, without mediation, there are no human agents.
that tools and signs, concepts, and activities do not function independently of one another, but instead form an integrated whole (Cole, 1996).

*Tools and signs* include material objects (e.g., hammers, pen and paper, calculators, computers) as well as semiotic systems, foremost among which is language (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). As noted above, tools and signs are only understood to be artifacts in the Vygotskian sense within the context of the activities they mediate. For example, language is understood to be a mediating artifact only within the context of language-mediated activities, not as the set of decontextualized and isolated sounds and structures privileged in formalist approaches to linguistics (Cole, 1996; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Thorne & Lantolf, 2007; Leontiev, 1981).

*Concepts* mediate human activity because they constitute systems of meanings that frame human mental activity (Vygotsky, 1986). As discussed in greater detail below, Vygotsky distinguished between *everyday concepts*, which spontaneously arise through extensive empirical experience, and *scientific concepts*, which are abstract yet systematic understandings of objects of study (Davydov, 2004; Galperin, 1989, 1992). Because conceptual knowledge, whether everyday or scientific, comprises networks or associations of meanings as well as relations among objects and other concepts, they fundamentally frame how humans know and act upon the world. As such, concepts mediate mental activity and, by extension, how humans use tools and signs in concrete material activity.

*Activities* themselves also mediate human behavior and cognition. Routinized patterns of interaction, cultural models, scripts, and schemas provide frameworks through which and within which humans operate (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1987). Activities comprise rules (conventions), divisions of labor, and available mediating artifacts (i.e., tools and signs, concepts) that are appropriate for the accomplishment of the activity in progress. In this regard, Cole (1996) notes that cultural scripts “[specify] the people who appropriately participate in an event, the social roles they play, the object [i.e., artifacts] they use, and the sequence of actions and the causal
relations that applies” (p. 126). Knowledge of the goals, roles, appropriate mediating artifacts, and sequences constituting activities is constructed from one’s experiences participating in phenomenologically similar events. In turn, this knowledge mediates one’s orientation to participation in future events.

The focus of the present study is on the role of scientific conceptual knowledge in L2 sociopragmatic development within a formal, structured educational setting, and how this knowledge frames the use of focal language features (signs). Before further delving into concept-based instruction, however, it is appropriate to discuss Vygotsky’s writings on educational praxis, specifically the role of scientific knowledge in the development of higher-order, culturally based forms of thinking that were specific to schooled contexts. The next section will situate for the reader the concept-based approaches to instruction later developed by two of Vygotsky’s followers, Galperin (1989, 1992) and Davydov (2004).

2.2.2 Educational praxis

Praxis—the unification of theory and practice—is one of the central commitments of sociocultural theoretic educational psychology. Vygotsky argued that, while practice was formally the mere application of theory, which “had practically no effect on the fate of the theory” (Vygotsky, 2004, p. 304), it was to be “the highest test of [the] theory” (Lantolf, 2008, p. 19). In short, Vygotsky believed that it was inadequate for educational psychology to limit its scope to the description of naturally occurring developmental processes; instead, he argued, psychology’s true objective was to be “a science of the laws of variation of human behavior and of the means of mastering these laws [emphasis added]” (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 10).

Vygotsky was careful to emphasize that his perspective on developmental education was not equivalent to experimental pedagogies that were primarily concerned with “the solution of
purely pedagogical and instructional problems by means of experiment” (1997, p. 10). Instead, his commitment to praxis meant that educational psychology was “concerned with psychological investigations applied in the field of education” (ibid.). For Vygotsky, formal education had the objective of promoting the “artificial mastery of natural processes of development” (Vygotsky, 1997, p. 88)—that is, intentionally promoting development through pedagogical intervention. In contrast to Piaget and other contemporary educational psychologists, who believed that instruction should follow natural developmental stages, Vygotsky argued that learning in a schooled context had the potential to cause particular kinds of cognitive development that were unlikely to occur in non-schooled (everyday) contexts.

Vygotsky considered education to be a specific form of cultural activity that had important and unique developmental consequences. . . . [E]ducation is not just an undertaking whereby knowledge is obtained, but it is indeed an intentionally organized (i.e., artificial) activity that restructures mental behavior. (Lantolf, 2008, p. 16)

According to Vygotsky, one of the key differences between natural or everyday development and artificial (intentional) development exists at the level of conceptual knowledge, in particular the distinction between everyday and scientific (or theoretical) concepts (Vygotsky, 1986).

Everyday concepts constitute empirical knowledge (Karpov, 2003) and are based on “an immediate observable property of an object” (Kozulin, 1995, p. 123). There are two types of everyday concepts: spontaneous and nonspontaneous. Spontaneous everyday concepts are generally inaccessible to consciousness without special education. For example, children acquire the grammar of their first language nonconsciously, and their appropriate use of the language does not depend on any conscious understanding of it. However, this knowledge can become open consciousness through schooling (e.g., learning grammar rules and parts of speech). Nonspontaneous everyday concepts are developed through conscious learning processes, whether in the everyday world or in formal educational contexts. As such, they are open to conscious inspection (i.e., awareness). For instance, the nonspontaneous everyday concept of a circle is
formed through the conscious abstraction of objects with the same or similar geometric shape with which one has had more or less extensive experience, “such as wheels, pancakes, bracelets, [and] coins” (Lantolf, 2008, p. 21). This kind of knowledge is akin to rules of thumb in language teaching: it provides some practical guidelines, but it is not coherent, nor is it part of a larger system.

Scientific concepts, by contrast, “represent the generalizations of the experience of humankind that is fixed in science” (Karpov, 2003, p. 66). They encompass the essential features of a given set of objects, which may not be immediately observable. To revisit the example of the concept of a circle, the scientific concept is “a figure that appears as the result of a movement of a line with one free and one fixed end” (Kozulin, 1995, p. 124; as cited by Lantolf, 2008, p. 21). The scientific concept describes all possible circles. As Kozulin (1995) notes, this definition of a circle “requires no previous knowledge of round objects to understand” (p. 124). Scientific conceptual knowledge of language therefore entails an understanding of the essential features of language. As argued in the present work, this kind of knowledge is semiotic rather than structural. To be sure, structure/form is important, but a holistic, systematic understanding of meaning potential must be the core of instructed L2 development. In other words, while traditional approaches to instructed SLA in general, and L2 instructional pragmatics in particular, have privileged form, the SCT framework begins with meanings (i.e., concepts).

Vygotsky (1986) acknowledged that everyday and scientific concepts have their own strengths and weaknesses. Everyday concepts are rich in empirical evidence and closely tied to everyday lived experience, and they can be used spontaneously or automatically. However, because they are empirical, everyday concepts lack generalizability, and they may not be transferable to circumstances that a person has not encountered before. Scientific concepts, however, have the advantage of being abstract and systematic, thus making their use applicable to the full range of possible circumstances. They are also explicit and therefore available for
conscious control. Yet scientific concepts are not necessarily linked to empirical experience and may take a very long time to become automatic. Keeping in mind Vygotsky’s commitment to praxis (i.e., the unification of theory and practice), he argued that “for scientific knowledge to be of value it must be connected to practical activity” (Lantolf, 2008, p. 21). In other words, acquiring scientific knowledge without developing the ability for use results in verbalism, or “knowledge detached from reality” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 217). The goal of formal education was, for Vygotsky, the artificial development of the student, with the scientific concept being the minimal unit of instruction. (For discussion of L2 learning, see Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, chap. 11.)

Although Vygotsky emphasized the role of scientific knowledge in educational praxis, he did not provide specific pedagogical recommendations in this respect. This was left to two of Vygotsky’s followers, P. Galperin and V. V. Davydov, who developed concept-based approaches to promoting the internalization of scientific concepts in educational settings.

2.2.3 Concept-based pedagogy

2.2.3.1 Principles of concept-based approaches to instruction

Following Vygotsky’s position on the value of conceptual knowledge in formal educational practice, Galperin (1989, 1992) and Davydov (2004) developed concept-based approaches to instruction. Although differences do exist between the Galperinian and Davydovian models—known respectively as systemic-theoretical instruction (STI) and movement-from-the-abstract-to-the-concrete (MAC)—both approaches treat scientific concepts as the minimal unit of instruction. As Ferreira (2005) notes, despite differences in these approaches, both Galperin and Davydov promoted conceptual instruction that “is explicit, linked to the leading activities [of
learners]... focused on conscious awareness of what and why one is doing what one is doing...

... and aims at developing autonomy and creativity in students” (p. 55). The main difference
between Galperin’s and Davydov’s respective approaches is in developing orienting models of
scientific concepts for instruction. For Galperin, the model is inflexible, a procedure used to
accomplish error-free action (Haenen, 1996, p. 190). For example, Negueruela (2003) developed
flow charts for teaching the concept of aspect in L2 Spanish. These flow charts led learners
through the process of selecting appropriate tenses for the meanings they wanted to create. As
such, although Negueruela’s study enabled learners to make creative, agentive choices regarding
verbal aspect, the flow charts served as a step-by-step guide for selecting appropriate tenses
without error. For Davydov, however, the model is flexible enough to guide learners through
quasi-investigation of a concept. The model encompasses the essence of the discipline and serves
as a tool for the development of theoretical thinking. Ferreira (2005), for instance, used
Davydov’s (2004) notion of a germ-cell model for teaching the concept of genre in an ESL
writing course. In this case, the model was open to evaluation and revision as learners developed.
Thus, rather than providing a step-by-step flow chart or diagram to produce error-free action, the
germin-cell model gave learners an orientation to exploring the concept of genre. (For an extended
comparison of STI and MAC, see Ferreira, 2005).

It should be noted that, although Galperin, and later Davydov, focused on teaching
experiments (STI, MAC), this research fundamentally addressed the problem of the development
of mind within Vygotsky’s overall project. What Galperin in particular demonstrated through his
STI experiments\(^5\) was that mental activity was not a mysterious internal process occurring solely
within the brain of the individual. Instead, mental activity arose in and through practical, material

\(^5\) It should be noted that Galperin referred to STI “experiments” not in the controlled laboratory
settings, but in classrooms. In line with Vygotsky’s (1997) position on developmental education (see
above), Galperin sought to perform psychological investigations in educational contexts by intervening in
the development of real learners. In this way, he was interested not only in teaching methods, but more
importantly in tracing the development of mental activity through pedagogy.
activity, which was goal-directed (i.e., purposeful) and always linked to the problems of real-life material activity. As Stetsenko and Arievitch (2010) write:

> the mind gradually arises in development . . . out of material activity because it serves the need to thoroughly examine emerging, new situations and to anticipate the consequences of actions within these situations prior to their physical execution. (p. 244)

And in a later passage:

> acting on the internal plane retains all the characteristics of human real-life activity—it is an active process of solving problems that exist out in the world and of searching for “what is to be done next” given present conditions and future goals. (pp. 244-245)

Thus, whether carried out on the internal or material plane, actions are goal-directed: “mental actions are carried out in the medium of meanings” (ibid., p. 245) whereas material actions are executed in physical activity. It is noteworthy the neither Galperin nor Davydov considered mental activity to occur only internally (privately), but also included externalized forms of thinking. Take, for instance, the example of an architect who draws blueprints and revises them before actually constructing a building (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). In essence, the building was constructed on the symbolic plane (i.e., in the blueprints) prior to its execution during construction. The blueprint represents the architect’s externalized mental activity (i.e., thinking on paper or in a computer assisted design program), which occurs prior to the physical construction of the building.

Concept-based pedagogy is therefore grounded in three basic principles (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). First, as mentioned above, concepts serve as the basic unit of instruction. Concepts are systematic representations of objects of study that guide learners’ actions during concrete material activity. The two remaining principals aim to support the internalization of relevant concepts: materialization of the concepts (e.g., in the form of pedagogical diagrams) and verbalization (e.g., explaining the concept as such and explaining one’s performance in relation to the concepts). As Lantolf and Thorne note, “These three principles are derived from Gal’perin’s
general theory of human mental functioning according to which mental activity is controlled by three processes: orientation, execution, and control” (p. 304). The orientation process (i.e., the planning function) “determines what and how something is to be done” (ibid.). The execution process represents the actual “doing” (i.e., activity), while the control process is responsible for evaluating whether, and to what extent, the orientation (i.e., plan) was successfully executed. Thus, the goal of concept-based pedagogy is to provide students with an orienting basis for action such that both mental and material activities are guided by coherent, systematic explanations of how to plan and execute actions, while at the same time enabling students to control and evaluate those actions in relation to their understanding of the activity’s goals. This approach has the potential to develop students’ agency, defined as the socioculturally mediated capacity to act and to assign meaning and significance to one’s actions given the constraints and affordances arising from one’s relationship with the environment (Ahearn, 2001; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; van Lier, 2008).

2.2.3.2 Concept-based second language instruction

To date, a number of studies have shown that internalized linguistic concepts serve a powerful mediational role in L2 development and use. Such studies have investigated the teaching of tense, aspect, and modality in Spanish (Negueruela, 2003, 2008; Negueruela & Lantolf, 2006), Spanish locative prepositions (Serrano-López & Poehner, 2008), genre in an ESL academic writing course (Ferreira, 2005), the concept of voice in French (Knouzi, Swain, Lapkin, & Brooks, 2010; Lapkin, Swain, & Knouzi, 2008; Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki, & Brooks, 2009), and Spanish literature and metaphor (Yáñez Prieto, 2008). In what follows, I provide a description of the research carried out by Negueruela and Swain and colleagues, cited above, as these projects have been the primary models for the research reported on in this dissertation.
Negueruela (2003) implemented a concept-based approach to instruction in an intermediate-level US university Spanish composition and grammar class. Students were presented with pedagogical models (diagrams) of the concepts of mood, aspect, and tense, assigned six at-home audiorecorded verbalization tasks in which they explained to themselves the relevant concepts, and engaged in several spontaneous spoken-interactive tasks outside of class over the course of a 16-week academic term. Negueruela documented in great detail how learners’ verbalizations (audiorecorded by learners at home) developed from rule-of-thumb-based explanations of the use of perfective and imperfective tenses to conceptually grounded, meaning-based understandings of the role of tense in assigning a particular aspectual perspective on a given event. This shift was suggestive of these learners’ thinking about language no longer as a set of rules to follow but as a system of meanings from which they could choose to fit their specific communicative purposes. Negueruela also documented marked improvement in these learners’ spoken performance, namely their agentive (i.e., voluntary, controlled) use of tense to assign specific meanings (aspect) to the events described. To be sure, the learners continued to struggle in performance, as evidenced by faltering control over linguistic forms from time to time. However, Negueruela explained that this should not be surprising since conceptual knowledge typically develops ahead of performance abilities (Valsiner, 2001). Elsewhere, Negueruela (2008) has described the internalization of categories of meanings (concepts) as leading to a Zone of Potential Development (ZPOD). For Negueruela (2008), the ZPOD entails the internalization of categories of meanings (i.e., concepts), which sets the stage for the (potential) development of communicative performance abilities.

Swain and colleagues (Knouzi et al., 2010; Lapkin et al., 2008; Swain et al., 2009) developed a one-time concept-based instructional intervention to teach the concept of voice in an intermediate-level Canadian university L2 French course, with a much more experimental design compared to Negueruela (2003) (i.e., with a formal pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest). Their
primary focus was on the role of verbalization, or *languaging*, in the internalization of linguistic concepts. Their study consisted of developing written concept explanations cards and pedagogical diagrams depicting the concepts for the learners to study independently in class. During an in-class intervention, students were prompted to speak to themselves (i.e., verbalize their thinking) in the presence of a researcher as much as possible. Their results indicated that all learners improved their understanding of the concept of voice, as measured by definition data (i.e., explaining the concept of voice) and a worksheet in which they identified voice in a text and explained how it functioned. However, interindividual differences were found, most notably the amount and quality of languaging varied across the learners. Their analysis, reported on in detail in Swain et al. (2009), suggested that high languagers (who performed better than the other groups on a posttest and delayed posttest) produced significantly higher rates of *self-assessment* and *inferencing* languaging units. Swain et al. (2009) identified three forms of inferencing:

(a) *Integration*: the participant uses information presented in previous cards; (2) *Elaboration*: The participant does not only show evidence of retaining the information presented previously but also appropriates the information either by incorporating it into prior knowledge . . . or by incorporating several pieces of information of the explanatory text; (3) *Hypothesis formation*: The participant forms a hypothesis based on what he or she has already learned or understood (p. 11).

*Self-assessment* refers to languaging units in which the learner monitors or evaluates his/her understanding of the concept. Based on their findings, Swain et al. (2009) argued that “it is not just that high languagers language more, but that they use language in qualitatively different ways, ways that mediate those processes important to the understanding of cognitively complex ideas” (p. 22).

What both of these research programs illustrate is that the internalization of conceptual knowledge is a key component of L2 development. As described earlier, concept-based pedagogy emphasizes three aspects of mental actions: orientation, execution, and control. Internalized concepts provide an orientation to action, and they also serve to control, monitor, and evaluate
action. Thus, conceptual knowledge is foregrounded as the central component of developing the ability to control one’s actions voluntarily to achieve one’s goal. In the following section, I describe how concept-based language instruction, namely the focus on developing conceptual (i.e., conscious, declarative, controlled) knowledge, articulates with recent insights from neurolinguistics.

### 2.2.4 Insights from neurolinguistics

As briefly noted in chapter 1, concept-based language teaching finds support in Paradis’ (2004, 2009) neurolinguistic account of bilingualism and the declarative and procedural determinants of second languages. Paradis (2004) points out that “[s]peakers who have learned a second language after acquiring their native language will compensate for gaps in their implicit competence by relying more extensively on the other components of verbal communication, namely metalinguistic knowledge and pragmatics” (p. 30). His argument, elaborated in Paradis (2009), is that once a person has acquired a first language, it becomes increasingly difficult to acquire languages beyond the first (in the sense of incidentally acquiring implicit linguistic competence). Yet, adult learners may develop what he calls “speeded up” (i.e., accelerated) access to explicit metalinguistic knowledge, which may in some cases be functionally equivalent to implicit linguistic competence during language use (i.e., the L2 can be produced fluently and effectively although it is controlled by the declarative rather than the implicit system). Repeated use of the L2, according to Paradis, may even result in the acquisition of some components of the L2 as implicit competence.

Paradis (2009) argues that gaps in one’s implicit L2 linguistic competence are compensated for by one’s available metalinguistic knowledge. Importantly, the model implies a continuum of reliance on metalinguistic knowledge or implicit linguistic competence rather than
an interface between the two in which metalinguistic knowledge becomes implicit linguistic competence. The two systems remain distinct because their operations are subserved by different neurological components, but an L2 user can rely on both systems in parallel during communication. Thus, while there is no interface between metalinguistic knowledge and implicit linguistic competence, L2 users may switch between the two, most notably when a gap in implicit linguistic competence necessitates the use of metalinguistic knowledge.

Adult L2 learners in formal (structured) educational contexts do not have a lifetime to acquire an additional language incidentally through repeated exposure to and use of a language, that is, the manner in which one typically acquires one’s first language (Paradis, 2009, p. 96). To compensate, adult L2 learners rely more heavily on their metalinguistic knowledge and declarative memory, which entails primarily those (not necessarily accurate) rules, conventions, and pragmatics that they have consciously learned through explicit teaching, noticing, deduction, and so forth, and that they are able to control to varying degrees. It is neurophysiologically impossible to transform explicit metalinguistic knowledge into implicit linguistic competence, except indirectly through repeated use of the L2 (Hulstijn, 2007; Paradis, 2009). In other words, for Paradis (2009), it is the implicit tallying up of patterns derived from actual L2 use that has the potential to lead to implicit competence acquisition. This is not to say, however, that adult L2 learners can never attain a high or even near-native level of proficiency in an additional language. In fact, “[e]xplicit learning may lead to speeded-up controlled use of a second language (and may even, with repeated practice, indirectly lead to the internalization of some components of L2)” (Paradis, 2009, p. 8). As Paradis argues in a later passage, while the so-called “normal acquisition of language, which results in implicit linguistic competence” (p. 117) appears to be determined by age, “language can also be learned, using cerebral mechanisms other than those used to acquire implicit linguistic competence, and resulting in conscious knowledge about form, namely metalinguistic knowledge that can be mastered to a high degree of proficiency. Its controlled use
can be sufficiently speeded up to be perceived as native-like” (pp. 117-118). To be sure, accelerated controlled use does not necessarily equate to accuracy, which depends on the quality of metalinguistic knowledge available to an L2 user.

While implicit linguistic competence may be preferred because it is automatic and does not require attention (consciousness), it can also be flawed or incomplete in the case of L2 learners. Acquisition of implicit competence does not guarantee accurate or appropriate L2 use, only that the neurophysiological process is automatic and does not come under conscious control. Likewise, as noted above, metalinguistic knowledge may be inaccurate or unsystematic: a learner may inaccurately deduce a rule based on conscious (empirical) experience (e.g., –ed marks past tense; therefore, the past tense of go is goed) or s/he may learn an unsystematic rule of thumb (Lantolf, 2007) presented by a teacher in the L2 classroom (e.g., the “rule” that –ed marks past tense, though not inaccurate, is not systematic since there exist irregular verbs such as go > went and since –ed past participles such as elated can also be used as adjectives). Thus, from a praxiological perspective on the teaching of L2s in classroom environments, the goal becomes one of promoting quality (i.e., accurate, comprehensive) metalinguistic knowledge (i.e., scientific concepts) while simultaneously creating the conditions under which learners are progressively able to speed up their controlled access to that knowledge during use. It follows that what is needed in the L2 classroom is systematic explicit teaching that develops learners’ metalinguistic knowledge that they can apply during L2 communicative activity.

In relation to adult L2 learning, Paradis’ (2009) neurolinguistic theory can help to illuminate the process of internalizing scientific concepts (i.e., explicit metalinguistic knowledge). As Paradis emphasizes throughout, metalinguistic knowledge itself can never become implicit competence. Instead, learners can develop speeded up access and control over metalinguistic knowledge in and through L2 use. Figure 2.2 depicts the acceleration process as the relationship between materialized, learned, and internalized scientific concepts in terms of a continuum of
regulation (i.e., from object to self regulation). It should be noted that *internalization*, in Vygotsky’s theory, is not equivalent to *implicit acquisition*. Therefore, there is no claim that an internalized concept is subserved by procedural neurological components. Instead, internalization of a concept entails its integration into consciousness such that a learner begins to think *through* the concept in addition to being able to think *about* and *apply* it. Indeed, the power of conceptual knowledge is that it is open to consciousness and can therefore be under a language learner’s control during L2 use.

![Figure 2.2. Continuum of regulation.](image)

Because concept-based pedagogy focuses on materialized scientific concepts as the minimal unit of instruction (for example, a flow chart for choosing verbal aspect; see Negueruela, 2003), the first shift in regulatory responsibility can be conceptualized as the decreasing reliance on the materialized concept and increased access to the learned concept (e.g., remembering components of the concept). This may be achieved through the application of the concept (model) to solve tasks and should eventually result in the progressive speeded up access to the learned concept, which would represent one transitional phase from object to self regulation. Where there
are gaps in the learned concept, however, learners may still rely on the materialized model to solve problems. Likewise, as learners develop and use their speeded up access to the learned concept while using the L2, there is the potential for them to internalize some components of the concept. However, because internalization entails a personalization of the mediating artifact (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), an internalized concept is qualitatively different (i.e., personally significant) from the materialized and/or learned concept as provided by a teacher. It is important to reiterate that the concept remains available to learners at all times. This continuous access (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985) to explicit metalinguistic knowledge (scientific concepts) serves a self-regulatory function for learners, simultaneously affording them a degree of control when they encounter difficulties as well as providing them with an orienting basis for creative language use.

2.2.5 Indexical order and designs of meaning

In chapter 1, I noted that the pedagogical program developed for this study was centered on Silverstein’s (2003) notion of orders of indexicality. Here, I present in greater detail what this concept means. In addition, I present a related concept, designs of meaning (New London Group, 1996), which was also central to the development of this study. Elsewhere (van Compernolle, 2011), I have discussed these concepts as two of the fundamental principles of a sociocultural orientation to variation in language. Briefly put, the framework privileges social meaning and situated language use over abstract linguistic structure in the investigation of sociolinguistic and pragmatic variation, taking an emergentist perspective on language rather than a derivational one (cf. variable rules, stochastic variables, etc.). This position may be summarized as follows:

we cannot presume that variation is a derivational process that takes an underlying form and variably applies rules prior to output. There is no underlying form. Instead, to borrow from Hopper (1998: 163), there is only a set of ‘sedimented conventions that have been routinized out of the more frequently occurring ways of saying things’ and that produce, reproduce, and transform
Silverstein (2003) introduces the notion of orders of indexicality to describe the dialectics of sociolinguistic phenomena. The dialectic, according to Silverstein, is the relationship between indexicals (e.g., sociolinguistic variants) and various degrees of social “meaningfulness.” An ‘n-th’ order (first-order) indexical is a feature of language that can be associated with a particular group (e.g., region or socioeconomic status) or semantic function (e.g., number-marking), indexicalities that can be discovered through tradition observational methods. However, an ‘n + 1-th’ order (second-order) indexical has been assigned “an ethno-metapragmatically driven native interpretation” (Silverstein, 2003, p. 212) and thus carries meaning in terms of one or more local ideologies, while an ‘(n + 1) + 1-th’ order (third-order) indexical is a feature that has come to be perceived as meaningful within another supralocal ideological schema. Second and third-order indexical meanings are not necessarily accessible to researchers through observational methods alone. To uncover them requires the adoption of more emic, ethnographic approaches to understanding a particular languaculture (Agar, 1994) that account not only for linguistic performance but the ways in which its members experience and make sense of their sociolinguistic worlds (Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008). As will be discussed below, the features of language focused on in this study are imbued with a wide range of second and third-order indexical meaning potentials.

The indexical field provides speakers with the basic ingredients for making meaning, or to borrow the New London Group’s (1996) terminology, “designs of meaning.” Variational practice entails the active process of staking claim to any number of meanings and ideologies indexed by existing language patterns. In turn, the active design of meaning participates in the propagation of these new potential indexicalities, hence the dialectic between conventionalized meanings available for use and the creative redesigning of meanings (Silverstein, 2003). Thus,
speakers do not simply draw from a sociolinguistic toolkit but ultimately have the potential to transform the patterns and meanings in and through discourse. As van Compernolle (2011) points out, the notion of designs of meaning articulates with Vygotsky’s (1986) distinction between meaning—the relatively stable “meaning” of a word—and sense—the psychological “meaning” assigned to a word in concrete communicative activity.

Approaches to teaching sociolinguistic and pragmatic features of second and foreign languages typically center on the sociolinguistic conventions (first-order indexicalities) reported in studies of native speakers and exposing learners to authentic discourse to provide them with evidence of these conventions (e.g., Etienne & Sax, 2009; Lyster, 1994; Nadasdi, Mougeon, & Rehner, 2005). In general, such approaches favor a one-dimensional view of variational practice as existing along a continuum of formality, broadly defined as ranging from more informal or colloquial to more formal or even hyperformal (literary), a view that privileges “attention to speech” (cf. Labov, 1972) as the leading factor in stylistic variation. Attention to speech certainly plays an important role in language style—particularly for L2 learners (Tarone, 1983, 1988)—but it serves only a mediative function in the construction of speech styles and personas (Bell, 1984, 2001; Eckert, 2000, 2005, 2008), which are drawn from the meaning potential of associative trends across a given speech community. Thus, while approaches to teaching sociolinguistic and pragmatic variation based on conventions are certainly beneficial for raising learners’ awareness of variation in language, alone they are limited to narrowly empirical representations of the first-order indexical meanings and typically ignore the meaning-making possibilities offered by various patterns and conventions of meaning and their associations with second- and third-order indexicalities. As argued by van Compernolle (2010a) and van Compernolle and Williams (forthcoming a, c), such narrowly conceived and often over-simplified explanations of variational practice do little to promote language learners’ conscious control over and agentive use of variation as a meaning-making resource.
Learning to control sociolinguistic and pragmatic variation in an L2 therefore entails an understanding of orders of indexicality (Silverstein, 2003) and their relationship to both micro and macro schemas of social meaning. Whereas L2 sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence have traditionally been evaluated on the basis of whether and to what extent a learner conforms to large-scale sociolinguistic conventions (i.e., first-order indexicalities), a sociocultural orientation emphasizes learners’ agentive role in constructing meaning—that is, their conscious and deliberate manipulation of the meaning-making resources available to them. As Lantolf and Thorne (2006) write, “[s]peakers are able to regularly shape their communicative artifacts to fit their meaning-making needs” (p. 17). Within this perspective, sociolinguistic and pragmatic variation is at the service of learners as a meaning-making resource and not simply a conventional rule to which they ought to conform. Although the specific dimensions of second-order and third-order indexicalities are usually available only to insiders, the concept-based approach to pragmatics instruction illustrated in this dissertation aimed to provide learners with a systematic way of thinking about social meaning beyond conventional patterns of language.

2.3 Participants

The participants in this study were all students enrolled in an intermediate-level French course focusing on oral communication and reading comprehension at the Pennsylvania State University, French 201. The rationale for recruiting from among this population was twofold. First, although French 201 students are generally communicatively capable in French, their experience with French is generally limited to what is taught in formal educational contexts. As such, their awareness of and ability to use the range of sociolinguistic and pragmatic variants available to French speakers is limited. Second, students enrolled in French 201 have already completed the university’s foreign language requirement and are therefore pursuing their studies
in French for their own purposes, for example a personal interest in the language, a desire to study abroad in the future, and/or a professional/career-related goal. This last reason was especially important in the present study because it was thought that learners in lower-level courses who were simply fulfilling a foreign language requirement may have been less willing to commit to a six-week extracurricular instructional program.

Participants were recruited from two sections of French 201 taught by the same instructor, a PhD candidate in French literature, during the first week of the Fall 2010 semester. Volunteers were offered compensation for their time in the amount of $60 for the study, which was prorated in the amount of $10 per session. Initially, 15 students expressed interest in the study; however, only 10 were able to arrange meeting times with the researcher. Of these, two withdrew from the study before it began without citing a reason for doing so. The remaining eight participants all completed the six-week study.

Table 2.1 displays basic information about these eight participants, including the pseudonym selected by or assigned to each participant, gender, and previous studies in French at the middle school, high school, and university levels. Five are females and three are males. All eight had previously taken French in middle and/or high school, including high school French at the Advanced Placement level 4 and/or 5. Six participants had taken one or two French courses

---

6 Although exploring motivations for learning French was not formally part of the present study, these issues arose during conversations between the researcher and the learners at various points during the six-week program. The three broad motivation categories listed here were all mentioned by several of the participants as reasons for continuing their studies in French beyond the university’s foreign language requirement.

7 I am grateful to the Center for Language Acquisition and the College of the Liberal Arts for awarding me the generous Gil Watz Dissertation Fellowship that funded this research.

8 The participants were given the option to select their own pseudonym to be used in this study or to allow the researcher to assign on to them. Susan, Leon, Pierre, and Conrad chose their own pseudonyms, while Nikki, Mary, Stephanie, and Laurie were names chosen by the researcher.

9 Advanced Placement (AP) courses are designed to provide high school students an opportunity to earn one or more semesters of college-level credit through examination. The exception here is Stephanie, who had four years of high school French but had not taken AP-level French.
(French 3, the final semester of the basic language sequence,\(^ {10}\) and/or French 202, an intermediate grammar course) at Penn State prior to enrolling in French 201;\(^ {11}\) the remaining two, Leon and Pierre, had not taken any university-level French courses. In addition, although all eight participants had had a number of years of previous French studies, none reported having had more than very little exposure to the language outside of a formal classroom setting. None of the participants were French majors or minors at the time of the study, though some were considering pursuing a minor, or at least advanced-level coursework, and/or participating in a study abroad program.

### Table 2.1. Participant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Previous studies in French: Years in middle school</th>
<th>Previous studies in French: Years in high school</th>
<th>Previous studies in French: Penn State courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 3, French 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 3, French 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 3, French 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>French 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^ {10}\) None of these participants was required to take French 3 at Penn State. However, those who chose to take this course did so because they felt they needed a “refresher” course for whatever reason (e.g., some stated having had “bad” high school teachers or having done poorly on an AP exam).

\(^ {11}\) French 201 and 202 are not sequential courses.
2.4 Enrichment Program and Data Collection

2.4.1 Overview of focal language features

In this section, I will present a brief overview of research into the features of French that are the focus of the present study: the second-person pronouns tu and vous; the first-person plural pronouns nous and on; and the variable use of the negative particle ne. The discussion will include research among native and L2 speaker populations.

2.4.1.1 Tu/Vous

Personal pronoun systems are important features of many languages for constructing and maintaining social relationships and identities. This is because pronouns indicating persons “include reference to specific social relations, knowledge of which is required for the relevant words to be used correctly” (Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990, p. 5). The French second-person pronouns tu and vous are particularly salient examples of the interrelationship between reference to persons and “reference to specific social relations.” Tu is generally considered to be the default singular second-person pronoun: it designates one interlocutor. Vous, however, carries the dual roles of both the plural form of tu (i.e., tu + a 3rd person, or tu + tu) and the formal, or polite, singular second-person pronoun used in opposition to tu (i.e., vous = polite or formal tu).12 However, French tu and vous, like many sociolinguistic features of language, are double indexicals (Silverstein, 2003). As Morford (1997) explains:

[French tu and vous] “index,” or point to, the relative formality of settings and occasions, as well as degrees of deference and/or intimacy between the speaker

---

and addressee; and second, the capacity to signal certain aspects of an individual speaker’s identity within the wider social order. (p. 5)

The interpretation of particular aspects of *tu/vous* use have also entered into supra-local ideologies, or what may be referred to as third-order indexicalities, which renders these pronouns capable of indexing a broad array of group memberships, politics, and ideologies.

Van Compernolle (2011) maps out a number of potential indexical meanings of *tu* and *vous* using Silverstein’s (2003) framework of *orders of indexicality* (Table 2.2). First-order indexical meanings are related to the sociolinguistic patterns of use that correlate with macrosociological categories (e.g., region, age, socioeconomic status, political leanings). In turn, these conventions, or the “differentiated correlations among [macrosociological] factors” (van Compernolle, 2011, p. 91), may serve as the basis for constructing second-order indexical meanings during the course of concrete communicative activity. To this can be added the metaevaluation of second-order meanings entering supra-local ideologies, or third-order indexicality. Although Table 2.2 depicts these potential indexical meanings in a somewhat static way, van Compernolle emphasizes that:

indexical meanings and associations with particular identities are, of course, not fixed but highly malleable [because they] are activated in the concrete form of the utterance. And utterances are never isolated. Instead, they follow preceding utterances and project futures ones as well. (p. 91)
**Table 2.2.** Indexical meanings of \textit{tu}/\textit{vous} choice in French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orders of Indexicality</th>
<th>Potential Meanings and/or Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **First-order indexicality** | Sociolinguistic conventions can be correlated with various social groups. For example:  
  - Generalized T use is widespread in Quebec whereas T/V distinctions remain conventional in France;  
  - Friends and family use T whereas strangers tend to use V;  
  - Younger speakers use T more frequently than do older speakers;  
  - Conservatives use V more frequently than do left-leaning individuals.  
  These conventions are observable by any linguist and represent only correlations with predetermined social factors. |
| **Second-order indexicality** | Sociolinguistic conventions are available as an indexical resource for speakers. Social meaning is attributed to T/V choice based on the correlations noticed by individual speakers. Here, T/V choice becomes a double indexical (Morford, 1997), which can serve to index both the nature of the relationship between two interlocutors and one’s social identity. Thus, V can be used to point to first-order indexicalities, such as distance between strangers, non-youthful (non-student) identities, conservatism, etc., while T can be used to point to familiarity, youthfulness, left-leaning politics, etc. To be sure, not all speakers will associate T/V use with the same set of potential second-order indexicalities. |
| **Third-order indexicality** | Third-order indexicality entails explicit metadiscourse (or ethnometapragmatics in Silverstein’s 2003 terms) about the T/V system, in particular noticing and valuating the second-order indexical meanings according to other ideological schemata. For instance, older, more conservative individuals may view the rise of T among younger, more liberal individuals as a sign of the loss of politeness or respect, and perhaps left-leaning individuals as a whole as rude or lacking respect for others. Young liberals, on the other hand, may see older conservatives as impolite too, because they refuse to use T to mark solidarity with others. Basically, the metadiscourse surrounding second-order indexicality points to associations with other political and ideological schemata (e.g., conventions for politeness/impoliteness, desire for solidarity/distance, desire for egalitarianism/hierarchical social order). |

*Note:* Adapted from van Compernolle (2011, p. 91).

Although learner textbooks offer advice for using \textit{tu} and \textit{vous}, explanations typically center on first-order indexicalities, such as relative age, interlocutor status, and so forth presented
as rules of thumb (van Compernolle, 2010a; van Compernolle et al., 2011; see also chapter 1). Such simplistic explanations may lead learners to assume (incorrectly) that *tu/vous* choice is a straightforward affair. Indeed, as Dewaele and Planchenault (2006) found in a study of learner perceptions, learners often judge the *tu/vous* system as easily navigable (based on simplistic rules of thumb) during the early years of study. However, as learners gain experience with and access to a wider range of social-interactive settings with French speakers (and, thus, second-order and third-order indexicalities), they begin to notice the more subtle complexities of the system and perceive it as increasingly difficult. Although some learners who have prolonged access to French-speaking communities and meaningful social relationships with French speakers (e.g., during study abroad) do indeed begin to uncover the indexical meaning potentials of these pronouns, their knowledge is often not very systematic but rather comprised of deductive rules derived from their concrete social-interactive experiences (see Kinginger, 2008).

L2 French learners often demonstrate variable or mixed patterns of *tu/vous* use that do not align with native speaker sociolinguistic conventions. Canadian immersion students who begin French instruction at a young age often overuse *tu* because of the preference for *tu* in learner-learner and learner-teacher interactions (Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990; Lyster, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 1990). However, immersion students who begin later (about 12 years of age) often overuse *vous*-singular (Swain & Lapkin, 1990), given the tendency for such learners to study relatively more formal varieties of French. (For a detailed overview of research involving Canadian immersion students, see Lyster and Rebuffot, 2002.) Similarly, McCourt (2009) and van Compernolle et al. (2011) have documented the quantitative patterns of *tu/vous* variation in a corpus of learner-learner synchronous computer-mediated interactions among US university students of French. Their results demonstrate that not only do learners demonstrate high levels of inappropriate or mixed use of *tu* and *vous*, but that this variation is related to the specific lexicogrammatical structures involved. Their argument, elaborated in van Compernolle and
Williams (in preparation), is that in addition to difficulties disambiguating the indexical potential of tu and vous, learners may also learn specific (semi)autonomous sequences by rote without being “associated with the units that comprise them” (Bybee, 2008, p. 219). It follows that lexicogrammatical motivations may sometimes override learners’ metapragmatic awareness as well as their grammatical competence (i.e., the ability to manipulate morphosyntax of second-person verb phrases) during relatively spontaneous language production.

Research on telecollaboration and study abroad has documented the important role played by participation in social interaction with expert language users in the development of appropriate tu/vous use. Belz and Kinginger (2002) investigated the cross-linguistic (i.e., French and German) development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning environments, focusing on two case studies (one learner from each language). In both instances, the telecollaborative partnerships resulted in an increased use of appropriate forms of address following the explicit questioning (on the part of French and German participants) of inappropriate pronoun use by the American learners. Thus, participation in social interactions where there exist social consequences for inappropriate tu/vous use is essential for the process of socialization. Similarly, learners of French who participate in study abroad programs often have opportunities to gain access to communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in which their understanding of and control over tu and vous can develop (Kinginger, 2008).

2.4.1.2 On/Nous

Another variable feature of the French pronominal system involves first-person plural reference. Whereas most reference grammars and pedagogical texts usually present the subject pronoun nous with a first-person plural verb form as the standard variant—as in nous allons au cinéma ‘we’re going to the movies’—the subject pronoun on with a third-person singular verb
form—as in *on va au cinéma* ‘we’re going to the movies’—has all but replaced *nous* in most varieties of everyday, informal, conversational French (Blondeau, 2003; Coveney, 2000; Fonseca-Greber & Waugh, 2003; van Compernolle, 2008b). In fact, Coveney (2000) notes that *nous* use is so infrequent in contemporary French that it may be considered as a vestigial variant (Trudgill, 1999) whose use is reserved for highly marked contexts. In addition, the *nous* variant can be used to emphasize the exclusion of the hearer from the reference (cf. “exclusive” *we*), or to refer “to a group seen from the outside” (p. 467). Van Compernolle’s (2008b) analysis of *on*/*nous* variation in corpus of synchronous computer-mediated French discourse confirmed this finding. At the same time, the author illustrated how the *nous* form has persisted as a resource for the construction of humor or to signal a microshift in style or activity type (see also van Compernolle, 2011). Thus, while there are clear first-order indexicalities associated with these pronouns (e.g., in terms of formality, speaker age, socioeconomic status), the conventions, or associative links, can be capitalized on by speakers in the very local, situated construction of personal meanings.

L2 French learners typically use the more formal *nous* variant at high frequencies, even in contexts where the more informal *on* would be appropriate (van Compernolle & Williams, 2009b). Positive correlations have, however, been found between contact with native speakers of French in noneducational settings and increased *on* use (Dewaele, 2002; Mougeon et al., 2010; Sax, 2003). This is also supported by study abroad research documenting learners’ performance before and after a sojourn in a French-speaking country (Regan et al., 2009). To my knowledge, only van Compernolle and Williams have reported on pedagogical research. They report that

13 It should be noted that *nous* remains obligatory as a direct object (e.g., *tu devrais venir nous voir* ‘you should come see us’), as an indirect object (e.g., *elle nous a dit la nouvelle* ‘she told us the news’), as a strong pronoun, such as a doubled subject (e.g., *nous on va voir un film* ‘us we’re going to see a movie’) or an object of a preposition (e.g., *chez nous* ‘our place’, *c’est à nous ça* ‘that’s ours [that]’), and as a possessive pronoun (e.g., *on va rester avec notre famille* ‘we’re going to stay with our family’), even when *on* is used as a subject clitic. The exception is in reflexive structures, where subject and object clitics agree (e.g., *nous nous appelons demain* vs. *on s’appelle demain* ‘we’ll call each other tomorrow’).
language analysis tasks within a whole-classroom ZPD can be effective in raising learners’ awareness of variation between *on* and *nous* (van Compernolle & Williams, 2012). In another study (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a), the authors showed how developing metasociolinguistic awareness can also lead learners to agentive use of stylistic variants such as *on*, though their performance lags behind their understanding of the meanings of the pronouns.

2.4.1.3 Ne...pas/Ø...pas

The presence versus absence of the proclitic negative particle *ne* in verbal negation is one of the best known stylistic variables in French (Coveney, 1996). Reference grammars and standard pedagogical texts depict verbal negation as involving *ne* (or *n*’ in prevocalic position) and one of several postverbal negative complements (e.g., *pas* ‘not’, *rien* ‘nothing’, *jamais* ‘never’) in an embracing structure, as in *il ne vient pas* ‘he is not coming’. However, *ne*’s absence, as in *il vient pas* ‘he isn’t coming’, is ubiquitous in nearly all varieties of informal or everyday French. Van Compernolle (2010b) provides a comprehensive overview of sociolinguistic analyses of French negation, highlighting the general trends (i.e., first-order indexicalities) documented as they relate to social, stylistic, and linguistic factors (Table 2.3).
Table 2.3. Social, stylistic, and linguistic factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region/Variety</td>
<td>Lowest frequencies in Canada (less than 1%) and Switzerland (2.5%). Rates in France range from ~ 1-20% in recent years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s Age</td>
<td>Older speakers tend to use <em>ne</em> more frequently than do younger speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>Some correlation between SES and <em>ne</em> retention, in that middle and upper-middle SES speakers use <em>ne</em> more frequently than speakers in lower SES. Effect less influential among younger speakers than among older ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Type</td>
<td><em>Ne</em> retention more frequent with nominal subjects and in nonovert subject environments (i.e., infinitive and imperatives) than with pronominal subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Expression</td>
<td>Frequently occurring expressions, e.g., <em>c’est pas, (il) faut pas, je sais pas</em>, may be becoming lexicalized without <em>ne</em>. Argument for grammaticalization of clitics and verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>More careful speech styles favor <em>ne</em> retention, while more relaxed settings favor <em>ne</em> deletion. <em>Ne</em> can be used productively for stylistic effect, e.g., emphasis, moralizing, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Adapted from van Compernolle (2010b, p. 451).

L2 French learners tend to use the *ne-*present structure at high rates (van Compernolle & Williams, 2009a). Similar to research on other stylistic variables, contact with native speakers outside of an educational setting positively correlates with increased *ne* omission (Dewaele, 2004; Mougeon et al., 2010; Sax, 2003), especially following a study abroad program (Regan et al., 2009). As with the *on/nous* variable, the only research conducted that incorporates instruction is that of van Compernolle and Williams. They report that explicit instruction is more effective in raising learners’ awareness of the meaning of variation when compared to simple exposure alone (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011) because explicit instruction, through instructional conversations, can provide developmentally rich patterns of interaction in the ZPD (van Compernolle & Williams, 2012). Subsequent research reported by these authors confirms that more extensive pedagogical intervention to raise learners’ metasociolinguistic awareness can also
lead to increasing control over these forms during spontaneous language production (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a, c).

2.4.2 Concept explanations and pedagogical diagrams

A small course text comprised of verbal (i.e., written) concept explanations and imagistic depictions of (components) of the relevant concepts (i.e., pedagogical diagrams) was developed for this study. At various intervals, think aloud questions were presented in an attempt to focus learners’ verbalized reflections on specific aspects of the concepts they were learning. More about these think aloud questions will be said below when the verbalized reflections are described.

The leading concept for the tutorial was based on Silverstein’s (2003) notion of orders of indexicality. This concept was chosen because it not only acknowledges probabilistic conventions for language use (i.e., first-order indexicals) but also how conventions enter into local (i.e., second-order indexicals) and supra-local (i.e., third-order indexicals) ideologies and social evaluations of language use. For the study, this concept was explained on four cards in addition to one diagram. The concept cards explained that (1) conventions emerge from the specific patterns of language use among different groups of people and in different contexts; (2) stereotypes are formed as people notice the conventions of certain groups of people and make broader judgments about those ways of speaking; (3) people draw from conventions and stereotypes to create meaning, by either conforming to or diverging from conventions; and (4) meaning is contingent upon both the design (i.e., intention) of the speaker and the interpretation of the utterance by an interlocutor, which may or may not converge. (These explanations were based on the sociocultural orientation to variation sketched out in van Compernolle, 2011.) The fifth card included a diagram depicting the relationship between conventions, stereotypes, and use of language (Figure 2.3).
This diagram aimed to depict for learners the dialectics of conventions, stereotypes, and local constructions of meanings. Two-way arrows are meant to suggest that each component exerts influences on the others in an ongoing and potentially unending process of meaning-making. The box at the top right of the diagram represents first-order indexicality, described here as observable conventions of language use. The box at the bottom right represents third-order indexicality, described to students as stereotypes about language use. The larger box on the left represents second-order indexicality, described as the way in which people use conventional patterns of and stereotypes about language to construct meanings. The larger size of this box is meant to focus learners’ attention to the active design of meaning (New London Group, 1996; van Compernolle, 2011), which was also the principal emphasis of the enrichment program—that is, promoting learners’ capacity to design their own meanings in relation to the possible
interpretations (based on the concepts presented below) of their use of language. It should be noted that the learners were regularly asked to consider this leading concept as they continued working through the materials. In other words, the more specific concepts presented below were contextualized within the *orders of indexicality* concept.

The second set of concept cards introduced learners to the three focal features of French (i.e., *tu*/vous, *on*/nous, verbal negation) addressed in the program as illustrative of how the concept of orders of indexicality plays out in actual language use, including examples of conventional patterns of use, stereotypes, and ways people use the language variants to make meaning. At the end of the section, the concept of *self-presentation* was presented as the first step in choosing to use either *tu* or *vous*-singular, *on* or *nous*, or negation with or without *ne*. The concept was depicted (Figure 2.4) as the difference between presenting oneself as “*t-shirt-and-jeans*” (*tu*, *on*, Ø...*pas*) versus “*suit-and-tie*” (*vous*, *nous*, *ne...pas*), and what the consequences would be for presenting oneself in one or the other way in various social-interactive contexts. It should be noted that the concept cards, as well as discussions between the tutor and the learners, also made it clear that mixing elements of “*t-shirt-and-jeans*” and “*suit-and-tie*” (e.g., using *vous*, *on*, and Ø...*pas*) was not only possible but an important semiotic resource.
This diagram is meant to encompass the potential indexical claims (Eckert, 2008; van Compernolle, 2011) invoked in the use of one variant or another in a simple, yet systematic fashion, based on culturally relevant images the learners most likely already recognized. The t-shirt-and-jeans image is meant to suggest such potential meanings as youthfulness, informality, coolness, and so on, while the suit-and-tie image draws on associations with conservatism, professionalism, formality, and so forth. To be sure, individuals will have different interpretations of these images and their relationship with language because we all experience the sociolinguistic world differently (Johnstone & Kiesling, 2008). Individuals will therefore necessarily differentially attribute indexical meanings to semiotic (linguistic and imagistic) artifacts. As such, variability across individuals (see chapter 3) in the interpretation of this diagram—as well as all other diagrams used here—should not be seen as a weakness of the design of the study but, to the contrary, as a strength of it in that the materials allow for individuals to internalize these concepts as their own. Internalization, as Vygotsky conceived of it, was not about the acquisition of
prepackaged knowledge but the process of appropriating culturally constructed artifacts and transforming them as one’s own (see Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, chap. 6).

The third section of the course text further delved into the indexical nature of *tu* and *vous*. Two well-known concepts in pragmatics were presented: (1) social distance and (2) power (or hierarchical status). Social distance was explained as the degree of familiarity and/or intimacy between two or more individuals, which may be previously established or not (e.g., existing relationships versus strangers). Thus, *tu/vous* choice was explained to maintain, establish, or possibly change the degree of social distance in a given relationship and was depicted as closeness versus distance. This was depicted as two persons standing close together (*tu*) as opposed to two persons standing with space between them (*vous*) (Figure 2.5).

![Pedagogical diagram 3: Closeness and distance.](image)

**Figure 2.5.** Pedagogical diagram 3: Closeness and distance.

Power hierarchies were explained in terms of *tu/vous* symmetry (Figure 2.6). While closeness or distance may be indexed via symmetrical *tu-tu* or *vous-vous* use, constructs of power (i.e., power over another person) may be brought into focus by establishing an asymmetrical *tu-
Ager (1990) gives the example of police officers using *tu* with suspects and expecting *vous* in return as the sociolinguistic extension of authority and legal power structures. As depicted in Figure 2.6, the difference between symmetrical and asymmetrical *tu/vous* relationships is in the degree of emphasis placed on, or construction of, hierarchical differences between interlocutors: two persons at about the same level (symmetrical *tu-tu* or *vous-vous*) versus one person placed above another (asymmetrical *tu-vous*).  

Figure 2.6. Pedagogical diagram 4: Relative status.

The fourth section of the course text provided more information about the absence versus presence of *ne* in verbal negation. Following a brief reminder of the concept of self-presentation, learners were introduced to the concept of linguistic emphasis. As documented in the sociolinguistics literature (Fonseca-Greber, 2007; van Compernolle, 2009, 2010b), the spread of

---

14 It should be noted that the seemingly equal status depicted for symmetrical relationships does not mean that institutional or other power/status differences do not exist. However, by establishing or maintaining a symmetrical *tu/vous* relationship, these differences are somewhat downplayed.
ne-absent negative structures in French has given rise to its use as a marker of emphasis. This is because ne’s presence is now considered to be a marked form and is therefore capable of drawing attention to a negative utterance. It was also explained that in communicative situations in which the presence of ne is ubiquitous (e.g., standard writing), its emphatic potential is diminished since it likely does not draw attention to the negation. This concept was depicted as the difference between a small yellow triangle with an exclamation point (Ø...pas, no emphasis) and a much larger copy of the same triangle (ne...pas, emphasis) (Figure 2.7).

![Diagram](image.png)

**Draw attention to negation?**

**Figure 2.7.** Pedagogical diagram 5: Emphasis.

The final section of the text revisited the variation between on and nous. Following a brief recap of the concept of self-presentation, the concept of inclusive/exclusive reference was presented. As noted above, on is the unmarked, or default, first-person plural pronoun in most varieties of Modern French. However, nous can be called upon in order to stress exclusion of the hearer (Coveney, 2000; van Compernolle, 2008b). Thus, the use of nous in social situations in which on is the default pronoun can emphasize that one’s interlocutor is not included in the first-
person plural reference. It was also explained, as with emphasis in negation, that contexts in which *nous* use is ubiquitous, it does not have the same potential to draw attention to the exclusion of the hearer. In addition, it was emphasized that *on* did not necessarily mean that the hearer was included, only that one’s interlocutor’s inclusion in or exclusion from the reference was not foregrounded. The corresponding diagram (Figure 2.8) depicts the speaker (the mouth), the hearer (the ear), and other potential persons included in the reference (smiley faces). On the left of the diagram, the ear (hearer) is within the circle (i.e., included in the group) whereas on the right of the diagram, the ear is outside of the circle (i.e., excluded from the group).

![Diagram showing inclusion and exclusion](image)

**Figure 2.8.** Pedagogical diagram 6: Inclusion and exclusion.

To summarize, the course text focused on six sociolinguistic concepts: (1) orders of indexicality (using conventions and stereotypes to create meaning); (2) self-presentation (t-shirt-and-jeans vs. suit-and-tie); (3) social distance (closeness vs. distance); emphasis (little triangle vs. big triangle); and inclusion/exclusion (ear/hearer within vs. outside of the circle). An essential
part of the concept explanations was the focus on the active design of meanings. To be sure, active designing does mean doing whatever one wants; speakers must engage with the conventions of language and meanings available to them and shared by others in their community, but they can manipulate these patterns and meanings to meet their communicative needs (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). As van Compernolle (2011) writes:

Variational practice is fundamentally about tapping into existing language patterns and conventions that are imbued with a broad array of indexical meanings and ideologies in the active process of staking claim to any number of those meanings and ideologies. In short, it entails the option of choosing one common way of saying something from among all available possibilities in the active design of meaning. (p. 92)

The concepts developed for this study, therefore, aimed to provide learners with an orienting basis for the use of linguistic variants grounded in meanings (indexicalities), any number of which they can stake claim to during concrete communicative activity.

2.4.3 Tasks

2.4.3.2 Verbalized reflections

Vygotsky (1997) argued that verbalizations (e.g., think aloud protocols) represent a type of secondary activity that allows individuals to distance themselves from tasks and to examine and evaluate the processes underlying their performance (Lantolf, 2003). Within this perspective, verbalization impacts and shapes as much as it reflects internal cognitive processes. In addition to verbalization during tasks (e.g., explaining, defending, and evaluating one’s own performance), verbalizing one’s understanding of a particular concept as such also plays an important role in the process of internalization. As discussed above, verbalization is an important aspect of concept-based approaches to pedagogy because it “transforms [thoughts] into artifacts that allow for
further contemplation, which, in turn, transforms thought” (Swain et al., 2009, p. 5). The struggle to articulate one’s holistic (inner) thoughts in speech or writing (externalization) has the potential to expand one’s conceptual understanding as well as to bring into conscious awareness aspects of the concept that may be poorly understood or currently beyond voluntary control.

In the present study, the participants engaged in what I am calling verbalized reflections as they independently studied the concepts and pedagogical diagrams presented above during the second session of the study (i.e., the beginning of the enrichment program proper; see below). The term verbalized reflection is meant to describe the activity of reflecting on the concepts presented in the text in verbal form. Verbalized reflections were prompted in two ways. First, participants were instructed to explain the concepts to themselves as much as possible as they read the explanations and considered the diagrams. Second, think aloud questions were written into the concept cards at various points instructing learners to consider specific aspects of the concepts and to link them to what they had previously learned. For example, the first concept card, which introduced the concept of stylistic variation, read as follows:

Stylistic variation refers to alternating between two or more ways of saying the same thing that have different social or stylistic values. For example, in English we can pronounce the word walking as walking or walkin’. The ing pronunciation is usually judged to be more formal or proper while the in’ pronunciation is usually judged to be more informal or “everyday.”

What can you infer from this explanation?

Can you think of any examples of how you might say the same thing in two or more different ways?

When? Where? With whom?

In addition, a second verbalized reflection task was given during the fourth session of the study. This time, the participants were instructed to explain each pedagogical diagram to themselves but
were not provided with the concept cards. Following both verbalized reflection tasks, participants were asked to explain to the researcher what they had understood. This served simultaneously to evaluate their learning and to provide clarification of aspects they may not have fully understood.

2.4.3.3 Appropriateness judgment questionnaires

Appropriateness judgment questionnaires (AJQs) were designed to be cooperative problem-solving tasks. (AJQs are provided as Appendix B.) For each AJQ, five situations were presented to the learners. They were instructed to consider the situation, the participants, and so on and to indicate whether they would use *tu* or *vous*, *on* or *nous*, and negation with or without *ne*. Some situations were designed such that the conventional choice of variants would be relatively clear, based on formality of context, interlocutor status, and so forth. Others, however, included some degree of ambiguity. Based on preliminary data collected prior to this study, it was clear that ambiguous items led to developmentally rich interactions because learners have to confront contradictions in their rule-of-thumb-based thinking and to reconsider them in relation to the concepts (meanings) they were learning (see also van Compernolle & Kinginger, in preparation).

The cooperative interactions that unfold during the completion of AJQs are revealing of learners’ orientations to social-interactive contexts and the meanings created by the language forms they choose. This perspective follows the general pragmatics literature as well. Golato (2003) notes that questionnaire-type instruments, such as discourse completion tasks (DCTs), provide insights into learner beliefs about, orientations to, and judgments of language use.

DCTs are in a crucial sense metapragmatic in that they explicitly require participants not to conversationally interact, but to articulate what they believe would be situationally appropriate responses within possible, yet imaginary, interactional settings. . . . This suggests that the DCT is a valid instrument for measuring *not pragmatic action, but symbolic action* [italics added]. (p. 92)
Such symbolic action has significance for learners’ orienting basis for material pragmatic action—that is, their metapragmatic or conceptual knowledge, and its development promoted through cooperation with an expert-mediator, can serve an orienting or planning function prior to the execution of pragmatic action in future social-interactive contexts.

2.4.3.4 Scenarios

Spoken-interactive scenarios—inspired by Di Pietro’s (1987) Strategic Interaction approach—were designed to provide learners with opportunities to use both more informal and more formal registers of spoken language in near-to-real-life situations with which the learners would be familiar (e.g., calling a friend to invite him or her to a party or speaking with a professor during office hours) (scenarios are provided as Appendix C). According to Di Pietro (1982), a scenario is “a strategic interplay of roles functioning to fulfill personal agendas within a shared context” (p. 41). A key component of scenarios, which distinguishes them from role-plays, is the tension created by providing each participant with a specific agenda without sharing all of the information with others. In other words, while the participants share some information regarding the context of the scenario, they are not aware of each other’s specific agendas, which should be designed to introduce some (potential) conflict. For example, in one of the scenarios performed in this study, the researcher and participants played the roles of future roommates searching for apartments. The unshared information, which created the tension, included budgetary constraints regarding the maximum monthly rent one was able to pay and proximity to the University campus. The goal of such scenarios is to push learners to strategically negotiate the conflict. As an extension of this idea to the domain of pragmatics, the scenarios used in this study also aimed to push learners to project, and potentially reshape, particular qualities of social relationships and identities through the use of the pragmalinguistic options available to them.
Although critiques have been leveled against tasks that require learners to suspend reality to participate in an imaginary role as being too cognitively demanding (Kasper, 2001), it was decided that scenarios were best suited to the pedagogical goals of this study. This is particularly evidence when one considers that, unlike traditional role plays, scenario consist of a rehearsal stage, a performance, and a debriefing. In order to minimize cognitive demand, efforts were also made to provide as much information about the students’ roles as possible so that they did not have to create the role on-line. In addition, the rehearsal stage also provided an opportunity for learners to ask questions to clarify their role, scenario, and objectives for the interaction. It was this stage that learners also responded to three planning questions: (1) What do you think about the relationship between these people? (2) How do you want to present yourself in this scenario? and (3) How can you use language to accomplish these goals? Thus, in cooperation with the researcher, the learners were able to develop a plan of action prior to the execution of the scenario. To be sure, the learners were free to change their plan depending on how the scenario unfolded. This planning stage articulates nicely with concept-based approaches to instruction, which emphasize the orientation function of mental actions as guiding material activity.

It should also be noted that scenario performances in this study involved cooperative interaction from the researcher. In cases where the learners’ performance faltered, the researcher intervened to mediate their performance through prompts, leading questions, hints, and so on. This approach derives from interactionist approaches to dynamic assessment (Poehner, 2008), which encourage mediators not only to assess but pursue problems in performance as they arise. Excerpt 2.1 shows one such example. For this scenario (attempting to find an apartment to rent), Leon had planned to use negation without *ne*. However, his performance faltered in line 3, where he initially used *ne* twice before self-correcting. The tutor intervened (line 4) to ask Leon what he had wanted to say, which elicited a repetition of the appropriate form from Leon (line 5), which he then used again as he and the tutor continued the scenario (line 7).
Excerpt 2.1

1 Tutor: est-ce qu’y a quelque chose qui est + peut-être

   *is there something* *that is maybe*

2 un peu moins cher, + mais=

   *a little less expensive* *but*

3 Leon: =um, + je ne + uh je ne pouvais- + je pouvais pas

   *um* *I [NEG] uh I [NEG] could* *I could not*

4 Tutor: what do you want to say, + wha=-

5 Leon: =je pouvais pas.

   *I couldn’t*

6 Tutor: okay, + je pouvais pas,

   *I couldn’t*

7 Leon: je pouvais pas + #uh# trouver un autre

   *I couldn’t* *uh* *find another*

As further developed in chapter 4, this type of cooperation helped learners not only in their current performance, but in developing better control (i.e., self-regulation) and consistency in future performances as well.

2.4.4 Summary of the research design

Data for this study were collected over the course of six one-on-one sessions between participants and the researcher/tutor (Table 2.4). All meetings were video recorded. These recordings constitute the primary source of data analyzed in this study. Because participants met with the researcher outside of a formal, structured classroom context, arrangements were made to accommodate the participants’ schedules, including rescheduling meetings. Thus, although the
study comprised six weekly sessions, the data collection period actually lasted for 7.5 weeks, in order to accommodate make-up meetings for individuals having missed a scheduled session due personal reasons (e.g., sickness). Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that all eight participants who started the program completed it; in fact, individuals who missed a meeting seemed eager to reschedule to complete the study. (As a reminder to the reader, specific descriptions of the materials are provided above and in appendices B and C.)

Table 2.4. Outline of the research design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preenrichment data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preenrichment LAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AJQ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scenarios 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of concept-based materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Verbalized reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AJQ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Scenarios 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Verbalized reflection (diagrams only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AJQ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Scenarios 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postenrichment data</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Postenrichment LAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeat AJQ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scenarios 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 1 of the program represents an attempt at assessing learners’ actual level of development (i.e., what they know and are able to do independently at the start of the program), including a language awareness interview (LAI), an appropriateness judgment questionnaire (AJQ), and two scenarios aiming to elicit informal and formal speech (see above). This first session also served as a diagnostic assessment in that the researcher noted specific areas of difficulties for each individual to be followed up on in subsequent sessions.
Sessions 2 to 5 represent the enrichment program proper. During this period, the participants were introduced to the concepts via the concept explanations and diagrams (session 2) asked to verbally reflect on the concepts (sessions 2 and 4), and cooperatively worked with the researcher/tutor on various AJQs (sessions 2 and 4) and SIs (sessions 3 and 5) to develop their conceptual knowledge and performance abilities. The enrichment program aimed not only to provide multiple opportunities to engage in similar tasks but also to withdraw mediation progressively. Thus, while verbalized reflections during session 2 took place while the participants had access to the full verbal concept explanations, they had access only to the pedagogical diagrams during session 3. Similarly, during interactive tasks (i.e., AJQs, scenarios), the researcher/tutor sought to provide the least explicit assistance required to position the participants to contribute maximally to the task (see Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

Session 6 was designed to mirror session 1 as a means of comparing preenrichment and postenrichment metasociolinguistic awareness and performance abilities. As such, the participants engaged in another LAI centered on the same guiding questions as in session 1, the same AJQ used in session 1 as a means of directly comparing preenrichment and postenrichment performance, and scenarios that were very similar to those used in session 1.

### 2.5 Formal Assessments and Qualitative Treatment of the Data

As noted above, the primary source of data for this dissertation is the corpus of video recorded CBP sessions in which learners and the researcher engaged in several types of learning tasks. Analysis of the videos included repeatedly watching and annotating the videos and transcribing and retranscribing the interactions. Because video provides a rich source of both verbal and nonverbal behavior, annotation and transcription of the data was also sensitive to embodied features of interaction, such as gaze and gesture.
As highlighted throughout this chapter, the present study focuses on both conceptual knowledge and performance abilities, as well as the relationship between the two. In addition, within the sociocultural framework adopted here, both process and product are equally important to understanding in what ways the enrichment program promoted (or did not promote) sociopragmatic development. As such, the analytic emphasis of this dissertation is twofold: (1) the outcomes of the study in terms of sociopragmatic awareness and performance abilities; and (2) the processes by which sociopragmatic development occurred.

In chapter 3, the results of the study are presented. The focus is on the product of the study in terms of conceptual knowledge and performance abilities as evidenced by language awareness interviews, appropriateness judgment questionnaires, and scenarios. In short, chapter 3 presents in broad strokes “what happened” during the study, a snapshot of development at both group and individual levels. Both quantitative and qualitative data are shown in order to provide a holistic view of the results of the study.

The focus of interest in chapter 4, then, is on the qualities of the various developmental processes identified in the data. The analyses in this chapter are an exploratory effort to specify some of the processes involved in sociopragmatic development within the context of a concept-based approach to instruction. The chapter begins by investigating the role of verbalized reflections. The focus then turns to the qualities of cooperative interactions that took place during appropriateness judgments questionnaire tasks. The final analytic focus of chapter 4 is on how dynamically administered scenarios lead to development, as well as a discussion of what counts as evidence of speeded-up (i.e., accelerated) controlled use of sociopragmatic variants.
Chapter 3

Results and Analysis of Sociopragmatic Development

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and analysis of the development of sociopragmatic capacity among the eight students who participated in this study. The analysis centers on three specific areas: (1) sociopragmatic awareness as evidenced in language awareness interviews; (2) symbolic action as evidenced by appropriateness judgment questionnaires; and (3) sociolinguistic performance as evidenced by language production during scenarios. Because several sources and types of data are considered in this chapter, the formal assessment of sociopragmatic development is necessarily multidimensional. Such an approach to the assessment of sociolinguistic and pragmatic development has been advocated elsewhere as a means of arriving at a fine-tuned evaluation of learners’ abilities, which may not always be revealed by a single type of data collection instrument (Kinginger, 2008; van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a, c).

This chapter begins with a presentation of the findings of the preenrichment and postenrichment language awareness interviews in which the students were asked to describe their understanding of the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous* ‘you’, the pronouns *nous* and *on* ‘we’, and verbal negation. The next section reports the findings of the preenrichment and postenrichment appropriateness judgment questionnaires, with a focus on both sociopragmatic choices and orientations to the situations presented to the students. The following section presents an analysis of sociopragmatic performance in scenarios, reporting findings related to the consistency of language variants during speech production as well as the learners’ orientations to the situations across the six-week program. The final section includes a discussion of the overall findings and the relationship among the various areas of sociopragmatic capacity considered in
this study. Excerpts of data presented in this chapter have been transcribed using the conventions shown in Appendix D. These conventions capture essential features of speech delivery and timing but emphasize the content of what is said and the linguistic forms produced that constitute the analytic focus of this chapter.

3.2 Sociopragmatic Awareness

This section reports the findings of the preenrichment and postenrichment language awareness interviews (LAIs). As described in chapter 2, the LAIs were designed as relatively open-ended interviews in order to assess learners’ understanding of the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous*, the pronouns *nous* and *on*, and verbal negation in French. The analysis presented below has a dual focus: (1) learners’ awareness that variation is possible and what the available variants are; and (2) learners’ understanding of the social meaning of the use of sociopragmatic variants. This approach aligns with that of van Compernolle and Williams (2011), who report that while some learners may develop an awareness that variation exists, assigning social meaning to variants in context may often remain beyond their abilities. Thus, following Kinginger and Ferrell’s (2004) definition of metapragmatic awareness, the locus of interest in the following sections is on learners’ “knowledge of the social meaning of variable second language forms and awareness of the ways in which these forms mark different aspects of social contexts” (p. 20). The excerpts taken from LAIs displayed below have been selected as illustrative examples of the participants’ sociopragmatic awareness that are representative of the group as a whole.
3.2.1 Awareness of address pronouns *tu* and *vous*

This part of the LAI aimed to elicit learners’ general knowledge of the address pronouns *tu* and *vous*. Although the LAI was designed to be relatively open-ended, it specifically sought to uncover learners’ awareness of both general meanings of *tu* and *vous* as well as how they would decide when to use one pronoun or the other in various situations. The following analysis thus focuses on two specific areas of interest: (1) general rules, principles, or concepts that guide students’ use of *tu* and *vous*; and (2) how they would decide between *tu* and *vous* when meeting someone for the first time.

The participants’ preenrichment understandings of the pronouns *tu* and *vous* was limited to informal/formal distinctions and lists of people with whom to use one or the other of these pronouns that are described in French language textbooks. Leon, for instance, noted the grammatical functions of *tu* (singular) and *vous* (plural or singular, formal) as well as several rules of thumb for choosing between the singular forms.

*Excerpt 3.1*

Tutor: can you tell me a little bit about what you understand about *tu* and *vous*.
Leon: okay. well um *vous*- uh *tu* and *vous*. obviously both mean you. uh *vous* is + either the plural form, or uh can just be formal,
Tutor: yeah
Leon: um *vous* you would use with people you hadn’t necessarily met yet, or with uh just like + also teachers and ++ people you want to show respect to.
Tutor: uhhuh
Leon: or are in a place of authority. as opposed to *tu*, it’s just more informal. with your friends. friendly.

(Leon, preenrichment LAI)
Leon also hinted at the notion that, as a rule, *vous* should be used with unfamiliar others (i.e., “vous you would use with people you hadn’t necessarily met yet”), as well as to show respect. In contrast, *tu* was, in Leon’s words, “just more informal” and appropriate for use with friends.

Susan more specifically addressed the default status of *vous*. As shown below, she reported that she would opt for *vous* if she did not know what to do, formulating this rule of thumb in the following terms: “if I wasn’t sure if I know what to do, I would probably just go with *vous*.”

Excerpt 3.2
Tutor: okay. + so for you. *vous* would be kind of like a + default. =
Susan: =yeah. like if I wasn’t sure if I know what to do, I would probably just go with *vous*.
Tutor: okay. [...] so + you know. when you’re meeting someone for the first time. how do you decide.
Susan: I would automatically just go with *vous*. just to show that I am + not being disrespectful of their standing or who they are
Tutor: mhm
Susan: or whatever. I’d just go with *vous*.
Tutor: no matter who it is,
Susan: um + I mean if it’s a five year old. I guess I’d say *tu*. ((laughs))
Tutor: uhhuh.
Susan: but if it’s my age or older. I would probably go with *vous*.

(Susan, preenrichment LAI)

She also indicated that *vous* could help her to avoid being perceived as disrespectful. However, when pressed on whether there was any exception to this rule, Susan noted that she would likely use *tu* with small children (something mentioned by most of the participants), but, as she reminded the tutor, if her interlocutor were her age or older, she would “probably go with *vous*.”
Nikki, shown below, was in fact the only participant to venture a guess that *vous* could be appropriate to use with a friend of a friend in a first meeting.

**Excerpt 3.3**

Tutor: and so except for- er is there any other time you might use *tu*, for the first time you meet someone,

Nikki: um (6.5) uh

Tutor: no?

Nikki: maybe if they’re like a friend of a friend? I don’t know.=

Tutor: =friend of a friend?

Nikki: mhm

(Nikki, preenrichment LAI)

Overall, the preenrichment LAIs revealed that the learners have some basic understanding of the pronouns *tu* and *vous*. This included an understanding of the grammatical function of these pronouns (second-person reference), particularly the dual role of *vous* as an unmarked plural pronoun and the more formal singular pronoun used in opposition to *tu*, as well as a general set of rules about how and when to choose between *tu* and *vous*-singular. However, the comments made by the learners focused on basic rules of thumb. In other words, as also highlighted elsewhere in the literature (Kinginger, 2008; van Compernolle, 2010a; van Compernolle et al., 2011), the learners report to choose between *tu* and *vous* on the basis of formulae (e.g., if X, then *tu*; if Y, then *vous*). While these formulaic rules certainly can provide an orienting basis for choosing between the two pronouns, they are unsystematic (e.g., what to do when meeting a peer (rule = T) for the first time (rule =V)). As shown in the analysis of AJQs below, the learners often deduced inaccurate rules of use in situations where two or more rules of thumb came into direct conflict.
During the postenrichment LAIs, however, the students demonstrated much more
developed orientations to using *tu* and *vous* based on the meaning potential of the pronouns as
presented in the concept-based materials. At the same time, their explanations predominately
focus on *tu/vous* variation as a system of choices. Laurie, for example, commented that she
understood that *tu/vous* choice was not just about a formal/informal distinction, but that it also
pointed to the amount of social distance one wants to create with another person and whether one
wants to extend constructs of power, in reference to symmetrical versus asymmetrical *tu/vous*
relationships.

*Excerpt 3.4*

**Tutor:** um so, *just* to start off, can you + tell me um now what you understand about using *tu* or
*vous*, uh you know. how do you decide which one to use, and what they mean, and all
that.

**Laurie:** well now I know that using *tu* and *vous* is not *just* for- if it’s plural or sin- plural or
singular, and also it’s not just for + um ++ if- if you’re trying to + if you don’t know the
person?

**Tutor:** mhm

**Laurie:** which is what I think I was taught pretty much? but using *tu* and *vous* can also decide
what kind of situation you want to present yourself as, um how close or far you want to
present yourself + between the other person, and ++ um + just the rank- the um like their
uh authority. like do you want to show your authority or not.

**Tutor:** okay.

(Laurie, postenrichment LAI)

Stephanie’s explanation was also suggestive of a systematic orienting basis for choosing
between *tu* and *vous*. Like Laurie, she noted that *tu* and *vous* can be used to create either
closeness or distance. In addition, she also emphasized the role these pronouns play in performing
one’s desired social identity by explicitly referencing the notion of self-presentation from the pedagogical materials used in this study (i.e., *tee-shirt-and-jeans* (*tu*) vs. *suit-and-tie* (*vous*)).

*Excerpt 3.5*

Tutor: first off, can you tell me about *tu* and *vous*, how you use them, how you decide which one to use,

Steph: okay. um *tu* is used to create *closeness* and uh to uh create uh bring kind of an atmosphere of personality to the conversation? so *vous* is used for that as well. but for *tu* especially it creates like a *tee-shirt-and-jeans* + type of situation? where uh you’re coming off as more laid back and uh you’re creating a more informal uh atmosphere.

Tutor: okay
Steph: whereas *vous* is used um to + kind of widen that distance between the two speakers?
Tutor: mhm
Steph: and um + to bring a sense of um suit-and-tie to the conversation.
Tutor: okay.

(Stephanie, postenrichment LAI)

It is also particularly noteworthy that although the formal-informal distinction remained present in Stephanie’s explanation, she referenced it in relation to the concept of self-presentation, the meaning one wants to create, rather than a rule to follow. This is indicative of an understanding that meaning is created, not only reflected, through the use of language.

Pierre, too, pointed to the idea that *tu*/*vous* choice is about making meanings. His explanation centered less on a synthesis of the concepts as was present in Laurie’s and Stephanie’s LAIs, but on a stepwise approach to choosing between *tu* and *vous*.

*Excerpt 3.6*

Tutor: and so how do you decide, for example, when you’re meeting someone for the first time.

Pierre: um +++ well, what I would do is I would um +++ first think about how I want to present *myself*. + and um and then I would think about how + um like what is like uh an
appropriate distance, + not distance + but like (3.0) not too sure what to say.=but like how + like what would be the right thing to use with them.

Tutor: well distance. right?
Pierre: yeah.
Tutor: whether it’s + small distance, which would be closeness. right? like you said before.
Pierre: mhm.
Tutor: that’s all part of distance.
Pierre: mhm. + so I’d think about that. and also + making sure that I was using the same thing that they were using too.
Tutor: okay.

(Pierre, postenrichment LAI)

Pierre explained the three concepts one has to consider in the order in which they were presented in the materials: self-presentation, social distance, and power hierarchies (i.e., symmetrical vs. asymmetrical use). Importantly, he also pointed out that he would want to make sure to use the same pronoun as his interlocutor, which reflected his sensitivity to the interpersonal nature of tu/vous use in interaction.

3.2.2 Awareness of stylistic variants: On/nous and verbal negation

In contrast to the preenrichment findings for tu and vous, the learners were unaware that the pronoun on could be used in alternation with nous or that the proclitic negative particle ne could be omitted from verbal negation, much less what types of meanings could be created through the use of these forms of stylistic variation. This should not be surprising given that most learners are never exposed to this possible variation in the classroom (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a). The excerpt of Susan’s preenrichment LAI illustrates a typical explanation of the pronouns on and nous in the preenrichment LAIs.
Excerpt 3.7

Tutor: can you + just explain a little bit, + what you know about + what do you know about nous and on.

Susan: *nous* for the most part is like + us, I guess?

Tutor: uhuh

Susan: like *we’re* doing something, or like mostly *us*, if I’m talking about myself and a group of people, and then *on*, I’ve always associated with like + *one*, kind of? like *one* does his homework. or one takes + his dog for a walk.

Tutor: uhuh

Susan: or something like that.

Tutor: okay.

(Susan, preenrichment LAI)

Susan described *nous* as the definite first-person plural pronoun (i.e., “like *we’re* doing something, or like mostly *us*, if I’m talking about myself and a group of people,), whereas she associated *on* with the English indefinite pronoun *one*. While this is not wrong, Susan never mentioned in the LAI that *on* could also be used for first-person plural reference. Instead, she previously learned that *nous* meant ‘we’ and that *on* meant ‘one’. The only exception to this understanding found in the preenrichment LAIs was that of Conrad, who identified the colloquial preformed sequence *on y va* ‘let’s go’ as an example of when *on* might be used to refer to the speaker and one or more persons. However, this did not reflect an actual understanding of variation, but only knowledge of one specific expression in which *on* is used.

Similarly, the learners all described verbal negation as an invariable feature of French, consisting of both the proclitic *ne* and a negative complement, such as *pas* ‘not’. Leon’s description of verbal negation was typical in that he pointed to the presence of both *ne* and *pas* and the embracing structure of negation (i.e., SUBJECT *ne* VERB *pas*).
Excerpt 3.8
Tutor: can you just describe um + what you understand about using negation, in French?
Leon: okay. I guess there’s um well first there’s just like the most usual one. which is just ne
pas.
Tutor: mhm
Leon: and it’s sort of like uh (xxx) describe this before. i- i- it’s like- you just put them on both
sides of the word. ne like the ne before + and like pas uh
Tutor: it’s like an embracing structure. or whatever.
Leon: mhm. so um y- you can’t really have one without the other.
Tutor: okay.
Leon: typically.

(Leon, preenrichment LAI)

Particularly telling of Leon’s orientation to negation as an invariable two-part structure (i.e., ne and a negative complement) is his comment that “you can’t really have one without the other.”

This points to his language learning history in which instruction most likely focused on the learning of invariable target forms (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a).

However, Leon did mention that he knew the phrase j’sais pas ‘I dunno’, which he characterized as slang (see also van Compernolle & Williams, 2010a), but when pressed to provide other examples of negation without ne, he could only think of elliptical negation, such as pas vraiment ‘not really’ or pas encore ‘not yet’, where ne’s absence is not variable. This was repeated in all of the LAIs. Susan was the only other participant to suggest that ne might be variably omitted.

However, she only reported having heard at some point that one of the negative words could be dropped. She was not able to indicate whether it was ne or the negative complement that could be absent.

The postenrichment LAI revealed that the learners had developed an understanding of the possible variation between nous and on and the presence versus absence of ne along two dimensions: (1) they developed an awareness that variation was possible (i.e., the linguistic
dimension) and (2) they developed an understanding of the meaning potential of such variation
(i.e., the sociopragmatic dimension). Mary, for instance, noted the difference between using *nous*
and *on* in terms of the concept of self-presentation (i.e., *tee-shirt-and jeans* vs. *suit-and-tie*). In
addition, she demonstrated an understanding that *nous* could be used to exclude an interlocutor
while *on* could be used to include an interlocutor.

*Excerpt 3.9*

Tutor: and what about using *nous* and *on*.
Mary: um +++ well *nous* is kind of like the more *proper* kind of suit-and-tie way to say *us*,
and then *on* is- would be more informal. if you just want to be relaxed. *tee-shirt-and-jeans*
type of thing. and then + for emphasis, you can- I guess you can use um *nous* as
exclusive. and *on* as inclusive.
Tutor: okay.

(Mary, postenrichment LAI)

In her LAI, Mary did not simply equate *nous* use with formal French and *on* use with informal
French, but rather incorporates the notion of formality into her developing understanding of the
meanings one intentionally makes (e.g., “*on* is- would be more informal. if you just want to be
relaxed. *tee-shirt-and-jeans* type of thing.”). This is important because it provides evidence that
she at least began to develop an understanding of this type of variation beyond first-order
indexicalities, or conventions.

Similarly, Conrad explained that the choice between *nous* and *on* was a question of the
“persona you want to have.” Conrad’s response, when pressed to specify what he meant, provides
evidence that he had begun to appropriate the concept of self-presentation in relation to his own
perception of himself as a “*tee-shirt-and-jeans* personality.”
Conrad’s mention of this own desired identity in French is important because it shows that the materials developed for this study allowed him to interpret the meaning potential of the variants as something he could instantiate voluntarily rather than a rule to follow (i.e., “cuz it’d be that + tee-shirt-and-jeans personality. that I want to give off.”). This is precisely what is meant by the internalization of L2 concepts: internalization is a transformative process by which cultural tools are made one’s own (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

LAI responses to questions about negation revealed a similar change in that all eight participants were able to identify the linguistic dimension of variation and describe the sociostylistic meaning potential of the variants. Nikki, for instance, began her explanation in terms of the meanings of *tee-shirt-and-jeans* and *business*¹⁵ (i.e., *suit-and-tie*) and then continued to describe how *ne*’s presence could indicate emphasis in negation. Nikki’s explanation therefore pointed to a primary focus on *meaning* over *form*, which is precisely the objective of concept-based approaches to language instruction. This is not meant to suggest that form is not important,

---

¹⁵ Nikki had previously redubbed the *suit-and-tie* concept as *business*. She used both terms interchangeably during the enrichment program.
of course; rather, the point here is that Nikki orients to the meanings she can create (i.e., concepts), first, and, second, to the specific linguistic practices through which these meanings are created (i.e., forms).

*Excerpt 3.11*

Tutor: and what about negation.
Nikki: um the + tee-shirt-and-jeans is negation without the *ne*, and the business is negation with the *ne*, but also um. + if you use the *ne*, an- and you have a tee-shirt-and-jeans, like +
Tutor: mhm,
Nikki: like relationship, like where you have a close relationship, you’re emphasizing, the negation?
Tutor: okay.

(Nikki, postenrichment LAI)

Although she formulated her explanation as an *if*-conditional, which is similar in form to some rules of thumb (see above), Nikki nonetheless indexed a systematic way of thinking about of the meaning potential (i.e., the concept of self-presentation). Systematicity is a crucial feature of scientific concepts that distinguish them from everyday concepts and rules of thumb.

In her explanation, Susan emphasized the agentive dimension of variational practice in relation to both self-presentation (i.e., *tee-shirt-and-jeans* vs. *suit-and-tie*) and emphasis through *ne*’s presence. This is evidenced by her focus on how a speaker wants “to come off,” the type of relationship one wants to create or maintain, and the amount of emphasis one wants to place on a negative utterance.

*Excerpt 3.12*

Tutor: and what about negation.
Susan: you would use *pas* to come off as tee-shirt-and-jeans. like really informal. or in a close relationship with someone. or something like that. and *ne pas* is again + more suit-and-
tie. more formal. or if you have a distant relationship with someone and you want to
maintain the distance
Tutor:  mhm
Susan:  BUT if you’re IN a close relationship with someone or it’s a really informal situation you
would use ne pas, if you’re like really serious about like + NOT doing something. like
NOT going somewhere.
Tutor:  mhm
Susan:  like you- if you REALLY REALLY didn’t want to + go have salad for dinner. you would
say ne pas.
Tutor:  okay.  

(Susan, postenrichment LAI)

Another particularly interesting aspect of Susan’s explanation, which was also present in Nikki’s
(above) and others’ LAIs, was the incorporation of the concept of social distance into
explanations of self-presentation.\textsuperscript{16} For Susan, \textit{tee-shirt-and-jeans} went hand in hand with \textit{close
relationships}, while \textit{suit-and-tie} is indicative of \textit{distance}. As elaborated further in chapter 4, one
of the important findings of this study was the way in which the participants began not only to
internalize the individual concepts as such but also to relate them to each other and transform
them in various ways within a larger, malleable sociolinguistic system of meaning. As
emphasized in chapter 2, this is precisely what is meant by the indexical order (Eckert, 2008;
Silverstein, 2003) and designs of meaning (New London Group, 1996) as elaborated in the
sociocultural orientation to variation in language that informed the design of the materials used in
this study (van Compernolle, 2011).

\textsuperscript{16} This also occurred in explanations of \textit{on/nous} variation, though no examples are shown in this chapter.
3.3 Appropriateness Judgment Questionnaires

As noted in chapter 2, AJQ situations included both cases in which sociolinguistic conventions were relatively clear and cases in which there was some element of ambiguity. AJQ 1, which was used for both preenrichment and postenrichment data collection sessions, included the following situations (for full descriptions, see Appendix B): (1) talking with a friend, Jean, at a café; (2) meeting a friend’s girlfriend, Sophie, for the first time; (3) running into a favorite teacher, M Robinet, on the weekend; (4) asking a university administrative assistant for course scheduling help; and (5) meeting a professor, Mme Triolet, in her office. Conventions based on relative status or power, social distance, and formality of context vary across the situations. In some cases, however, one or more of these factors may in fact be ambiguous or at least highly variable across individuals’ interpretations. Table 3.1 displays information about these factors for each situation based on (perhaps idealistic) sociolinguistic conventions.

**Table 3.1. Situation information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation 1: Jean (friend)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 2: Sophie (friend’s girlfriend)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 3: M Robinet (professor)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ / ?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 4: Administrative assistant</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 5: Mme Triolet (professor)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A question mark (?) indicates ambiguity and/or probable interindividual variation.*

Situations 1 and 2 both represent relatively informal social-interactive contexts in which the use of everyday, informal French (e.g., *on ‘we’, Ø...pas*) would most likely be expected. However, since Situation 2 involves a first meeting, the amount of distance between the Sophie and the participants is somewhat ambiguous, or at least subject to variable interpretations. This is especially true for learners who may not be familiar with the sociolinguistic conventions of native
speaker communities (e.g., use *tu* with friends of friends who are peers) because Sophie is stranger, a context requiring *vous* according to learner textbooks. Situation 3, too, is not completely straightforward. First, the appropriate level of style/register is subject to variable interpretations (e.g., more informal because the setting is an everyday, noninstitutional context or more formal because the interaction takes place between a student and professor). Second, although there exists the convention to use *vous* with teachers/professors, M Robinet is described as a favorite teacher who is very friendly with his students, which could lead at least some less experienced language learners to deem *tu* appropriate. Situations 4 and 5 are clearly contexts in which *vous* is the conventionally appropriate form of address, based on the amount of social distance and/or relative status. However, the formality of, or expected level of style for, Situation 4 is ambiguous: some speakers may favor a more formal style because of the age difference and the institutional setting of the situation while others may find a more relaxed, everyday style to be perfectly appropriate. In short, the degree of ambiguity and/or probable interindividual variation in interpretations of social-interactive appropriacy within and across the situations makes judgments of the “correctness” of responses somewhat inappropriate. For this reason, responses to the AJQs must be set against a backdrop of participants’ orientations to the situations and their own explanations of their sociopragmatic choices.

The next section provides a snapshot of the learners’ choices on the preenrichment and postenrichment AJQ. Each language feature is treated independently as a means of focusing specifically on the figures for each of the variants chosen across situations. In addition, some student commentary (i.e., explanations of choices) is provided in order to situate their choices against their understanding of the meanings of each language variant.
3.3.1 Second-person pronouns

Total choices of *tu* and *vous* on the preenrichment and postenrichment AJQ are provided in Table 3.2. In some cases, especially for situations 2 and 3 during the preenrichment stage, participants had difficulty deciding which pronoun to select. The figures shown in Table 3.2 represent participants’ final answers. As noted above, situations 1, 4, and 5 are relatively unambiguous, based on relative age, relationship, and/or social status. However, situations 2 and 3 are somewhat ambiguous: in situation 2, Sophie is a peer and friend of a friend—factors favoring the use of *tu*—but at the same time a stranger—a factor favoring the use of *vous*; in situation 3, M Robinet is a teacher/professor and older than the participants—factors favoring *vous*—but he is also described as a favorite teacher and someone who is very friendly with students—factors possibly indicating a *tu* relationship.

**Table 3.2.** Total choices of *tu* and *vous* on the AJQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Preenrichment</th>
<th>Postenrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Vous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 1: Jean (friend)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 2: Sophie (friend’s girlfriend)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 3: M Robinet (professor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 4: Administrative assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 5: Mme Triolet (professor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As these figures indicate, the participants as a group were able to select the conventionally appropriate pronoun for the unambiguous situations on both preenrichment and postenrichment AJQs, where there is categorical agreement about the appropriateness of *tu* (situation 1) and *vous* (situations 4 and 5). This finding should not be surprising given that
textbooks and other pedagogical materials typically present a set list of rules of thumb such as “use *tu* with friends” and “use *vous* with teachers.”

Situation 2 presented some difficulty to learners during the preenrichment stage, however. Nikki, Leon, Mary, and Conrad all selected the conventionally appropriate *tu* form, while Susan, Pierre, Stephanie, and Laurie decided that *vous* would be the appropriate pronoun to use with Sophie. On the postenrichment AJQ, however, all eight participants agreed that *tu* would be the appropriate pronoun to use with Sophie, one indication that the enrichment program helped learners to disambiguate the indexical meanings of the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous*.

Although their explanations for choosing *vous* on the preenrichment AJQ varied to some degree, the four participants who did so cited stranger status as the most important factor. Susan, for example, commented that *vous* would be appropriate in order to show respect toward someone she had never met before, despite the fact that Sophie was a peer and the girlfriend of a good friend.

*Excerpt 3.13*

Tutor: What about the second one. +++ Jean’s girlfriend Sophie.

Susan: I would probably say *vous*, just because I haven’t met her before, + and its goes back to the whole respect thing, I think, + and even though, + she’s my age, and + the girlfriend of my friend, + I still just + because I’m meeting her for the first time, + I feel like I would just default to *vous*,

Tutor: okay.

Susan: to be respectful,

(Susan, preenrichment AJQ, Situation 2)

Susan’s reasoning changed on the postenrichment AJQ, however. Specifically, she noted that because of the similar social status, and the fact that Sophie is her friend’s girlfriend, *tu* would be appropriate since there is no reason to create social distance through the use of *vous*. 
Excerpt 3.14

Tutor: and the second one?
Susan: okay. ((silently reads situation)) umm + I guess, for that one, cuz I know there was one like that before. and I think I said vous to maintain a distant relationship, + BUT I wouldn’t + actually, because I went and thought about it. and I was like if it’s my friend’s girlfriend, + she’s clearly kind of like + I don’t wanna say on our level, + but almost like + kind of on our level. [. . .] so I would just use tu. + and hope she wouldn’t get offended by it.
Tutor: and what would that do.
Susan: umm + like create a relationship that like + you don’t have to be distant. like you’re my friend’s girlfriend, + like there’s no reason for us to be like mmmm ((moves back in chair as if distancing herself from someone)) I don’t wanna talk to you ha ha,
Tutor: yeah.

(Susan, postenrichment AJQ, situation 2)

Together, these two excerpts provide evidence that Susan’s thinking has shifted from a rule-of-thumb-bound system (i.e., default to vous) to a conceptually based system (i.e., avoiding social distance) following her participation in the enrichment program.

Although seven of the participants chose vous for situation 3 (M Robinet) on both the preenrichment and postenrichment AJQs, one student—Leon (preenrichment) and Susan (postenrichment)—chose tu as the appropriate pronoun. On the preenrichment AJQ, Leon noted that because M Robinet was a favorite teacher, he would likely use tu with him despite the fact that M Robinet was older and a teacher, both factors that typically call for the use of vous.

Excerpt 3.15
Leon: ((silently reads situation)) so again, this is (xxx) he’s one of my favorite teachers, + even though he may be forty years old, um + if I’ve had him for like a while, I feel like I’m
familiar with him, there’s a very good chance I’d actually use the *tu* form, + even though often + um teachers use the *vous*.

(Leon, preenrichment, situation 3)

However, on the postenrichment AJQ, Leon reinterpreted the category “favorite teacher.” He commented that “favorite teacher” did not necessarily mean “close relationship,” and as such he would use *vous* to create and maintain a sort of professional distance, at least initially.

**Excerpt 3.16**

Leon: ((reads situation aloud)) hmm + so in this case, this person’s ol- I guess ++ a teacher of *mine*.

Tutor: mhm,

Leon: uh + again, it depends. cuz like often- I guess typically, with my teachers. they’ve told me whether or not + um I should like. use the *tu* form or not,

Tutor: okay.

Leon: um so because there is no other information, I would jus- I would start out using *vous*, um

Tutor: okay.

Leon: because although he’s- he’s one of my favorite teachers. it doesn’t necessarily mean like that we’re + very close or + there’s still that sort of like ++ um professional distance,

Tutor: mhm,

Leon: he’s my teacher and I’m the student.

Tutor: sure.

(Leon, postenrichment, situation 3)

Susan, on the other hand, initially selected *vous* as the appropriate pronoun during the preenrichment AJQ, citing the student-teacher rule of thumb, “you should use *vous* with teachers.” On the postenrichment AJQ, however, Susan decided that she would use *tu*. This choice, which would likely risk negative social consequences, was not however random. Instead,
it was based on Susan’s interpretation of the category “favorite teacher” and the concept of social distance.

*Excerpt 3.17*

Susan: um + because it says one of your favorite teachers, + I would assume that you have a close relationship, with them? [. . .] like I would say favorite teacher use *tu.*

(Susan, postenrichment, situation 3)

A lengthy discussion following this comment revealed that Susan’s experiences in high school and university level French courses where her teachers had explicitly told her and other students to use the *tu* form led her to subsume the category “favorite teacher” under the concept of closeness. Susan reported having developed a close relationship with her high school French teacher in particular, whom she called by her first name and used *tu* with in class. Thus, her interpretation of the situation based on her conceptual understanding (i.e., a close relationship between a teacher and student) led her to articulate her choice as “favorite teacher use *tu.*” As elaborated further in chapters 4 and 5, there are other sources of knowledge and development, such as prior experiences and socialization, relevant to the interpretation of these results. In Susan’s case, her previous experiences in US French classrooms where ubiquitous *tu* use indexed a particular local understanding of social relationships in pedagogical settings (e.g., close relationships between teachers and students) formed a foundation upon which to begin to internalize the meanings (concepts) presented in this study. The question is whether, and to what extent, the approach to pedagogy illustrated in this study enables learners to reevaluate their assumptions about the meanings of *tu* and *vous* in future social-interactive contexts.
3.3.2 Sociostylistic variants

Because the choice between *on* and *nous* ‘we’ and negation with or without *ne* is typically determined by social-interactive context, these two sociostylistic features of French will be considered together here. In addition, while there was not always agreement across participants, there was categorical correspondence within individuals between the choice of *on* or *nous* and absence or presence of *ne* on both preenrichment and postenrichment AJQs. In other words, *on* and the absence of *ne* were always selected together while *nous* and the presence of *ne* were always selected together. Table 3.3 displays the total choices of *on* and *nous* on the preenrichment and postenrichment AJQ. Table 3.4 shows the total choices of Ø...pas and ne...pas on the preenrichment and postenrichment AJQ.

**Table 3.3.** Total choices of *on* and *nous* on the AJQ

| Situation | Preenrichment | | Postenrichment | |
|-----------|---------------||---------------|---------------|
|            | On | Nous | On | Nous |
| Situation 1: Jean (friend) | 1 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| Situation 2: Sophie (friend’s girlfriend) | 1 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| Situation 3: M Robinet (professor) | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Situation 4: Administrative assistant | 0 | 8 | 3 | 5 |
| Situation 5: Mme Triolet (professor) | 0 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
Table 3.4. Total choices of Ø...pas and ne...pas on the AJQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Preenrichment</th>
<th>Postenrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø...pas</td>
<td>Ne...pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 1: Jean (friend)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 2: Sophie (friend’s girlfriend)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 3: M Robinet (professor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 4: Administrative assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 5: Mme Triolet (professor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate a dramatic shift in learners’ choices of sociostylistic variants between preenrichment and postenrichment AJQs, namely a shift from choosing all formal variants to choosing mostly informal variants across the situations. This finding should not come as surprise, however, given that none of these learners had a good understanding of the possible variation between on and nous and negation with and without ne during the preenrichment stage (see above). As noted earlier in the discussion of the LAIs, Leon was the only participant to mention the possible absence of ne in the phrase j’sais pas ‘I dunno’, which he characterized as slang. This stands in stark contrast to the address forms tu and vous, of which students had some awareness.

As shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, one student did choose the informal variants for situations 1 and 2, which warrants some discussion here. Conrad appeared to be relatively sensitive to social-context appropriacy in general even before beginning the enrichment program. Although his conceptual knowledge of French pragmatic and sociolinguistic variation was not developed, he was able to deduce possible interpretations of language forms as he completed the preenrichment AJQ. As the following excerpt shows, he immediately recognized that the AJQ centered on what he referred to as “different levels of relationships” and, based on his
understanding of *tu* and *vous*, accurately deduced that the pronoun *on* was “the more familiar version of *nous,*” which he selected for situations 1 and 2.

**Excerpt 3.18**
Conrad: ((reads situation 1 silently)) I feel like this is suggesting that + they all have to do with + different levels of + um +++ like +++ of- of- you know. different levels of relationships. for instance. + so.

Tutor: okay.
Conrad: I- I would use *tu* for this.

Tutor: okay. why would you use *tu* with Jean.
Conrad: because it’s a friend. so like I’m very familiar with this person.

Tutor: okay.

Conrad: I guess then I would use *on*. because I feel like + this is implying that *on* is the more familiar version of *nous*.

(Conrad, preenrichment AJQ)

Conrad also originally selected *ne . . . pas* for these two situations, but as he completed the AJQ, he noticed that it did not make sense that he had chosen this form for all of the situations. As the excerpt below shows, he revised his selection based on the assumption that the *ne*-absent structure must be a viable informal choice because he “wouldn’t even have the option otherwise.”

**Excerpt 3.19**
Conrad: ((Writes *ne...pas* for situation 5)) but then this doesn’t make sense. that I would just use the *ne- ne pas* for all of them.

Tutor: right,

Conrad: cuz I wouldn’t even have the option otherwise. +++ which makes me think that this should be just *pas*. ((pointing to situations 1 and 2)) cuz I feel like + like if kids are talking. they’ll be more colloquial. slang. just like leaving out the *ne*.

Tutor: right

Conrad: so I’m going to go with that. ((crosses out *ne* from situations 1 and 2))
Thus, Conrad’s selection of informal variants for situations 1 and 2 during the preenrichment AJQ appears to be an artifact of the task itself (i.e., accurate deduction based on response options), rather than the result of an existing understanding of the potential sociostylistic values of these forms. It is also likely that the tutor’s use of “right” in this exchange instead of a more neutral backchannel (e.g., hmm) pushed Conrad forward in his analysis of the response options and in fact mediated a new understanding of possible variation in French.

The general shift toward choosing informal variants during the postenrichment session represents an interesting finding of this study. Not only did all of the learners assign informal style to situations 1 and 2, which would be conventionally appropriate, but they also agreed that the chance encounter with M Robinet, a teacher, while walking down the street was a situation in which the more informal variants for negation and first-person plural reference would be perfectly acceptable, even if vous were the appropriate address form. As Leon noted:

*Excerpt 3.20*

Leon: ((finishes explaining why vous is appropriate for creating distance with M Robinet)) but- um. you know. I am with my- with my friends. it’s a Saturday afternoon, there’s no reason for me to be o- overly formal. + so I think I would still use the on. and pas.=
Tutor: =okay.=
Leon: =forms.

In addition, all but one student, Laurie, decided that using informal variants during a meeting with a professor, Mme Triolet, during her office hours (situation 5) was appropriate. The main reason for doing so expressed by these participants was that, because they were in fact young students,
they wanted to express their tee-shirt-and-jeans (i.e., youthful, relaxed, student) personas. As Susan put it succinctly:

*Excerpt 3.21*

Susan: ((finishes explaining why *vous* is appropriate to create distance)) and then just stick with [. . . ] + I would stick with *on* and *pas* because I am + tee-shirt-and-jeans + I am a student.

Laurie, however, stated that she usually tried to present herself as more suit-and-tie with professors, so even if she would normally want to be relaxed or informal in most contexts (i.e., the tee-shirt-and-jeans persona), she would opt for the more formal style. After noting that *nous* would reflect the suit-and-tie nature of the situation, as Laurie interpreted it, she was asked to elaborate on her reasoning:

*Excerpt 3.22*

Tutor: so and you wanna do suit-and-tie, in that situation,
Laurie: yeah. + I think so.
Tutor: why.
Laurie: cuz she’s + my professor, and + um. yeah. that’s how I usually try to come off. with my professors, in a more professional way.
Tutor: oh. okay.

Thus, Laurie’s choice to select the more formal stylistic variants for situation 5 is related to her symbolic expression of her own social identity in these sorts of situations (i.e., how she would want to present herself), which did not align with the other participants’ interpretations of the situation.

Situation 4 proved less straightforward for the group as a whole. As the figures provided above indicate, five students (Susan, Leon, Pierre, Stephanie, and Laurie) agreed that formal variants were most appropriate to use with the administrative assistant, while the remaining three
(Nikki, Mary, and Conrad) opted for the more informal forms. The principal reason for choosing the more formal variants in situation 4 was that because the administrative assistant is described as being formal with students, the participants would opt to style shift in the direction of the assistant’s typical level of discourse. Stephanie, for instance, noted that, in light of the information given on the AJQ, she would likely use more formal variants in order to avoid insulting the administrative assistant.

Excerpt 3.23
Tutor: and the fourth one?
Steph: ((reads situation silently)) um, just with the background information that she’s relatively formal with students, I would prob- I would definitely use *vous*. um because + uh she’s older so she might expect that,
Tutor: mhm
Steph: from students as well? same with *nous* and *ne pas*, I would stick with those.
Tutor: okay.
Steph: um just to make sure that + I don’t like + in some way insult her. by using the like more casual laidback conversation.
Tutor: okay.

Stephanie’s explanation of her choice to use the more formal variants is indicative of her desire to converge with the speech level of her interlocutor, specifically when the interlocutor may be perceived as being in a higher social position relative to her (e.g., based on age).

The students who selected the informal variants, however, expressed a desire to assert their own casual, tee-shirt-and-jeans social identities or personas regardless of the (real or perceived) expected level of discourse on the part of one’s interlocutor. To be sure, sensitivity to one’s interlocutor and sociolinguistic conventions is an important dimension of sociopragmatic capacity, but speakers are also free to adopt (potentially) unconventional stances as they see fit.
The issue is whether or not the unconventional choice is mediated by an understanding of the meanings indexed by it. Conrad, for example, had indicated throughout the enrichment program that he wanted to be able to express his everyday relaxed, casual persona in French. The informal variants presented during the program thus served as tools through which he could accomplish this goal. He explained his choice to use the informal variants in situation 4 in relation to the same choices he had made for situation 3 (M Robinet): *vous* is appropriate to show distance, but *on* and Ø...*pas* are appropriate for taking an informal, tee-shirt-and-jeans stance.

**Excerpt 3.24**

Conrad: ((reads situation silently)) I would- yeah I would use the same thing as the + um as the past one. ((situation 3)) so I would use *vous* and *on* and *pas*.

Tutor: okay

Conrad: *vous* again for that same + level of respect + ful distance. that we talked about. for my teacher.

Tutor: okay.

Conrad: and um. + yeah. *on* and *pas*. for um +

Tutor: cuz you just wanna be you, ((laughs))

Conrad: yeah. I’m me. ((laughs))

Conrad’s choice for situation 4 creates what he referred to as *respectful distance* through the use of *vous* but simultaneously represents an assertion of his relaxed, casual identity.

### 3.4 Dynamically Administered Scenarios

As described in chapter 2, strategic interactions scenarios (Di Pietro, 1987) were designed to provide learners with opportunities to use the sociopragmatic and sociolinguistic variants they were studying. In addition, the strategic interaction approach best suited the goals of this study in
that (1) scenarios could be designed to elicit more and less formal registers of language and (2) the three-stage approach (i.e., rehearsal, performance, debriefing) enabled the students and researcher to cooperatively plan, execute, and control language production, the three primary components of mental actions according to Galperin (1989, 1992) (see chapter 2). The control function was particularly important in minimizing undue cognitive stress on learners in that the researcher was able to provide assistance when learners encountered not only language-related but also task-related difficulties. It is important to recall that the scenarios were dynamically administered (see chapter 2) as a means of assessing both learners’ independent abilities and, more importantly, their emerging abilities that were not yet fully formed.

The main methodological drawback of the strategic interaction design was that not all participants produced tokens of the target features of discourse they planned to use in each scenario. This is because scenarios, which promote relatively spontaneous discourse, may proceed in unexpected or unpredictable ways, and it is difficult to ensure that a statistically significant number of tokens of a target feature of discourse will always be produced by every learner. Although this has negatively impacted the ability to produce statistically significant individual quantitative patterns of variant use, the scenarios did elicit quantitative patterns for the group as a whole and qualitative evidence of developing performance abilities across time for each participant. As a reminder to the reader, scenarios were given preenrichment (session 1) and postenrichment (session 6) as well as during the enrichment program proper (sessions 3 and 5).

### 3.4.1 Orientations to the scenarios

As part of the rehearsal stage of the scenarios, participants discussed with the tutor their understanding of the relationship between the interlocutors depicted in the scenario, a desired way to present themselves in the scenario, and how these could be shown/accomplished through
language. In short, this rehearsal stage aimed to allow the participants to develop a plan of action for their use of sociopragmatic and sociolinguistic variants. Table 3.5 displays the student’s role for each scenario (full descriptions, including the tutor’s role, are provided in Appendix C). Tables 3.6 and 3.7 provide each participant’s planned performance (i.e., an orientation) for the informal and formal scenarios.

**Table 3.5.** Strategic interaction scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Formality</th>
<th>Student’s role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>You recently met an exchange student from France. He doesn’t know many people at PSU because he’s only been here for a couple of weeks. The two of you have gotten together a couple of times for lunch and seem to get along well. You and your roommate are having a party at your place on Friday and want to invite him, so you call to invite him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Two weeks ago, a French professor from PSU came to your class to talk about a one-year study abroad opportunity in France. You and a friend really want to go study abroad, so you go to his office to talk to him (your friend isn’t available right now, so you go alone to ask for the two of you). However, you’re not sure whether you meet the requirements to participate in the study abroad program, so you’ll have to convince him you’re qualified. Also, you really need to talk to him now because you and your friend have to tell your parents soon that you’re interested in going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>You and friend from France have decided to share an apartment in State College. Because your friend isn’t very familiar with State College yet, you have taken care of finding some potential places to live. Your main concern about the apartment is the rent. You have a budget of $500/month for your share, but you’d really rather spend $350/month or less. In fact, you’d be fine living relatively far from campus/downtown if it means spending less money – there’s always the bus! You’ve found four possible places in State College that have different prices and locations, so you need to discuss them with your friend. Based on what you’ve found, though, there is one in particular that you prefer – it’s far from campus (too far to walk and at least a 30 min bus ride) but it’s cheap!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>You are planning a trip to Paris with a friend for next summer, so you need to get some information about places to stay. You call a travel agency in France to ask for some recommendations. You and your friend would like to stay close to the center of Paris – for example in the Quartier Latin or near la Tour Eiffel – but you have a budget of 50€ per night for both of you together. Of course, you want something clean but it doesn’t have to be fancy. You also want a private room. Your budget is very strict, so you’re also willing to stay farther away from the center of town if it means a cheaper place. You plan on being in Paris for 10 nights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 5  Informal  You’re supposed to have lunch with a friend, and you’ve agreed to meet in front of the library at noon. However, you haven’t decided where to go. You don’t want to spend too much, but you’re sick of eating in the HUB. You think it would be nice to go somewhere downtown for a relaxing lunch, especially since you don’t have to be anywhere before 3pm. You’re not sure what your friend likes to eat, so you’ll need to ask and recommend some places the two of you could go to.

Formal  You need to meet with your professor to discuss an upcoming exam, so you go to his office to ask if he’s available now or sometime soon for the two of you to talk. Since the exam is next Monday, you need to talk with him soon. Normally, you’re available in the mornings between 10 and 11 and in the afternoons from 3 to 5. On Fridays you don’t normally come to campus, but technically you’re free since you don’t have any classes then.

Session 6  Informal  You recently met an exchange student from France. He doesn’t know many people at PSU because he’s only been here for a couple of weeks. The two of you have gotten together a couple of times for lunch and seem to get along well. You and another friend of yours are planning to have a small dinner party at your place, so you call to see if he’s available.

Formal  You have a phone interview with a work-study program director in France today. The program is for a summer job in Montpellier where you would work part time in a hotel and take language courses at the university. You know you’re a finalist, but you don’t know what job you might get. On your application, you indicated that your top two preferences were front desk receptionist and wait staff (waiter/waitress) in the hotel restaurant because those jobs would allow you to interact in French with other people—one of your main reasons for wanting to go to Montpellier. Also, you don’t know when you would be expected to arrive because some jobs are expected to start at the beginning of July, while others start in mid July. This is a potential problem since you and several of your friends have planned a trip to New York from July 1-July 10.
Table 3.6. Planned performance in informal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>T  ?  ?  T  O  -  T  O  -  T  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T = tu; O = on; N = nous; - = ne omission; + = ne presence; ? = no response.

Table 3.7. Planned performance in formal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td>T/V  O/N  Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  O  -  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  O  -  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  O  -  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  N  +  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  N  +  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  O  -  V  O  -  V  O  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  N  +  V  N  +  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>V  ?  ?  V  N  +  V  O  -  V  N  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T = tu; V = vous; O = on; N = nous; - = ne omission; + = ne presence; ? = no response.

As these data indicate, the participants categorically agreed on the appropriateness of *tu* in informal scenarios and *vous* in formal scenarios for all strategic interactions, including prior to
the start of the enrichment program (session 1). None of the participants indicated a preference regarding the pronouns *on* and *nous* or verbal negation during the first session. This should not be a surprise given the lack of awareness about this type of variation as evidenced by the preenrichment LAIs and AJQs analyzed above. Beginning in session 3 (the first pair of scenarios after the introduction of the concept-based materials), however, the participants all judged the use of *on* and absence of *ne* to be appropriate for the informal scenarios. The formal scenarios proved to be somewhat more ambiguous. For instance, the participants were equally divided with regard to stylistic appropriateness during session 3 (calling a French travel agent to make a hotel reservation), while session 5 (meeting a professor during office hours) was overwhelmingly judged to be at least moderately informal and session 6 (telephone interview for a work-study program) was overwhelmingly judged to be formal.

Reasons for this variability were many, but they all essentially related to the participants’ interpretations of the scenarios, including the quality of the relationship between the interlocutors, the type of activity they are to engage in, and how they wanted to present themselves in such situations. Leon, for example, explained that informal variants were appropriate in session 3 (calling a travel agent) because the scenario represented a type of activity in which he was comfortable presenting himself as “some informal random guy” while at the same time maintaining a degree of social distance through the use of *vous*.

Excerpt 3.25
Leon: in terms of the other ones though. ((on/nous, ne)) I don’t know- I don’t think that there’s like a + huge need to be like + overly formal. and *use ne,*=
Tutor: =so what do y- so how do you want to come off.
Leon: well + I guess uh just like. you know. = s- s- a + nice + just kind of some informal. random guy. who’s calling. I don’t know.
Tutor: okay.

(Leon, session 3, formal scenario planning)
By contrast, Mary decided to use the more formal variants based on her understanding of the potential negative consequences of the tee-shirt-and-jeans style of self-presentation in such a situation, namely being duped into something because she could be perceived as naïve.

*Excerpt 3.26*

Tutor: do you want to be tee-shirt-and-jeans? or suit-and-tie.
Mary: + um ++ WELL I guess I wouldn’t want to be taken as someone who like could be duped into + like + I don’t want to sound um naïve,
Tutor: okay,
Mary: by sounding too casual, + or too young, + or too +
Tutor: okay.

(Mary, session 3, formal scenario planning)

For session 5, Laurie was the only participant who believed that more formal variants were most appropriate, the others deciding that an office hours meeting was more casual, despite the distance and power factors related to using the vous form of address. As Laurie explained:

*Excerpt 3.27*

Laurie: ((reads scenario)) um + with the professor I woul- it’s a suit-and-tie situa?=I would want to come off as a suit-and-tie situation?
Tutor: okay
Laurie: um + to show respect + and just + um yeah.
Tutor: okay
Laurie: so I would use *vous, ne pas*, and + *nous*. I guess.
Tutor: okay.

(Laurie, session 5, formal scenario planning)
Laurie’s orientation therefore reflected her interpretation of an office hours meeting as a situation in which she preferred to present herself as *suit-and-tie* (i.e., more formally). This also aligned with her orientation to the office hours meeting on the postenrichment AJQ (see Excerpt 3.22, above).

As noted, all of the participants except Stephanie judged session 6 (job interview) to be formal. She explained that, while *vous* was certainly appropriate for creating social distance, she would opt for the more informal stylistic variants, *on* and *ne’s* absence, to sound more welcoming, an important aspect of her own personality and, in her view, a trait desirable for the job positions available (i.e., wait staff in a restaurant or front desk receptionist at a hotel).

*Excerpt 3.28*

**Steph:** ((finishes explaining that she wants to use *vous* to create distance)) I don’cuz at the same time I would want to show my personality?=cuz like it’s a + it’s a program + it’s like a waitress and a or a front desk? so you’re gonna need to be like + welcoming?

**Tutor:** okay.

**Steph:** so I wouldn’t wanna necessarily use *nous* and *ne pas.*=cuz that would be like + too stiff. and like for me. if I were + (xxx) in this role. I wouldn’t wanna be like + I would wanna show that I’m more laid back, I’m not like + uppity or whatever. so prob-so I would probably use *on* and *pas*.

**Tutor:** okay. + so *vous* for the + relationship. [distance.]

**Steph:** [mhm ] and then *on* and *pas* to show like + my personality. I guess.

**Tutor:** okay.

(Stephanie, session 6, formal scenario planning)

The variation in interpretations of appropriate levels of discourse is therefore indicative of each individual’s unique perspective on which meanings they wanted to produce in interaction. Therefore, while some choices may have broken with conventional patterns of use, the
participants’ decisions were grounded in a real understanding of the meaning potential of each of the variants. Taken together with the results of the LAIs and AJQs, these orientations to strategic interaction scenarios provide evidence of conceptual development in that the participants had begun to internalize and transform the concepts presented to them for their own meaning-making purposes.

3.4.2 Performance in scenarios: Group results

Group results regarding performance (i.e., sociopragmatic and sociolinguistic variant use) during scenarios are presented below. The figures provide a snapshot of the group’s development across time. Overall, the results indicate that the learners became increasingly able to control their use of both informal and formal language variants according to their orientations to the scenarios. Most notably, the figures indicate a rise in the use of conventionally informal sociostylistic variants (i.e., on ‘we’ and negation without ne), which aligns with these learners’ orientations to the scenarios displayed above.

To tally the number of occurrences of each language variant produced by the learners in the scenarios, the following methods were used:

1) All morphologically marked tokens of tu and vous produced by learners were identified in the corpus. These included (see Kinginger, 2008; van Compernolle et al., 2011):

Subject pronouns

Examples: si tu veux venir ‘if you want to come . . . ’; qu’est-ce que vous avez dit ? ‘what do you say ?’

Direct/indirect object pronouns
Examples: *je voulais t’inviter à notre fête* ‘I wanted to invited you to our party’; *j’ai besoin de vous parler* ‘I need to speak to you’

“Strong” forms used in

*Tags*

Examples: *et toi* ? ‘and you ?’; *et vous* ? ‘and you ?’

*Subject doubling/dislocation*

Examples: *toi tu préfères celui-là ?* ‘you you prefer that one ?’; *vous voulez voyager ensemble vous et votre amie ?* ‘you want to travel together you and your friend ?’

*Prepositional phrases*

Examples: *c’est un ami à toi ?* ‘is it a friend of yours ?’; *chez vous ?* ‘(at) your place’

*Determiner phrases*

Examples: *ton/votre ami* ‘your friend’

*Imperative verb forms*

Examples: *regarde celui-ci* ‘look-[tu] at this one’; *revenez me voir demain après-midi* ‘come back-[vous] to see me tomorrow afternoon’

2) All instances of the pronouns *on* and *nous* were identified in the corpus. However, only subject pronouns with first-person plural reference (i.e., tokens in which the two pronouns are in fact variable; see van Compernolle, 2008b) were included in the analysis. That is, tokens of *nous* used as object pronouns and strong pronouns or in prepositional phrases were excluded from the analysis, as were tokens of *on* having an indefinite third-person referent (i.e., the equivalent of English *one*).
3) All instances of negation were identified in the corpus. However, only verbal negation (i.e., negation of a verb phrase) is considered here since *ne* can variably be present or absent only in this context (see van Compernolle, 2008a). In other words, tokens of elliptical negation (i.e., negative utterances not including a verb phrase such as *pas vraiment* ‘not really’) were excluded from the analysis.

Because the scenarios were dynamically administered, a certain number of tokens of interest produced by learners were excluded from the final analysis. While giving assistance, the tutor often modeled the utterance for the learners to repeat. These “repeated” tokens produced by learners following the researcher’s model have been excluded from the figures presented below. Thus, tokens included in the final analysis include only those produced during the execution of the scenario itself, which excludes inserted pedagogical sequences in which learners are instructed to repeat a phrase modeled by the tutor. Excerpt 3.28 provides one such example. (Line numbers have been added for ease of reference. Boldface text highlights examples of interest.)

*Excerpt 3.29*

1 Tutor: est-ce que vous pouvez venir me voir euh=
   *can you come see me uh*
2 Mary: =ah oui. oui. + je n’ai pas de + classe. +++ je suis libre + tout
   *ah yes yes I do not have class I’m free all*
3 Tutor: mhm, + go back,
4 Mary: ++ oh. *j’ai pas* + de classe.
   *oh I don’t have class*
5 Tutor: so *j’ai pas* de classe. say it,
   *I don’t have class*
6 Mary: *j’ai pas* de classe.=
   *I don’t have class*
7 Tutor: =*j’ai pas* de classe.
   *I don’t have class*
Mary:  um je suis libre + um tout le jour.

*um I’m free um all day*

For this scenario (meeting with a professor during office hours), Mary had planned to omit *ne* from verbal negations. However, in line 2, she produces an instance of *ne*, which leads to a mediated performance as well as to modeled examples by the tutor (lines 5-7). In this example, Mary’s *ne*-present token in line 2 was counted as her first choice. The *ne*-absent structure produced in line 4 following a relatively implicit prompt from the tutor was also counted as a “mediated” performance and included in the final tally. It was decided to keep such mediated tokens in the figures because, while produced after some form of assistance, they do reflect some control over the forms as well as intended performance. The repeated token produced by Mary in line 6 was not, however, counted since it was uttered at the explicit request of the tutor who was modeling the form. Line 8 represents the transition back to the scenario in that Mary reinitiates her incomplete utterance from line 2 to move the interaction forward.

Table 3.8 provides total figures for appropriate *tu/vous* use. The term appropriate is used here to refer to the use of *tu* in informal scenarios and *vous* in formal scenarios. Appropriateness judgments are possible because of the categorical agreement among participants across time about which pronoun should be used as evidenced by their planned performance (see above). It is also noteworthy that the participants’ appropriateness judgments during the rehearsal stage all happened to align with the sociolinguistic conventions of European French.
Table 3.8. Group results for appropriate *tu*/*vous* use in scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Informal (T)</th>
<th>Formal (V)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>66/72</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>16/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>53/53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As these figures show, the participants demonstrated some difficulty in using the appropriate pronoun consistently during session 1, where there were several instances of mixed *tu*/*vous* use. However, following the start of the enrichment program, the participants moved to categorical consistency in the use of *tu* in informal scenarios. The use of *vous* in more formal scenarios, however, proved to be more difficult. Although the data indicate increasing stability after the start of the enrichment program, there were still a number of infelicitous uses of *tu* forms. The inappropriate *tu* form in session 5 and the two in session 6, where we see the greatest consistency of appropriate *vous* use, were used in the tag question *et toi?* ‘and you?’ Recent corpus-driven research (van Compernolle et al., 2011) has suggested that certain supraword constructions such as tags may be memorized by rote as (semi)autonomous sequences, which aligns with the results of this study. A number of the participants in fact noted that the tag *et toi?* ‘and you?’ came to them more automatically, even though they knew that the alternative *et vous?* ‘and you?’ was appropriate. (This will be covered below in the discussion of the individual results.)

Table 3.9 provides group figures for the use of *on* in variation with *nous* ‘we’. Observed frequencies (*n*) and percentages (%) refer to the number of *on* tokens used out of the number of contexts in which either *on* or *nous* could have been used for first-person plural reference. Table 3.10 displays group figures for the absence of *ne* in verbal negation. Observed frequencies and
percentages refer to the number of times *ne* was omitted from negation out of the number of contexts in which *ne* could have been present or absent (i.e., negative verb phrases). It should be kept in mind that all eight participants indicated that informal variants were appropriate for the informal scenarios during sessions 3, 5, and 6, whereas appropriate judgments regarding the formal situations were variable: participants were evenly split between formal and informal variants during session 3, while session 5 was overwhelmingly judged to be more informal and session 6 to be more formal (see above for the analysis of orientations to the situations).

**Table 3.9.** Group results for *on* use in scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>35/39</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>19/48</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>54/87</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18/20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>18/23</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19/31</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.10.** Group results for *ne* absence in scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>34/45</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40/63</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>23/30</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>33/46</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12/29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the informal scenarios show a dramatic shift in performance starting in session 3, where *on* was used in the vast majority of contexts where either *on* or *nous* could have
been used, and *ne* was omitted at very high rates from negated verb phrases. This trend continued for the remainder of the study as indicated by the high rates of *on* use and *ne* omission in sessions 5 and 6. Nonetheless, there was still some variation—in all sessions, there is at least one instance of *nous* and *ne* presence despite planned performance. This is indicative of increasing controlled use of the informal variants, but that the more formal, standard variants that were taught as invariable forms most likely remain more habitual for these learners (see also van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a) and required mediation during the performance of the scenario. This is also corroborated by the participants’ own comments. For example, Leon noted during a debriefing stage of a scenario that even though *tu* and *ne* omission were relatively easy for him, *nous* was still “ingrained” in his head.

*Excerpt 3.30*

Tutor: so. ++ what did you think.
Leon: uh + I guess, I don’t know. the *tu* is like again. very easy for me to use
Tutor: uhhuh
Leon: and I think *pas* even is like I’m like slowly beginning to be able to drop that like pretty easily.
Tutor: mhm
Leon: but again like the *on* versus *nous*, it’s still like the *nous*’s like still very much ingrained in my head.

(Leon, session 5, informal scenario debriefing)

In short, the data suggest that, although the learners developed control over their use of linguistic variants according to their orientation to scenarios, their use of previously unknown informal variants (i.e., *on, ne*’s absence) was not yet completely consistent because the “old” (more formal) forms (i.e., *nous, ne*’s presence) emphasized in their previous coursework were more easily accessible to them during language production.
In the formal situations, there was also an increase in the total number of *on* tokens and *ne* absence across time. Although individual results will be discussed in detail below, it is appropriate to tease out some of these patterns here since there was variation in orientations to the more formal scenarios, which resulted in variable “appropriate” performance (i.e., in line with planned performance) among the participants. As noted above, the participants were evenly split in appropriateness judgments during session 3, with Nikki, Susan, Leon, and Stephanie opting to use the more informal stylistic variants and Pierre, Mary, Laurie, and Conrad deciding that the more formal variants were appropriate to use. Pierre, Mary, Laurie, and Conrad categorically produced the more formal *nous* (*n* = 26/26; 100%) and *ne ... pas* (*n* = 11/11; 100%). Such consistency should not be surprising since the more formal, standard variants were the ones with which the learners were most familiar. However, Nikki, Susan, Leon, and Stephanie were also consistent in their use of the informal variants *on* (*n* = 19/22; 86.4%) and *Ø ... pas* (*n* = 6/7; 85.7%). Taken together with the results of the informal scenarios, it appears that even after only one enrichment session, the learners were able to control their use of both formal and informal language variants. This conclusion is supported by the relatively consistent use of informal variants in session 5 and formal variants in session 6, which were overwhelmingly judged to be more informal and more formal, respectively.

Learners’ increasing control over the variants can also be seen in the correlation between planned performance (as indicated in the rehearsal stage of scenarios) and actual performance (as evidenced by their use of variants in scenarios). Figure 3.1 displays correspondence scores for each of the variables (i.e., *Tu/Vous, On/Nous*, and *Negation*) for each session of the enrichment program in which scenarios were performed. Informal and formal scenarios were combined because the goal of the analysis was to understand the degree to which the variants were under the learners’ control in all contexts of use. The scores were calculated as follows:
In other words, the score represents the percentage of participant-selected appropriate variant use. However, as noted above, none of the participants indicated whether *on, nous*, or the presence versus absence of *ne* would be appropriate in session 1 (i.e., preenrichment). The scores for the first session therefore reflect the percentage of conventionally appropriate uses (i.e., *nous* and *ne*’s presence for the formal scenario and *on* and *ne*’s absence for the informal scenario).

Figure 3.1. Correlations between planned and actual performance.

The data reveal a basic trend toward a higher correspondence between planned and actual performance over time, which reflects the descriptive statistics shown above. However, correlations between the features of language are variable. There is a moderate positive correlation between *tu/vous* and *on/nous* \((r = .501)\) and between *tu/vous* and negation \((r = .579)\), but these correlations are not statistically significant \((p > .05)\). However, there is a strong positive correlation between *on/nous* and negation \((r = .943)\), which is significant at the \(p < .001\) level.
These findings suggest that increasing control over *tu* and *vous* was independent of the *on*/nous and negation variables, yet developing control over *on*/nous and negation was linked to a common factor. It is reasonable to presume that the tight correlation between *on*/nous and negation is related to the fact that the learners were adding new forms (i.e., *on* and negation without *ne*) to their repertoires, rather than simply revising their knowledge of existing forms, as in the case of *tu* and *vous*. Incidentally, the data in Figure 3.1 also show that control over *on*/nous developed at a quicker pace than did control over negation. This suggests that substitution variants (e.g., substituting *on est* ‘one is = we are’ for *nous sommes*) may be easier to appropriate than omission variants (i.e., omitting *ne* without modifying the remaining components of the verb phrase) (see Mougeon et al., 2010).

### 3.4.3 Performance in scenarios: Individual results

The group results presented above provided a snapshot of development in performance across time. The data showed that the participants made an initial step toward gaining control over formal and informal variants. At the same time, there was variability in the learners’ orientations to the supposedly more formal scenarios, especially during session 3. The individual results presented in this section serve to develop individual learner profiles, focusing specifically on the consistency of variant use in relation to each participant’s planned performance.

Individual tallies for *tu* and *vous* use in informal and formal scenarios are presented in Tables 3.11 and 3.12, respectively. Recall that all the participants indicated that *tu* was appropriate for all informal scenarios while *vous* was appropriate for all formal scenarios.
Table 3.11. Frequencies of Tu/Vous use in informal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Vous</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Vous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12. Frequencies of Tu/Vous use in formal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Vous</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Vous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for the informal scenarios indicate that, following the initial preenrichment session in which there was some mixed use of *tu* and *vous*, all learners consistently used the *tu* form of
address during their scenarios. However, in the formal situations, there remained some variable or mixed use of these pronouns. Specifically, Susan, Leon, and Conrad demonstrated some trouble using *vous* consistently, producing tokens of *tu* at times, specifically in (semi)autonomous sequences. As noted above, this was particularly relevant for the tag question *et toi?* ‘and you?’, which appeared to be more habituated than its *vous*-form alternative, *et vous?* This finding aligns with the corpus-driven research reported in van Compernolle et al. (2011) and van Compernolle and Williams (in preparation). In addition, there is evidence that the participants in this study were aware of this inconsistent use of *tu* and *vous*. As noted above, several participants reported that *et toi?* ‘and you?’ was much more quickly accessible than *et vous?*, which they produced even though they had consciously decided that *tu* forms were more appropriate. One particularly salient example of the inconsistency between a learner’s awareness of *tu* and *vous* and her actual performance comes from the opening lines of Susan’s formal scenario (a telephone job interview) during session 6 of the study.

Excerpt 3.31

Tutor:  ah bonjour Susan. comment allez-vous.

  *oh hello Susan how are you [vous]*

Susan:  ehh + pas mal. **et toi**?

  *not bad and you [tu]*

Tutor:  ((looks at Susan with raised eye brow))

Susan:  mm et **vous**. ((in a low, serious tone))

  *mm and you [vous]*

Both:  ((laughing))

Susan:  **GEEZ**.

Tutor:  uhhuh. ((laughing))

Susan:  **AHHH**.

Tutor:  ((laughs)) donc. + moi ça va, merci. ((scenario moves forward))

  *so me fine thanks*
The tutor, playing the role of a work-study program director in Montpellier, France, asked Susan how she was doing, using a vous form in his question. In her response, Susan produced the tag et toi?, which is both incongruent with the tutor’s initiation of vous and divergent from Susan’s own orientation to the scenario. Following the tutor’s glance at Susan with a raised eye brow, she recognized that she had diverged from her stated plan and, in a low, serious tone, corrected herself, this time using the vous form of the tag question. At the end of the scenario, Susan immediately addressed this example.

Excerpt 3.32
Susan: okay, so I screwed up right in the beginning. I was like et toi? ((laughs))
Tutor: uhhuh ((laughs)) you don’t get the job.
Susan: crap, um probably you get so used like drilled in your head, like ça va? ça va bien. et toi? ((‘how are you?’ ‘fine’ ‘and you?’))
Tutor: mhm
Susan: so it was just like it wasn’t + that I wasn’t thinking about it, it was out of habit. it just + came out.
Tutor: right.
Susan: so that’s + going to be something I have to think about. [...] I’m so so so used to being like et toi? (xxx) I’ve been used to saying that.

(Susan, session 6, formal scenario debriefing)

Susan’s account of why she produced the tu form rather than the vous form pointed to her previous experience learning French, where the tag form et toi? is much more frequent than its vous alternative, most notably in greeting sequences. Thus, while more novel (i.e., less autonomous) sequences may be consciously controlled, there is evidence that other sequences remain more habitual, despite gains made in conceptual knowledge. Nonetheless, the fact that
Susan and several other learners were becoming aware that certain sequences may be habitual in their own discourse constitutes a first step toward progressively coming to control them.

Tables 3.13 and 3.14 display figures for the use of *on* and *nous* in the informal and formal scenarios, respectively. To recall, all of the participants indicated that *on* was appropriate in the informal scenarios after session 1. However, there was variation in the more formal scenarios. Gray shading has been added to Table 3.13 to indicate which of the variants was selected by individual participants during the rehearsal/planning stage.

**Table 3.13.** Frequencies of On/Nous use in informal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding hearer from reference
Table 3.14. Frequencies of On/Nous use in formal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Nous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures indicate that the participants began to develop control over their use of *on* and *nous* as evidenced by the relative consistency with which each individual used *on* in informal scenarios and *on* or *nous*, depending on individual orientation, in more formal scenarios. Leon, however, demonstrated some difficulty using *on* consistently. Although he did develop his abilities to use this pronoun when and how he wanted to, he also produced tokens of *nous* in each of the informal scenarios and in the formal scenarios for sessions 3 and 5, where he had planned to use *on*. This was explained by Leon as relating to his previous learning experiences in which *nous* was taught as the only first-person plural pronoun.

*Excerpt 3.33 (Reexcerpted from 3.30)*

Leon: but again like the *on* versus *nous*, it’s still like the *nous*’s like still very much ingrained in my head.

(Leon, session 5, informal scenario debriefing)
Likewise, several other students had difficulty using *on* consistently in sessions 3 (Stephanie, Laurie, Susan) and 6 (Pierre, Mary). Nonetheless, all of the participants did begin to incorporate *on* into their repertoires and used it more frequently than *nous* where they judged it to be appropriate.

Laurie also used *nous* once for exclusion in session 6 (informal scenario), the only example of this particular use of *nous* in the data. In the following excerpt, Laurie was calling a friend (the tutor) to invite him to a party that she and another friend were throwing.

*Excerpt 3.34*

Laurie: ring, ring,
Tutor: oui? allô?
   *yes hello*
Laurie: bonjour c’est Laurie.
   *hello it’s Laurie*
Tutor: ah salut Laurie, çà va?
   *oh hi Laurie how are you*
Laurie: oui çà va. et toi?
   *yes fine and you*
Tutor: moi, çà va, çà va,
   *me fine fine*
Laurie: um j’ai + une question? uh mon ami et moi? *nous + nou- uh nous sommes,*
   *um I have a question   uh my friend and I   we we uh we are*
Tutor: hmm?
Laurie: but it’s my friend and me.
Tutor: okay.
Laurie: I would use nous.
Tutor: okay. so what are you trying to do there.
Laurie: I’m saying *we’re* having a party.
Tutor: ah okay.
Laurie: cuz *you’re* not having the party. *we are.*
As shown in Excerpt 3.33, Laurie’s choice to use *nous* was questioned by the tutor because it diverged from her planned performance (i.e., she had indicated that *on* was appropriate). This prompted Laurie to defend her choice: she explained that because she was referring to her friend and herself, but not to the tutor, *nous* was appropriate for exclusion. This is evidenced by her comment in the last line: “cuz you’re not having the party. we are.” Following this excerpt, there was a lengthy discussion of the pragmatics of using *nous* for exclusion, which focused primarily on situations in which potential referential ambiguities exist and therefore make the use of *nous* relevant for exclusion. As elaborated in chapters 4 and 5, this particular concept was the most difficult for learners to understand, even with assistance from the tutor. The problem was twofold: on the one hand, the presentation of this concept in the materials was likely too vague; on the other hand, there were too few situations in the AJQs and scenarios where exclusion was relevant.

Individual frequencies of *ne* presence and absence in informal and formal scenarios are displayed in Tables 3.15 and 3.16. As with planned performance for *on/nous*, all participants selected the *ne*-absent structure as appropriate for the informal scenarios following the start of the enrichment program, whereas there was variation in the more formal scenarios. Gray shading has therefore been added to Table 3.16 to indicate which of the variants was selected by individual participants during the rehearsal/planning stage.
Table 3.15. Frequencies of Ø...pas/Ne...pas use in informal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ne</td>
<td>+ Ne</td>
<td>- Ne</td>
<td>+ Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Leon used *j’sais pas* ‘I dunno’ once, which was the only ‘slang’ expression he knew in which *ne* could be absent (see the discussion of the LAIs, above).
**emphatic *ne*

Table 3.16. Frequencies of Ø...pas/Ne...pas use in formal scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ne</td>
<td>+ Ne</td>
<td>- Ne</td>
<td>+ Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data displayed in Tables 3.15 and 3.16 indicate that each individual began to incorporate the ne-absent structure into his or her productive repertoire over the course of the study in both informal scenarios and those formal scenarios in which certain participants judged ne omission to be appropriate. However, as with the findings related to the use on, their use of the ne-absent structure was not completely consistent. Pierre, Stephanie, and Laurie in particular demonstrated some problems omitting ne throughout the study. Despite this inconsistency in performance, however, the data do show that each learner developed the ability to omit ne during speech production.

Another interesting finding shown in Table 3.15 is that ne is used as an emphatic by Susan (session 5) and Stephanie (session 3). As Excerpt 3.35 shows, Susan not only used ne as an emphatic, but she also emphasized her utterance through prosody and gesture.

Excerpt 3.35
Tutor: où est-ce que tu veux manger. + peut-être quelque chose de rapide?
   where do you want to eat maybe something quick
Susan: uh[h
Tutor: [comme le H[UB?
   like the HUB
Susan: [je voudrais un + hamburger=,
   I'd like a hamburger
Tutor: =un hamburger? ouais. d’accord. ils ont ça, euh dans le HUB.
   a hamburger yeah okay they have that in the HUB
Susan: uh NON, uh je ne veux pas aller à er au HUB. ((makes emphatic beats with left hand on je, ne, and veux))
   uh no uh I do not want to go to the HUB
Tutor: ah. d’accord.
   oh okay

(Susan, session 5, informal scenario)
In this scenario, Susan and the tutor were trying to decide where to eat lunch. The tutor suggested going to the student union building on campus (i.e., the HUB). In response, Susan emphatically stated that she did not want to go to the HUB, prosodically stressing each syllable in *je ne veux pas* ‘I do not want’ and producing three beat gestures that synchronize with the initial sound of the first three words. The interpretation that Susan’s use of *ne* was intended to be emphatic was confirmed during the debriefing, where she explained that she had used *ne* to stress that she did not want to eat at the HUB.

*Excerpt 3.36*

Tutor: and what about negation.=cuz the first time you=
Susan: =YEAH, cuz I really didn’t want to go to the HUB.

(Susan, session 5, informal scenario debriefing)

In short, these data indicate that the participants not only developed control over the presence and absence of *ne* according to their interpretations of stylistic appropriateness, but that two students (Susan and Stephanie) also incorporated *ne*’s presence as an emphatic into their productive repertoires.

### 3.5 Summary and Conclusions

The formal assessment of sociopragmatic development presented above focused on the analysis of three types of data: (1) language awareness interviews (LAIs), (2) appropriateness judgment questionnaires (AJQs), and (3) scenarios. The analysis provided evidence of learners’ development in terms of conceptual knowledge, problem-solving abilities, and spoken performance capacity. The participants in the study demonstrated development along all three dimensions.
The comparison of preenrichment and postenrichment LAIs revealed several important findings. Overall, there was a shift in orientations to *tu/vous* use. In the preenrichment LAI, explanations of *tu* and *vous* centered on simplistic rules of thumb based on formality and categories of persons. By contrast, in the postenrichment LAI, the learners explained *tu/vous* choice in terms of a system of meanings based on the concepts of self-presentation (*tee-shirt-and-jeans* vs. *suit-and-tie*), social distance (*closeness* vs. *distance*), and power hierarchies (*symmetrical* vs. *asymmetrical* *tu/vous* use) presented to them during the enrichment program. This finding suggests that the enrichment program was indeed successful in helping learners to reorient their awareness of French second-person address by incorporating the concepts into their cognitive systems. With regard to stylistic variants, the learners were unaware that variation between *on* and *nous* or *ne* presence versus absence was possible during the preenrichment LAI, a part a very few specific expressions (e.g., Leon’s *j’sais pas* ‘I dunno’ and Conrad’s *on y va* ‘let’s go’). However, during the postenrichment LAI, all of the learners were able to identify the variants accurately. In addition to the linguistic aspect of variation (i.e., awareness of the variants), the ability to assign meaning potential to variation is fundamentally important if learners are to incorporate variation into their own speech (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011, forthcoming a). This ability was documented in the postenrichment LAIs, where the learners oriented to the concepts (meanings) that could be instantiated through the use of one variant or another. Together, these findings indicate that the enrichment program was successful in not only raising learners’ awareness of the possible variation but, more importantly, of how the variants fit into a functional sociolinguistic system of meanings.

The comparison of preenrichment and postenrichment AJQs corroborated the analysis of the LAIs in that the learners’ choices during the final session of the study were based on their conceptual understanding of the meaning potential of the variants. This stood in sharp contrast to the AJQs completed during session 1, where the learners selected *tu* or *vous* based on rules of
thumb and, with the exception of Conrad’s ability to deduce that *on* and *ne’s* absence were informal, did not consider the informal variants provided as response options to be viable. In addition, the postenrichment AJQ results showed that the learners developed a good conceptual understanding of the way in which the various concepts can work together, demonstrating in several cases an orientation to presenting themselves as *tee-shirt-and-jeans* through the selection of *on* and the *ne*-absent structure while maintaining social distance and/or avoiding a salient power hierarchy through the use of *vous*.

Results of performance during scenario scenarios provided evidence that the concept-based approach to teaching sociopragmatics not only enabled learners to develop their conceptual knowledge or sociopragmatic awareness, but that they were also able to incorporate what they were learning into their productive spoken repertoires. This is a crucial finding of the study because praxis-oriented pedagogies aim to develop one’s critical awareness of what one is doing and why one is doing it. In short, it is never enough simply to know something (empty verbalism), but neither is it sufficient to be able to do it without understanding why (mindless activity) (see Vygotsky, 1986). Instead, as this study has emphasized throughout, the development of sociopragmatic capacity requires both the conceptual orientation and the ability to perform, as well as the capacity to control and revise one’s performance (see chapter 2).

It is important to note, however, that developmental trajectories were not identical across the participants. Indeed, each learner developed his or her own interpretation of the concepts presented in the materials and how they were related. In addition, each individual demonstrated variation in the ability to use and control the variants considered in this study. Such variation is to be expected given that development is not linear but revolutionary, and that internalization is a transformative process of making something one’s own (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Despite differences in how concepts were interpreted, and despite the variation in performance documented above, all of the participants’ orientations to AJQ situations and scenario scenarios
came to be guided by their conceptual knowledge and, in turn, their performance abilities became increasingly controlled by the orientations. In short, the results suggested that the participants had at least begun to internalize the concepts and to integrate into their productive repertoires the language forms that instantiate them, not according to prespecified rules of use but in relation to how they wanted to use the meaning-form relationships they had appropriated in order to accomplish their goals. This precisely what is meant by sociopragmatic capacity, conceived of as goal-directed, mediated action (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a).
Chapter 4

Discussion of Developmental Processes

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I explore a number of developmental processes observed over the course of the study. While it is not possible to present analyses of everything each learner did over the six-week program (approximately 25 hrs of videorecorded data), a careful selection of cases illustrating the various developmental processes found in the study has been made. The cases were selected on the basis of two criteria. First, each of the cases is representative of the developmental process that it aims to illustrate. By representative, I do not mean to suggest identical—each learner certainly demonstrated unique and interesting developmental processes. Nonetheless, a number of phenomena were common throughout the data. Second, cases were selected for their concise, yet illustrative, qualities—that is, the developmental process under consideration is illustrated in a relatively brief episode or set of excerpts from the data.

The chapter is organized around four brief studies of one learner in each section that illustrate the specific qualities of each phase of the pedagogical enrichment program. I first examine verbalized reflections, with specific focus on two dimensions of these tasks: the independent verbalized reflections (Susan, study 1) and concept clarification through cooperative interaction with the tutor (Mary, study 2). The following section then analyzes cooperative interaction around appropriateness judgment questionnaires (Nikki, study 3) and such interaction is implicated in concept formation and internalization processes. Last, I present an analysis of developmental processes during scenarios, namely the mediated development of performance abilities during the spoken-interactive tasks (Mary, study 4). Although some degree of
generalization may be inferred when the formal assessment of development reported in chapter 3 is also taken into account (i.e., the development of conceptual knowledge and performance abilities among all learners), the analyses presented below allow for the “particularization” (van Lier, 2005) of learning experiences that may be representative of the group but simultaneously unique to the individual. As such, the four studies presented here serve in concert with chapter 3 to provide a holistic view of the outcomes of the pedagogical enrichment program along both macro and micro dimensions.

4.2 Verbalized Reflections

4.2.1 Independent verbalized reflections

4.2.1.1 Introduction

Independent verbalized reflection tasks prompted the participants to externalize in speech their emerging understanding of the concepts they were appropriating. Although the participants were certainly aware that they were being video recorded for later review and analysis, the absence of another person pushed them to formulate hypotheses about the nature of the concepts and to confront and attempt to resolve aspects of the concepts that they did not understand for themselves. In this sense, these independent verbalized reflections do not represent “pure” private speech (i.e., speech produced only for the self; see Lantolf, 2003; Lantolf & Yáñez-Prieto, 2003) because they were produced at the request of and for the tutor. Nonetheless, whatever social or interpersonal qualities may be present, verbalized reflections simultaneously had a private or intrapersonal function—namely, to begin to articulate an understanding of the concepts and to link any existing knowledge to the conceptual system provided in the materials.
It should also be noted that within Vygotsky’s (1986) theory of the relationship between thinking and speaking, and his analysis of the development of private (or egocentric) speech as the internalization of social speech (Lantolf, 2003), there is no contradiction in recognizing that speech produced for another may simultaneously have an intrapersonal function. In fact, as Wells (1999) argues, insisting on a *private-speech-versus-social-speech* dichotomy is both unproductive and incommensurable with Vygotsky’s argument. What seems more useful and closer to Vygotsky’s own theorizing is to posit two continua of private and social functions of speech wherein the question is not whether, or to what extent, a particular instance of speech is social or private (i.e., as a single continuum), but rather in what ways does some instance of speech function on both interpersonal and intrapersonal planes (i.e., as two parallel continua). The question relevant to the present data is, therefore, how might speech elicited by, and produced for, another both reflect and shape thought in a real-time dialectic? Below, I present a case study (Susan) of what emerged as the primary function of independent verbalized reflections: linking existing functional and semantic knowledge to the concepts.

### 4.2.1.2 Linking functional and semantic knowledge to scientific a concept

In this section, I present a case analysis of Susan’s independent verbalized reflections centered on the concept of social distance as it relates to the use of the second-person pronouns *tu* and *vous*. Data collected during the initial independent verbalized reflection task from session 2 (i.e., introduction of concept cards and diagrams) are analyzed. Susan’s case illustrates the principal function of these verbalized reflection tasks: assisting learners in linking their *functional, semantic, and conceptual* knowledge.
These three categories of knowledge have been operationalized as follows:

- **Functional knowledge** refers to a learner’s understanding of rules or conventions of use that are social-context-specific and/or interlocutor-dependent. As such, they typically take the form of simplistic rules of thumb, as discussed in chapter 3. With regard to the pronouns *tu* and *vous*, this includes such rules as “use *tu* with friends,” “use *vous* with people older than you,” and “if in doubt, use *vous*.” Functional knowledge therefore reflects some understanding of how to use a particular language feature but, importantly, it does not entail a meaning component. In addition, because functional knowledge is ultimately tied to concrete examples, it cannot necessarily be recontextualized to meet the demands of new and potentially ambiguous situations.

- **Semantic knowledge** refers to a learner’s understanding of the meaning(s) of a particular feature of language, which can be *abstract*, as in “*tu* is friendly, familiar, or informal,” and “*vous* is polite, respectful, or formal,” or it can be incorporated into functional knowledge, as in “*tu* is informal, so you can use it with friends and people your own age” or “use *vous* with teachers to show respect.” Importantly, semantic knowledge reflects a static, or essentialist, understanding of meaning as residing in the linguistic sign itself (e.g., *tu* is always friendly or familiar and *vous* is always polite or respectful). Such semantic properties derive from overgeneralizations of conventions of language use in which correlations with first-order indexicalities are taken to be co-equivalent with inherent meanings.

---

17 These definitions/descriptions have been adapted from Negueruela’s (2003, chap. 6) criteria of generality in conceptual development and respecified for relevance to sociopragmatics.
• Conceptual knowledge refers to a learner’s understanding of a particular coherent and generalizable meaning (or meaning potential) that may be instantiated through the use of some feature of language, such as the concept of social distance. In contrast to semantic knowledge, which reflects an understanding of ready-made or prepackaged (inherent) meanings, conceptual knowledge entails an orientation to the active design (creation) of meaning. This may be abstract, as in “vous can be used to create social distance,” or concrete (i.e., applied to a context), as in “you use tu with friends to show or maintain a close relationship.” In other words, conceptual knowledge entails understanding that meanings are created through the use of linguistic forms (a semiotic perspective) rather than the forms themselves having meanings (a semantic perspective). Conceptual knowledge also allows learners to intentionally violate sociolinguistic conventions to accomplish a special effect, such as creating distance with a peer either in jest (see, e.g., Williams & van Compernolle, 2007) or to deliberately reject potential friend status.

The concept cards, including think aloud questions, and pedagogical diagrams developed for this study were designed to lead students through a three-step process of (1) introducing the relevant forms, (2) introducing the relevant concept(s), and (3) mapping the concepts onto forms. This stepwise approach was adopted in order to guide learners through a reinterpretation of whatever existing functional and semantic knowledge they might have previously developed in terms of the
holistic concepts presented to them (see also the analysis of language awareness interviews in chapter 3).  

Susan’s existing knowledge of *tu* and *vous* was primarily functional with some semantic components (e.g., formality, respect) at the start of the enrichment program. In her preenrichment language awareness interview (LAI), Susan described the rules for using *tu* and *vous* as follows:

**Excerpt 4.1**

Tutor: can you explain a little bit about what you know + um about using *tu* and *vous*, in French, Susan: um I know *tu* is more informal. like if you’re um meeting up with a friend. or a classmate or something. and *vous* is more for + a person uh + that you hold um. + like highly in respect, I guess?=like a teacher.

Tutor: mhm.

As is clear in excerpt 4.1, Susan’s description of the rules of *tu*/*vous* use centered on functional knowledge of categories of people with whom to use one or the other of these pronouns, which aligned with the kinds of rules of thumb normally presented in learner textbooks. In addition, Susan mentioned some semantic properties of *tu* and *vous* such as formality and respect. The analysis of Susan’s independent verbalized reflections presented below focuses on how she began to reinterpret this functional knowledge in relation to the concepts of *social distance*, namely how Susan reoriented her thinking not just to articulate categories of people as rules governing the choice between *tu* and *vous* (functional knowledge) but to consider the qualities of the social

---

18 It should be noted that an important part of developing sociopragmatic capacity in learners who have already received formal L2 instruction is unlearning many unsystematic or invariable rules (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011). As such, it was decided to address the forms directly as a way of highlighting for the learners the inconsistency in and/or inaccuracy of their existing knowledge. It is also important to recall that the leading concept, *orders of indexicality*, was presented first without reference to specific forms. The remaining concepts (e.g., self-presentation, social distance) were designed to lead the learners through a quasi-investigation (Davydov, 2004) of the orders of indexicality in relation to concrete communicative practices (i.e., sociolinguistic variants).

19 The notions of formality and respect, as articulated by Susan, entail *semantic knowledge* in the sense that *tu* and *vous* are depicted as inherently having these qualities or meanings.
relationships she was describing (i.e., closeness and distance) as meanings indexed by, and created through, the use of these pronouns (conceptual knowledge).

Susan’s first verbalized reflection regarding *tu/vous* choice is shown in excerpt 4.2, which she produced in response to the concept card displayed below. This concept card was intended to prompt learners to begin thinking about and to verbalize their understanding of second-person pronoun use in French, and therefore articulates with data collected during preenrichment LAIs. As should be clear, the description of *tu* and *vous* provided on the card is primarily semantic and based on textbook-style depictions of these pronouns. As noted above, the intent behind this explanation is to directly address the kinds of rules presented in normal pedagogical materials, which can then be deconstructed and reinterpreted through the conceptual information provided in the subsequent cards. The think-aloud questions are intended to push the learner to verbalize what he or she has understood from the card and to elaborate on it in his or her own words.

**Concept card:**

*Tu* and *vous*: Both *tu* and *vous* (and related forms, e.g., *toi, ton, ta, tes, votre, vos,* and imperatives) refer to a second person or persons (i.e., ‘you’). *Tu* is always singular (it refers to one person), but *vous* can be either singular or plural (it refers to two or more people). *Tu* is usually described as informal (or familiar) while *vous*-singular is described as formal (or polite). Many students have trouble deciding whether to use *tu* or *vous*-singular, especially if their first language doesn’t make this distinction, like English.

What can you infer from this explanation?

When might you use *tu? Vous?*

**Excerpt 4.2**

1 ((reads silently)) so basically + it’s describing the difference ((coughs))
2 between *tu* and *vous,* + and *when* to use it? ++ umm ++ I would say
3 I would use *tu* in a situation where it’s *informal,* + um + of if I’m +
4 *comfortable* speaking to a person, and *tu* + for example I wouldn’t use
This verbalized reflection provides important information with regard to how Susan orients to factors influencing *tu/vous* use (functional and semantic knowledge). Most notably, she articulated a number of rules related to the formality of the context (line 3), familiarity with her interlocutor through such adjectives as “comfortable” (line 4) and “welcoming” (line 11) and references to first meetings (lines 6, 9), and the relative age (lines 7, 11) and status (e.g., a professor; line 5) of her interlocutor, including issues of respect and authority (lines 7-8). While none of these individual rules of thumb is incorrect (each is, after all, derived from probabilistic conventions of use), taken together they do not represent a coherent orienting basis for using *tu* and *vous*. The incoherence of her explanation is clear if we take, for example, the rule that *tu* should be used in informal situations (line 3) and the rule that *vous* should be used when meeting someone for the first time (line 6) because these two rules are often in direct conflict (e.g., when meeting someone for the first time in an informal setting such as a party). It is also noteworthy that in concluding this verbalized reflection (line 12), Susan shrugged her shoulders and said “whatever. (it) depends.”, which suggests that she was not committed to, and could not articulate, a specific understanding of, or orientation to using, *tu* and *vous*.

To be sure, Susan demonstrated some awareness of the potential ambiguity or unsystematicity of her rules in two places: (1) when she suggested that *tu* would not be
appropriate to use with a professor (lines 4-6); and (2) when she was attempting to articulate a rule for meeting a friend of a friend (lines 9-11). In both of these examples, Susan provided exceptions to her rules: “use vous with a professor unless explicitly told to use tu;” and “use vous when meeting someone for the first time, except in the case of a friend of a friend if he/she ‘seems welcoming’ and is the same age.” Thus, while Susan demonstrated some functional and semantic knowledge of tu and vous, which would serve her at least moderately well in the specific social-interactive contexts she described, this knowledge was comprised of a set of loosely related pieces of information derived from social-context-specific conventions of use without the presence of any overarching meaning potentials or concepts that could explain these rules of thumb and their apparent exceptions. Nonetheless, as demonstrated below, this functional and semantic knowledge became useful for Susan as she began to struggle to understand the concept of social distance because her previously developed knowledge constituted a thesis against which an alternative (i.e., concept) is proposed. It is the struggle to resolve this type of dissonance that creates the starting point for development. In fact, although Susan’s original rules were unsystematic (cf. the potential conflict between the rules and exceptions to them), they mediated between her existing everyday (experiential, unsystematic) understandings of such notions as familiarity, respect, and formality and the theoretical (abstract, holistic, systematic) concept of social distance (see also Brooks et al., 2010).

The concept card shown below introduced the concept of social distance. This particular card included no mention of tu and vous because it was intended to lead learners to consider the qualities of social relationships in terms of closeness and distance independently of the various linguistic practices that index them (i.e., the concept/meaning potential rather than the form). As is evident in Susan’s verbalized reflection (excerpt 4.3), this card guides her to begin to reinterpret her functional and semantic knowledge in relation to the concept.
Concept card:

The first concept, social distance, refers to the degree of familiarity or intimacy you have with another person. You can think about social distance as a continuum ranging from ‘close’ (very familiar or intimate) relationships to ‘distant’ (unfamiliar or nonintimate) relationships.

What can you infer from this explanation?

What are some examples of close relationships? Distant relationships? In between?

Excerpt 4.3

1. so basically social distance is how comfortable, you feel, with a person?
2. um + an example of a close relationship is + your family. + um + your
3. siblings. whatever. probably your parents. unless they were + really
4. strict.= but for my parents at least I’d say that that’s a close relationship,
5. and it would be informal speaking to them, + um my friends. classmates
6. probably, + um. + distant relationships would be + employer + or + if
7. you’re shopping, and you (run into) someone, probably if you don’t know
8. them, + um + a waiter, (just) to show respect.= and in between. +++
9. I don’t really know. + hm. + I guess if you like started out. + with a
10. distant relationship, and + became more comfortable, and they said
11. you could switch to a close relationship, ++ I don’t know if there’s an
12. in between. + switching between like tu and vous. + you could like
13. confuse yourself (and) the other person. ((laughs))

The first shift in Susan’s thinking appears in line 1, where she inferred that “social distance is how comfortable, you feel, with a person?” in response to the first think aloud question on the concept card. Earlier, in excerpt 4.2 (above), Susan had formulated a rule for using tu with people with whom she felt comfortable speaking. However, when the notion of “comfort with an interlocutor” recurred, Susan linked it to the concept of distance (i.e., the degree of comfort, or the continuum of closeness and distance). She then considered how the concept of
social distance related to specific examples of social relationships, including family (siblings and parents), friends, and classmates as potentially close relationships and employers, strangers, and wait staff as distant relationships (lines 2-8). In essence, Susan began to reinterpret her previously existing functional knowledge (i.e., rules of use) in terms of the concept. Such was also true of her existing semantic knowledge (e.g., formality, respect). For example, as Susan linked her rule “use *tu* with family” (functional knowledge) to the idea that “family” is a close relationship (conceptual knowledge), she also associated close relationships with informal speech (semantic knowledge) (line 5). This was also evident when she was considering distant relationships, such as the relationship between a diner and a waiter, where social distance (conceptual knowledge) may be one way to show respect (previously semantic knowledge, as in the rule of thumb “*vous* is respectful or polite” provided in most learner texts) (line 8).

Susan encountered some difficulty when attempting to think of a relationship that might be in between close and distant (lines 8-13); that is, where the degree of social distance is somewhat ambiguous. Here, she hesitated, as evidenced by her self-assessment “I don’t really know.” (line 9) and multiple pauses, before positing that some distant relationships may become close relationships. However, she continued to demonstrate some confusion (e.g., “I don’t know if there’s an in between.”; lines 11-12), at which point she reverted to considering not the concept itself, but particular uses of *tu* and *vous* (line 12). Specifically, Susan appeared to have interpreted the question centered on ambiguous relationships as a reference to alternating between the two pronouns, which she rejected on the grounds that “you could like confuse yourself (and) the other person.” This possibly reflects her previous educational experiences—including exposure to French textbooks—where social relationships and the rules of *tu/vous* use were overwhelmingly
depicted in an idealized, unambiguous way (van Compernolle, 2010a). Despite her uncertainty regarding what counted as “in between,” Susan’s verbalized reflection in excerpt 4.3 constituted an initial step toward linking her functional and semantic knowledge to social distance and, thus, represented an important stage in the process of concept formation.

The next concept card, displayed below, focused on linking the way in which social distance is indexed by and/or created through the use of *tu* (closeness) and *vous* (distance). In this way, it was intended to help learners map the concept onto the forms that instantiate them. In addition, the think aloud questions aimed to prompt learners to consider examples of when and why they would want to mark closeness or distance, as well as those that may be more ambiguous (see excerpt 4.4). This was a key part of the design of the pedagogy as it constituted one way in which a learner’s emerging abstract conceptual knowledge could be applied to concrete, real-world practices and, in turn, helped them to transform and reinterpret their functional and semantic knowledge of the rules for use of linguistic forms.

**Concept card:**

Marking closeness or distance can be achieved, in part, through your choice between *tu* and *vous*. You can point to closeness by using *tu* and distance by using *vous*. Your choice of pronoun, therefore, has real consequences for your relationships.

What can you infer from this explanation?

Can you think of some examples when you would want or need to use *tu* to mark closeness? *Vous* to mark distance?

---

20 One of the critiques of textbook examples of *tu/vous* use is that model interpersonal interactions presented to learners nearly categorically depict social distance as preexisting, static, and known to and agreed upon by each interactional participant (van Compernolle, 2010a). In other words, model dialogues in particular make it seem as though all highly proficient and/or native speakers of French know exactly which pronoun to use at all times and in all contexts. Examples of the social work of negotiating and (re)shaping patterns of address form use, including avoidance (Gardner-Chloros, 1991; Morford, 1997), are almost never shown, nor are examples of the potential consequences of inappropriate or mixed use of these pronouns. As such, classroom learners typically perceive *tu/vous* choice as a straightforward affair governed by very clear rules of use (see, e.g., Dewaele & Planchenault, 2006).
Can you think of any examples where the choice between *tu* and *vous* would be difficult? Why?

**Excerpt 4.4**

1. so using *tu* would be for a close relationship, and *vous* for a uh distant relationship. ++ so *tu* you would use with your family and friends, +
2. and *vous* would be + (with) a professor. or, + an employer, (7.0) um
3. I would say it might be + difficult ++ if the person is + close to your age, but you know that you + that they have authority over you? so it might be uh tricky. to determine. *tu* or *vous*. like with + an RA ((“resident assistant” in the dormitories)) I don’t know what I would use. probably *vous*. +++ um, +++ or like. + I guess if you have a maid or something?
4. like they’re obviously- like you have authority over them, + but to show respect, I would still use *vous*.

Susan began her verbalized reflection by summarizing the content of the concept card, namely that *tu* marks a close relationship while *vous* marks a distant one (lines 1-2). She then cited several examples of relatively straightforward close (family, friends) and distant (professors, employers) social relationships in which she would use *tu* and *vous* respectively (lines 2-3). These specific relationships were also examples that Susan provided earlier in her verbalized reflection centered on the concept of social distance (excerpt 3.3, above). As such, these data provide evidence that as she was developing an understanding of the concept of social distance, she was progressively reinterpreting her functional knowledge (i.e., rules of use, such as “use *tu* with friends”) within a coherent system of meaning. In other words, the concept of social distance provides Susan with an overarching meaning potential through which she is able to explain and understand the probabilistic conventions she earlier depicted as rules. For example, Susan’s explanation for why *tu* is used with friends and family (both are examples of close relationships; see excerpt 4.3) is as follows: “using *tu* would be for a close relationship” (line 1) and “so *tu* you
would use with your family and friends.” (line 2). As this example illustrates, although certain aspects of Susan’s functional rules remain present, they have taken on new meaning in relation to her emerging understanding of the concept of social distance. Nonetheless, Susan was continuing to think empirically (cf. rules of thumb, functional knowledge), and she had not yet fully appreciated the concept that the qualities of social relationships are not only reflected by, but are in part establish through, the use of tu and vous.

Susan continued to demonstrate difficulty in thinking of and explaining more ambiguous examples (cf. excerpt 4.3), as evidenced by the remainder of her verbalized reflection (lines 4-10). She reverted to her functional and semantic knowledge, recognizing that it would be difficult to decide between tu and vous if her interlocutor were her own age (cf. the rule of thumb “use tu with people your own age”) but had also authority over her (cf. the rule of thumb “use vous with people of authority”). Although she decided that in the case of the resident assistant (RA), she would probably opt for vous, she did not demonstrate any understanding of why this might be an appropriate choice, other than the relatively vague reference to authority (lines 6-8). Likewise, her explanation of why she might choose vous when speaking to a maid was limited to her semantic knowledge, namely that vous was respectful (lines 8-10). One of the issues here is that Susan appeared to have trouble disentangling the concept of social distance from that of power, which had not yet been introduced. More specifically, Susan equated closeness with equality and distance with inequality or authority. Although these associations are certainly grounded in real-world examples (e.g., friends are generally close and relatively equal, while employee-employer relationships often entail social distance and a power hierarchy), there are many exceptions to them. For instance, parents typically have power over their children, despite there (at least often) being closeness or intimacy between them. Along the same lines, social distance between two

---

21 The concept of power hierarchies was presented in the subsequent group of concept cards, which helped to disambiguate it from social distance.
people does not necessarily entail a relevant power hierarchy, as in the case of two coworkers who do not know each other well or at all, but where neither has any sort of power over the other.

4.2.1.3 Summary

The data analyzed above illustrated how the concept cards and verbalization tasks helped Susan to begin to link and reinterpret her existing functional and semiotic knowledge of *tu/vous* use within the concept of social distance. As Susan read through the concept cards and verbally reflected on their content as prompted by think aloud questions, she was able to contemplate the so-called rules with which she was already familiar (e.g., “use *tu* with friends”) in relation to the meanings and concepts that such rules indirectly index (e.g., social distance). Following the design of the materials, Susan ultimately began to map the concept of social distance onto the forms *tu* and *vous*. This is an important distinction from more traditional approaches to pragmatics instruction that typically aim to assist learners in, first, acquiring forms and, second, mapping those forms onto meanings. One of the consequences of the concept-based approach illustrated here is that Susan—as well as the other participants—were eventually able to transfer their conceptual knowledge to other, new situations as well as to map the concept of social distance onto other relevant language forms (e.g., *nous* vs. *on*, *ne’s* presence and absence), as indicated by the results reported in chapter 3.

The data presented above have also provided insight into the aspects of the concept of social distance that proved difficult for Susan. Specifically, Susan had trouble thinking of and interpreting social relationships that are not straightforwardly close or distant as well as separating the concept of social distance from that of power. While this is certainly evidence of immature conceptual development, it is nonetheless an important part of development in that the verbalized reflections rendered visible these difficulties and ambiguities to Susan herself as well
as to the tutor in subsequent tasks. In fact, one of the important findings of this study is that although the independent verbalized reflections did not in and of themselves immediately result in fully developed conceptual knowledge, they did in many cases highlight for learners a number of aspects of the concepts that they did not understand. Developing awareness of what one does not actually understand is a crucial component of conceptual development since, as Negueruela (2008) puts it, one of the goals of Vygotskian revolutionary pedagogies is to develop “awareness about awareness through concepts” (p. 194). In other words, while becoming aware that one knows something (i.e., conscious knowledge of the object of study) is certainly an important part of development, it is equally important that one also become aware of the gaps in one’s conceptual knowledge. As highlighted in the following section, cooperative verbalized reflections with the tutor both revealed sources of difficulty (i.e., gaps in conceptual knowledge) and occasioned opportunities for mediated development and were, thus, central components of the pedagogical enrichment program.

4.2.2 Cooperative verbalized reflections

4.2.2.1 Introduction

As shown in the preceding analysis, independent verbalized reflections assisted Susan in developing her conceptual knowledge by reinterpreting her extant functional and semantic (everyday) knowledge. Such was also true—to varying degrees—for all of the other learners. However, their understandings of the concepts were often immature for at least two reasons. On the one hand, without expert guidance, many of the participants were unable to think of examples to which they could apply the concepts or, because the concepts were abstract, they were unable to fully understand them independently. On the other hand, some of the learners completed the
independent verbalized reflections relatively quickly, without spending much time contemplating their meanings. As Swain et al. (2009) have reported, such low languagers (i.e., students who do not produce much verbalization) often do not develop very mature understandings of the concepts. In the present study, some participants appeared to orient to the verbalized reflection task as one in which the goal was to simply repeat or paraphrase the content of the concept cards for the camera/tutor rather than to develop for themselves a deeper understanding of them or to question or reinterpret their existing everyday knowledge.

For these reasons, the cooperative verbalized reflections in which the tutor and students discussed the pedagogical diagrams together were a crucial component of the study that accomplished two objectives. First, they enabled the tutor to evaluate learners’ emerging conceptual knowledge immediately following their independent verbalized reflections. Second, they provided an opportunity to elaborate on, and to clarify, aspects of the concepts with which the learners had difficulty. As such, cooperative verbalized reflections were simultaneously an exercise in assessment and instruction because the tutor was able to determine what each learner had understood independently and to push them to consider aspects of the concepts that were beyond their current independent understanding. In other words, an opportunity to work within a learner’s ZPD was provided.

The following section presents an analysis of a cooperative verbalized reflection between Mary and the tutor in which Mary attempted to articulate her understanding of the leading concept of orders of indexicality, based on the pedagogical diagram shown in Figure 4.1:
As is evident in the data, shown below, Mary had independently developed an understanding that meanings can be intentionally created by speakers (second-order indexicalities; large box on left) by drawing on conventions of language use (first-order indexicalities; upper right-hand box) and stereotypes about language use (third-order indexicalities; lower right-hand box). However, she had difficulty disambiguating intention from interpretation, or more specifically the notion that there may be multiple social interpretations of any single instance of language, which may or may not align with a speaker's intention. The cooperative interaction with the tutor helped Mary to take the first step in recognizing the contingency of language (van Lier, 2004); that is, the relationship between speaker designs and interlocutor interpretations.
4.2.2.2 Elaboration and concept clarification through cooperative interaction

Excerpt 4.5 displays the opening of the cooperative verbalized reflection in which the tutor asked Mary to explain her understanding of the diagram depicting *orders of indexicality*. It is clear from the outset that Mary had trouble articulating her understanding of this concept, as evidenced by her hesitation (i.e., “yeah. umm”) and lengthy pause in line 4 in response to the tutor’s question. In addition, when the tutor reformulated his question (line 5), there as another long pause (line 6), which further points to the difficulty Mary encountered in explaining how she understood the concept.

Excerpt 4.5

1  Tutor: so can you just ex- like this first one. for example.
2                     what do you understand. =wha- what that diagram
3                     represents.
4  Mary: yeah. umm (5.5)
5  Tutor: how do those three boxes + interrelate.
6                     (4.5)
7  Mary: I think this one is about + choosing + how to say things,
8                     ((making circular motion around large box on left with pen))
9      ++ uh in relationship + to how you uh want to come off?
10  Tutor: mhm,
11  Mary: to other people, + what you would emphasize about
12                     yourself. or + hide about yourself. + um ++ and those
13                     are based on + these things. ((pointing to conventions with pen))
14                     like where you’re from.
15  Tutor: mhm.
16  Mary: and what your + status is. and what your age is. + so I
17                     think. + you think about yourself in all these contexts
18      + and then. you go over here ((moves pen to large box on left))
19  Tutor: play up my geographical location
dialect? or do I wanna down play it.

Tutor: mhm,

Mary: and then down the list. and all that.

Tutor: mhm,

Mary’s attempt at explaining the diagram was initiated in lines 7-9. She began by explaining that the large box on the left (second-order indexicality) was about making choices in language, which was related to the presentation of one’s identity. This line of thinking continued through lines 11-14, where she then linked such choices to conventions of language use. She summarized her understanding in lines 16-22 as either playing up or downplaying the aspects of language use listed in the box depicting second-order indexicalities. It is noteworthy that Mary’s explanation was more or less a paraphrasing of the content of the diagram, which is expected given that the tutor had not yet intervened to push her to think about the concept in greater depth. Nonetheless, Mary demonstrated an initial understanding of the relationship between conventions and locally enacted meanings (i.e., second-order indexicalities).

As Mary continued her explanation to include stereotypes (Excerpt 4.6), it became clear that her understanding of orders of indexicality conflated the notion of intention with that of interpretation, as if they were the same thing.

**Excerpt 4.6**

Mary: and then + making the distinction whatsoever, + having any + care? about +++ um how you come off, =

Tutor: =mhm,

Mary: is + that’s how um I think that’s how it (xxx) from this box. ((pointing to stereotypes)) ++ you know. you don’t- if you don’t care about being judged? then +

Tutor: yeah.

Mary: you just say whatever the hell you want, and you don’t
Mary explained language use in relation to stereotypes as an issue of whether or not one cares about being judged by others. However, her articulation of the concept implies that the issues listed on the diagram were fixed or static meanings. This is especially clear when Mary noted that if one did indeed care about being stereotyped, one would pay attention to the relationship between first- and second-order indexicalities (lines 34-39). In other words, Mary oriented to the diagram as a set of rules or patterns of meanings that are always shared among all speakers, hence the confusion of intention and interpretation. In addition, Mary’s construal of stereotypes was a negative one inasmuch as she discusses this notion in terms of avoiding being stereotyped. It is also important to note that the tutor has not yet attempted to elaborate or clarify the concept; instead, he simply offered a number of continuers (e.g., mhm) throughout Mary’s explanation. As such, he was able to uncover her actual level of development (i.e., what she has understood so far), which allowed him to intervene to co-construct Mary’s ZPD, as shown below.

The tutor’s first attempt at clarifying the concept was initiated in excerpt 4.7, where he challenged Mary’s interpretation of stereotypes as being inherently negative. This led to an in-depth discussion of stereotypes and, as illustrated below, the first step toward a reinterpretation of the concept.

Excerpt 4.7
Tutor: mhmm, right. and the stereotypes aren’t always + negative.
right?
Mary: right.
Tutor: not all stereotypes are negative.
Mary: right.
Tutor: it can be like + someone who speaks a certain way
Mary: right.
Tutor: is highly + educated.
Mary: right. but that could also be negative. because + I
personally think that + people who are highly educated,
come off as like + arrogant.
Tutor: right.
Mary: and that’s a choice. like
Tutor: right.
Mary: like you could be super intelligent. but just. talk like.
Tutor: =and so what does that tell you about + language use.
as far as people use= ((pointing to diagram))
Mary: =then tha- then that’s their choice. like ++ they know
that like +++ and I think that also has to do with your
personal + like + security versus insecurity?
Tutor: mhm,

Here, Mary agreed with the tutor that not all stereotypes were negative (lines 40-46), but
countered the tutor’s example of a highly educated person by insisting the she personally found
highly educated people, and who speak in a certain way, to be arrogant (lines 48-50). Further, she
stated that such arrogant-sounding language use was a choice (line 52), and that the preferable
alternative, in her opinion, was to “talk like. any ol’ regular person.” (lines 54-55). In response,
the tutor prompted Mary to reconsider her example in terms of the diagram (line 57), at which
point she restated that it was about speaker choice and expanded this explanation to include her
own judgment regarding personal security versus insecurity (lines 58-60). Although Mary’s interpretation of the concept of stereotypes was not necessarily inappropriate (it did, after all, reflect her own judgments of highly educated people’s speech), it did not capture the essence of the concept of orders of indexicality. Mary did not acknowledge that there may be multiple and variable interpretations, or evaluations, of language use. In other words, as mentioned above, she conceptualized such evaluations as static or monolithic (e.g., everyone interprets language use in the same way).

Mary then offered a concrete example of her understanding of stereotypes (Excerpt 4.8), which the tutor was able to use to clarify the variable nature of interpretations of language use. In this case, Mary mentioned a professor whom she had had who—at least in her opinion—spoke in a high, perhaps overly formal register.

Excerpt 4.8

62 Mary: like ++ I kept thinking the whole time about this one
63 professor I had here, + like oh my god. he would- like
64 the way he spoke. like you couldn’t even- it’s like he
65 wasn’t even speaking English. like he would use every
66 formal
67 Tutor: mhm
68 Mary: like. + language, construction, he would use + the
69 fanciest words to talk about + just- you wouldn’t even
70 be able to understand him. and I felt like he was doing
71 that to say like look how smart I am.
72 Tutor: ah. and so what was your interpretation=
73 Mary: =that he has something to prove. + and I was like that’s
74 annoying, like I know you’re smart, you don’t have to +
75 shove it in my face, like huhhuh I still respect you if
76 you’re smart, but you don’t have to + annoy me with
77 all these formalities,
Tutor: so think about this. you can have one your intention. right,

Mary: mhm.

Tutor: but what else do you have to consider. (2.5)

((Mary makes ‘I don’t follow’ face)) if you haven’t-

Mary: mhmm.

Tutor: but what’s the other thing that you have to consider.

Mary: oh how the other person is gonna +++ interpret that.

Mary’s example of a professor who used very formal constructions and “the fanciest words” (line 69) provided some context within which to interpret the basis of her understanding of stereotypes. When prompted to consider her own interpretation of this professor’s speech, Mary indicated that, for her, it was evidence that “he has something to prove.” (line 73) and then continued to describe his speech and use of formalities as “annoying” (lines 74-77). In response, the tutor led Mary to reconsider the relationship between a speaker’s intention and others’ interpretations of them. Mary demonstrated some difficulty here, following the tutor’s question regarding other factors to consider in addition to intention (lines 81-82), as evidenced by the long pause and “I don’t know face.” The tutor reformulated his question in lines 83 and 85, which prompted Mary to realize a new feature of the concept: that one also has to consider possible interpretations of one’s speech. The evidence for considering this new or emergent knowledge on the part of Mary is the oh-prefacing of her response (line 86), indicating a change of (cognitive) state. Mary also demonstrated understanding by offering a response whose content could be evaluated (cf. “claiming” understanding by saying yes or I get it; see Sacks, 1995): “how the other person is gonna +++ interpret that.” (line 86). The tutor oriented to Mary’s response by pursuing the discussion a bit further (Excerpt 4.9).
Excerpt 4.9

Tutor: ah. and + is there just one interpretation?
Mary: ++ no I guess- that was something that I- that I was saying- that I had a hard time thinking of examples.
where people use- specifically try to give off a certain + um + impression. and someone takes it as- takes it the wrong way.

Tutor: ah
Mary: I was having a hard time [thinking of ] examples of that.
Tutor: [cuz you have ]
well, just think about that professor.=
Mary: =yeah.
Tutor: you interpret it as + kind of snobby or=
Mary: =yeah.=
Tutor: =(that) kind of thing. somebody else might interpret it as + a good thing. as a sign of intelligence. or something like that. right,
Mary: yeah.

The tutor first prompted Mary to consider whether there is always a single interpretation of language use (line 87). In her response, Mary switched to past tense (lines 88-92) and described the difficulty she encountered during the independent verbalized reflection task, which is evidence that she was distancing herself from the task at hand (i.e., she did not response to the question asked, but rather stated a problem she was having). This provided an opportunity for the tutor to intervene by providing an explicit explanation of the appropriate interpretation of the concept, using Mary’s professor as a concrete example (lines 96-103). The tutor’s orientation to Mary’s contribution at lines 88-92 suggests that he heard her switch to past tense and reference to the independent task as a request for assistance—namely, that an explicit explanation was necessary at this point because she was unable to articulate at an appropriate response to the question asked. In sum, the interaction led the tutor to uncover Mary’s current understanding of
the concept, and how much support she would need in order to develop her understanding further, which served as a point of departure to begin to work within her ZPD.

4.2.2.3 Summary

The preceding analysis has illustrated how the cooperative verbalized reflection not only served to evaluate what Mary had understood on her own but, crucially, to promote her continued conceptual development through elaboration and clarification. Mary’s initial understanding of the concept of orders of indexicality confused the notions of intention and interpretation, as if these were the same thing and universally shared by all people. As she and the tutor continued to discuss this concept, the tutor was able to draw on Mary’s own experience about the meaning of stereotypes to assist her in disambiguating intentions from interpretations and to help her to recognize that interpretations of some instance of language use vary across different people. Over time, this type of cooperative dialogue helped Mary as well as the other students to arrive at a deeper understanding of the concepts they were learning, but which were often too abstract to fully understand on their own. As such, independent and cooperative verbalized reflections functioned together to assist learners through the process of concept formation.

This analysis leads to an interesting question for concept-based approaches to language instruction: whether independent or cooperative verbalizations are both necessary or if one is more beneficial than the other. Although the present study does not allow such a formal comparison, the results reported here and those of previous research suggest that doing both types of tasks may be most beneficial to learners. As Negueruela (2003) and Swain et al. (2009) have found, learners can indeed use verbalization tasks to mediate their own learning. However, both studies found a high degree of variation in development, with some learners benefiting greatly from verbalization and others benefiting much less. As illustrated above (Susan), independent
verbalized reflections as done in the present study did lead to some development; however, cooperative dialogue with the tutor afterwards promoted further and more mature understandings of the concepts (Mary). It is therefore reasonable to suggest that learners may benefit, first, from independent verbalizations as a means of trying to confront and resolve L2 conceptual problems, but that subsequent cooperative tasks with an expert may be necessary to expedite the process of the formation of mature concepts. To be sure, this conclusion is only speculative and future research into this question will no doubt shed light on developmental processes taking place through verbalization.

4.3 Appropriateness Judgment Questionnaires

4.3.1 Introduction

As described in chapter 2, a number of AJQ items introduced a degree of conflict between two or more functional or semantic rules of thumb related to age, relationship status, formality of context, and so forth. This was done in order to assess learners’ abilities to use the concepts they were learning to negotiate language choices in ambiguous situations and to promote their continued conceptual development through cooperative interaction with the tutor. These items confronted learners with the inherent ambiguity of social relationships frequently encountered in a variety of interactions and, therefore, helped them to consider the interrelationship among the concepts (e.g., self-presentation, social distance, power) they were learning and the potential consequences for choosing one form or a combination of forms over another. As illustrated in chapter 3, the learners were able to negotiate such ambiguities by the end of the enrichment program on the basis of their conceptual knowledge. Importantly, however, this ability did not arise from rote memorization of the individual concepts as presented in the
materials; rather, it developed out of their internalization of the concepts, which included an emerging and qualitatively different, synthetic understanding of how the various concepts worked together. Ambiguous AJQ items were an important catalyst for the emergence of this type of thinking.

The case study presented below illustrates the relationship between cooperative problem solving on ambiguous AJQ items and concept formation. The analysis focuses on Nikki’s synthesis of the concepts of social distance and power hierarchies as she forms a qualitatively new, personally significant concept: distant-equal relationships (i.e., a synthesis of “social distance indexed by vous” and “equal status indexed by symmetrical tu/vous use”). The microgenesis of this concept is traced as Nikki and the tutor cooperate to decide on an appropriate choice between tu and vous in the following situation, which comes from the second AJQ (session 2 of the study) completed immediately after the introduction of the concept-based materials:

**AJQ2, Situation 4:**

You’re at the grocery store looking for some cheese for a small dinner party you’re having with some friends. Unfortunately, you don’t see the cheese you wanted. You decide to ask the clerk, a young woman in her mid twenties.

This situation is somewhat ambiguous because it involves conflict between several functional rules of thumb. On the one hand, tu could be seen as appropriate since the store clerk is a (near) peer and the setting (a grocery store) is not necessarily formal. On the other hand, vous could be appropriate because the store clerk is a stranger and conventions of use (at least in European French) call for vous in service encounters. As shown below, the cooperative interaction around this AJQ item assisted Nikki in confronting this ambiguity and reinterpreting her functional knowledge in light of the concepts to which she had just been introduced.
4.3.2 Cooperative interaction around ambiguous items

Excerpt 4.10 displays the opening turns of the interaction between Nikki and the tutor as Nikki attempts to choose between tu and vous. Nikki had difficulty deciding which pronoun to use because of the ambiguity of the situation and the hypothetical relationship between the sales clerk and herself, as evidenced by the hesitations and long pauses in line 2 following her reading of the situation. It should be noted that AJQ completion times significantly increased between the first (preenrichment) and second sessions for all participants. This was due in part to the fact that there was more intervention on the part of the tutor during the second session; more importantly, however, the increase in completion times reflects the learners’ hesitations when confronted with ambiguities, which they only began to notice following the introduction of the concepts.

Recognizing that many social-interactive contexts and relationships are ambiguous represented a crucial step in development because the learners began to see that their functional rules of thumb were insufficient, which in turn highlighted the importance of the holistic and systematic concepts that they were learning. Recall also that the pedagogical diagrams were available for the participants to refer to during the completion of AJQ2 (see chapter 2).

Excerpt 4.10
1 Tutor: umm okay. the fourth one?
2 Nikki: ((reads situation aloud)) um (3.5) I would? ++ use (4.0)
3 Tutor: hmm.
4 Nikki: ((laughs))
5 Tutor: what are you thinking.=what’s the- what’s giving you problems.
   don’t think about the forms now. just think about the situation.
6 Nikki: because it’s- + um + someone + first off. that you don’t know.
7 but, she’s in her mid twenties, so she’s someone, + who’s like.
8 your age, and + she doesn’t necessarily have power over you?
9 like. but. you’re still + you’re asking her for + help.
The tutor moved to assist Nikki starting in line 5. First, he prompted her to articulate the sources of difficulty (line 5) and, second, he attempted to orient her away from the forms themselves to consider the qualities of the situation (line 6). This is an important aspect of the interaction since the goal of the concept-based instructional program was to assist learners in mapping concepts (i.e., meanings related to identity, social relationships, and social-interactive settings) onto forms. In response, Nikki identified the ambiguity, or conflict, presented in the situation, namely that the sales clerk was “someone + first off. that you don’t know.” (line 7) but that at the same time the clerk was a (near) peer and someone who would not have power over her (line 8). Interestingly, Nikki also commented that she was asking the sales clerk for help. This orientation to power likely reflects the fact that in most French textbooks, learners/nonnative
speakers are positioned as having less power than their native speaker interlocutors and, as such, should avoid potentially offending native speakers by defaulting to the *vous* of respect (cf. the rule of thumb: “If in doubt, use *vous*—better too much respect than too little!” [Heilenman, Kaplan, & Tournier, 2006, p. 6]). The tutor’s contribution in line 13, then, helped Nikki to reconsider the concept of power. His statement “it’s not always that other people have power over *you.*” (lines 13-14) was completed by Nikki in line 15, where she demonstrated a new understanding that she, too, could have power over someone else. However, Nikki still had difficulty deciding what she would do in this situation, and she was unable to articulate a response to the problem (lines 18-23). In line 24, then, the tutor provided assistance, orienting Nikki to the concepts presented in the materials. In response, Nikki offered her first answer: that she would use *tu* with the store clerk.

An important aspect of the design of the cooperative AJQs is that tutor-learner interactions were not supposed to end with the provision of a response. Instead, the tutor prompted learners to explain and defend their choices as a means of evaluating their reasoning. In Nikki’s case, her answer—*tu*—would typically be seen as sociopragmatically inappropriate according to the sociolinguistic conventions of European French. However, as shown in excerpt 4.11, rather than telling Nikki that her answer was correct/appropriate or incorrect/inappropriate, the tutor pursued an explanation of her performance.

*Excerpt 4.11*

28 Nikki: alright. + I think I would use ++ *tu*.
29 Tutor: uhhuh, why.
30 Nikki: because um (4.0) ((picks up and flips through diagrams))
31 um ++ ((looking at diagram 2)) it’s + a tee shirt and jeans,
32 relationship, more than a suit and tie? and it doesn’t-

---

22 In Quebec, it is not uncommon for relatively young near-peers to use *tu* with each other in service encounters (e.g., in shops, cafés, casual restaurants, bars).
As Nikki began to formulate an explanation (line 30), she paused and turned to the pedagogical diagrams provided to her. This is important because her answer—*tu*—was given without specific reference to the concepts but she consulted them as a means of justifying her conceptual choice. Referencing diagram 2 (line 31), Nikki explained that the situation is more *tee-shirt-and-jeans* (informal self-presentation, *tu*). Then, as she turned to diagram 3 (social distance), she argued that she was not, however, trying to create a close relationship (lines 33-34). At this point, Nikki was orienting to the concept of self-presentation as the primary meaning she was trying to convey. However, the tutor prompted her to consider that, by using *tu*, she could also be indexing closeness in the relationship (lines 37-41). Then, pointing to diagram 4 (power hierarchies), he instructed Nikki to think about another possible interpretation of her use of *tu*.
In response, she recognized that by using *tu*, she could also be indexing a power hierarchy by initiating an asymmetrical *tu/vous* relationship (i.e., where she uses *tu* but receives *vous* in return, which is depicted in the diagram). Nikki did not revise her original choice, once again opting for the use of *tu*.

It is important to reiterate that the goal of these interactions was not simply to guide learners to a predetermined “right” answer. Instead, cooperative interaction served to simultaneously assess the quality of learners’ conceptual knowledge and to promote its continued development. Therefore, although Nikki’s choice of *tu* did not adhere to sociopragmatic conventions, the reason for continuing to pursue an explanation for the choice was not intended to make her change her mind; instead, the goal was to help her to articulate a coherent justification for her choice based on the concepts. The following excerpt displays the culmination of the cooperative interaction, which results in the microgenesis of a qualitatively new concept: distant-equal social relationships.

*Excerpt 4.12*

51 Tutor: you would use *tu*? ++ to show, (2.0)
52 Nikki: uhh, ((laughs)) (4.0) uh
53 Tutor: think about this specifically. ((pointing to diagram 4))
54 (2.0) the *power* thing.
55 (3.5)
56 Nikki: I would use ++ wait. + ugh. + like I don’t necessarily want to show that I have *power* over her. but like +++
57 I w- + I’d use *vous*.
58 Tutor: okay,
59 Nikki: cuz +++ I don’t ++ want to +++ cuz
60 Tutor: mhm,
61 Nikki: cuz I don’t want a close relationship with this person.
62 so I’m like distancing myself from her.
63 Tutor: okay,
Nikki: but + and I don’t want to show that I have power,
over the person, but ++ so I wanna (3.5) use ++
I think we should use vous with each other. + like
to show that like ++ it’s an equal relationship. but
distance equal? distant equal.=

Tutor: =ah.

In line 51, the tutor once again prompted Nikki to explain her choice of *tu*. He produced a leading incomplete utterance with slightly rising intonation designed to elicit a completing utterance/explanation on the part of Nikki. However, she was still unable to defend her choice (line 52). Again, the tutor pointed to diagram 4 (power), specifically the image depicting two unequal people using *tu* and *vous* asymmetrically (lines 53-54). After a long pause and some hesitation (lines 55-56), Nikki explained that she did not want to show that she had power over the store clerk, and this time changed her answer to *vous*. Importantly, the tutor still did not confirm or disconfirm the appropriateness of this choice, but instead offered a continuer with slightly rising intonation (line 59). In response, Nikki initiated her explanation that she did not want a close relationship, but instead wanted to distance herself from the store clerk (lines 60-63). In addition, she then mentioned that she did not want to demonstrate power over the clerk (line 65-66). This was crucial to what follows because it provided evidence that Nikki was beginning to operate with two of the conceptual meanings that map onto *tu*/*vous* choice: creating social distance (through *vous*) and downplaying power hierarchies (through symmetrical *tu-tu* or *vous-vous* use). In line 67, Nikki decided that she and the clerk should use symmetrical *vous* (i.e., each calling the other *vous*), a critical step in recognizing the interactional, interpersonal nature of *tu*/*vous* relationships. In turn, she justified her choice in terms of a synthesis of social distance and power, namely the concept of distant-equal social relationships (lines 68-69). A symmetrical *vous* relationship was chosen by Nikki in order to create social distance but also, in her thinking, to downplay her relative power in the customer-employee interaction. This exchange was important
for two reasons. First, it clearly demonstrated a coherent, conceptual (i.e., meaning-based) orientation to *tu*/*vous* choice rather than one based on unsystematic rules-of-thumb. Second, it provided evidence of the microgenesis of a new and personally significant concept through which Nikki could think.

**4.3.3 Summary**

The analysis presented above documented the microgenesis of the concept of distant-equal relationships in Nikki’s thinking. This qualitatively new concept emerged as she attempted to choose between *tu* and *vous* on an ambiguous AJQ item in cooperation with the tutor. As the excerpts have shown, Nikki’s first attempts at solving the problem centered on a mix of functional rules of thumb and elements of the concepts she was appropriating. However, through interaction with the tutor, she began to recognize the ambiguity of the situation. Part of the tutor’s responsibility was to reorient Nikki’s attention to the concepts and how they related to one another as a means of solving the problem. In addition, the tutor mediated Nikki’s performance through relatively implicit means, such as eliciting an explanation of a particular response or asking her to consider the consequences of a choice in relation to a specific concept. In other words, Nikki was simultaneously positioned to contribute maximally to the task and pushed to perform and/or explain her performance beyond her current independent abilities, which are important dimensions of co-constructing a ZPD (Aljafreeh & Lantolf, 1994). As the analysis has shown, the result was that Nikki herself began to identify the ambiguities and conflicts (i.e., they were not explicitly pointed out by the tutor) and developed her own solution to the problem: the concept of distant-equal relationships.

The importance of ambiguous AJQ items in the development of conceptual knowledge cannot be understated. On the one hand, they served as clear examples of why functional
knowledge/rules of thumb were insufficient, which led the participants to recognize the benefit of the systematic concepts they were appropriating. On the other hand, ambiguity pushed learners to perform beyond their current independent abilities to consider not only the concepts as such but how they interrelated and, by extension, the circumstances in which the demands of one may outweigh the demands of another (e.g., in Nikki’s case, the demands of creating a distant-equal relationship through the use of vous outweighed her desire to present herself as tee-shirt-and-jeans through the use of tu). In this way, ambiguous AJQ items were not simply exercises in applying a particular concept to a specific situation, but more importantly they functioned to catalyze the formation of new, personally significant types of conceptual knowledge.

4.4 Scenarios

4.4.1 Introduction

The figures reported in chapter 3 demonstrated that learners’ spoken abilities, as evidenced by the use of sociopragmatic variants in scenarios, developed over the course of the study. On the one hand, the learners began to incorporate previously unknown informal variants (i.e., ne absence, on ‘we’) into their productive repertoires. On the other hand, their use of the full range of sociopragmatic variants became increasingly consistent and aligned with their orientations to the scenarios regarding the appropriateness of the various language forms available to them. Thus, the development of performance abilities consisted of both the emergence of new forms in the learners’ productive repertoires and increasing consistency and control over all the forms. As argued throughout this study, the development of performance abilities is fundamentally linked to consciousness-raising learning actions (i.e., verbalized reflections, cooperative AJQs) and, thus, learners’ emerging conceptual knowledge. However,
conceptual knowledge is never enough. As highlighted in chapter 3, development in performance also involved attention-focusing during speech production and practice using the variants with which learners were less familiar in order to overcome their more habituated patterns of language use. As illustrated below, this was accomplished through intervention on the part of the tutor during scenarios.

The analysis presented below centers on a case study of Mary’s developing control over ne-absent negative structures during speech production. This case study illustrates how cooperative interaction with the tutor assisted Mary in incorporating the ne-absent structure into her productive repertoire and in increasing her control over her performance. In line with research into dynamic assessment (DA) (Poehner, 2008), the data demonstrate the role of cooperative interaction in assessing Mary’s control over the variants while simultaneously promoting her continued development. More specifically, the excerpts drawn from strategic interaction scenarios discussed below document a gradual shift from reliance on the tutor’s assistance in focusing attention on and producing ne-absent negative utterances to increased self-regulation.

4.4.2 Assessing and promoting control over variation

Mary’s preenrichment data (session 1) indicated that she was not aware that ne could be omitted from verbal negation (based on LAI and AJQ data), nor was the ne-absent structure in her productive repertoire (based on her performance in scenarios). Like most of the other participants in this study, her knowledge of negation was limited to the “invariable” ne . . . pas

---

23 Unawareness does not necessarily equate to the absence of a particular variant in a learner’s productive repertoire. Van Compernolle and Williams (2011) in fact documented a case in which a learner was completely unaware that ne could be deleted from negation based on metalinguistic questionnaire data despite the fact that she omitted the negative particle at near-native-like frequencies in spontaneous discourse. The authors argued that Caroline, the learner, who had learned to speak French in a noneducational, L2 immersion context, had learned to “do” negation without ne but this was not part of her declarative metalinguistic knowledge, which she developed later through formal foreign language education.
structure presented in learner texts. As such, her understanding of the variation is traceable to her participation in the enrichment program, which helped her to develop not only an awareness that the variant existed but what it could point to in terms of the concepts of orders of indexicality, self-presentation, and so forth. In what follows, I trace the emergence of the *ne*-absent structure in Mary’s productive repertoire, which occurred during session 3 (i.e., the first scenario following the introduction of the concept-based materials) and then provide evidence of her continued developing control over the variant based on data collected during session 5 (i.e., the second scenario following the introduction of the concept-based materials).

During session 3, Mary elected to use *tu*, *on*, and negation without *ne* for the informal scenario in which she and the tutor would be adopting the roles of soon-to-be roommates debating the pros and cons of four apartments they have found. Although Mary had learned that *ne* could be omitted during the previous session (i.e., introduction of concepts and AJQ2), this was the first time she had the opportunity to omit the negative particle during spontaneous speech production. Excerpt 4.13 displays the first negative utterance produced by Mary (line 6), which included *ne* and thus diverged from her plan to omit it, and the resulting opportunity for mediated development. (Mary’s negative utterances are set in boldface.)

Excerpt 4.13

1 Mary: + um. cet + ce + cet appartement est
   *um this this this apartment is*
2 + um + le plus loin.=
   *um the farthest*
3 Tutor: =ah.=
4 Mary: =de campus.
   *from campus*
5 Tutor: donc euh + on peut pas marcher?
   *so uh we can’t walk*
Mary: um ah non. **on ne peut pas** marcher.

Tutor: wait- do you want to say on ne peut pas,

+ what do you want to say.

Mary: oh. + um (5.5) I guess I wan-

Tutor: =okay,=

Mary: =there?

Tutor: so what d- so think about that, + a little bit, + what did you just say,

Mary: **OH. on ne pouvons pas.**

Tutor: mmm,

Mary: +++ oh. + **ON** + **peut pas.**=

Tutor: =ah. there you go. + right, + **on peut pas.**

Mary: **on peut pas.**

Tutor: on peut pas.

Mary: okay. so **on peut pas** + uh marcher.

Tutor: un arrête de [bus?

Mary: [un arrête de bus.
Mary’s first negative utterance appears in line 6. Here, she has responded to the tutor’s utterance *on peut pas marcher*? ‘we can’t walk?’ (line 5) by repeating a similar structure that differs in two ways. First, it is designed as an answer to a question, signaled by final falling intonation (cf. the tutor’s final rising intonation). Second, she includes *ne* where the tutor had omitted it. Although it is clear that Mary has understood the question, as evidenced by her orientation to the preceding utterance as a question and the delivery of an appropriate response, her use of *ne* diverges from her plan to omit it as she had indicated during the rehearsal stage of this scenario.24

The mediated learning opportunity began at line 7. The tutor stopped Mary (*wait*) and then asked her if she wanted to say *on ne peut pas*, with slightly rising final intonation, signaling that there was a potential problem with her utterance. After a brief pause (line 8), the tutor rephrased the question as *what do you want to say*. Mary responded by explaining *what* (i.e., the content) she was trying to say (lines 9-12), which is evidence that she had not noticed her use of *ne* but rather oriented to the tutor’s question as an indication that there was a problem with the content of her response. In turn, the tutor prompted Mary to consider what she had said in the form of a clarification request (*what did you just say*; line 14). At this point, Mary recognized that there was an issue with language form (line 15): she produced a change-of-state particle (*oh*) and then reformulated her utterance by changing the verb ending, producing the ungrammatical construction *on ne *pouvons pas*. This is ungrammatical because she used the first-person plural form of the verb with a third person singular pronoun.25 In line 16, then, the tutor once again signaled that there was a form-related problem by a simple *mmmm*, articulated with slightly rising intonation, to which Mary oriented by producing the target form: *on peut pas* (line 17). It should

---

24 During the rehearsal stage of the scenario, Mary and the tutor discussed which sociolinguistic variants would be appropriate to use. Mary decided that omitting *ne*, using *on*, and addressing her interlocutor with *tu* were the most appropriate choices. As such, she indicated that she would try to use those variants during the performance of the scenario.

25 Recall that *on* always occurs with a singular third-person verb form, even when it is used for first-person plural reference (see chapter 2).
be clear that Mary understood where the problem was because she again produced the particle *oh*—an indication that she had realized something—and then produced emphasis on *on*, a slight pause where *ne* previously was, and then *peut pas*. The appropriateness of this construction was confirmed by the tutor in line 18, where he repeated the phrase, prompting Mary to do the same.

This interaction is important because it served as the initial opportunity for Mary to develop control over her use of verbal negation in French. It should be noted that the assistance provided by the tutor in this excerpt was strategic rather than directive: it pushed Mary to make successive attempts at resolving the problem (i.e., content > verbal morphology > *ne*). Although Mary’s eventual production of the appropriate form was not attributable to Mary alone, but rather to the cooperative interaction\(^{26}\) between her and the tutor (i.e., *interpsychological functioning*). In other words, Mary was offered with just enough support to allow her to work to assume most of the responsibility for working through the problem.

Excerpt 4.14 provides evidence that Mary began to develop increasing control over *ne*’s presence versus absence following the mediated learning opportunity shown above. The following exchange took place as Mary used verbal negation for the second time (just under two minutes after the first negative construction was used). The tutor, in his role as a future roommate, had suggested finding a third roommate for one of the apartments (lines 1-3), but Mary seemed to hesitate (line 3), to which the tutor oriented by asking if she did not like this idea (line 4). In line 5, then, Mary began to respond with the utterance *je ne suis pas* ‘I am not’, which included the negative particle *ne*.

*Excerpt 4.14*

1 Tutor: mais tu sais, + il y a *trois* chambres. on pourrait peut-être

\(^{26}\) *Cooperative* interaction here refers to the fact that the tutor and Mary were *co*-operating, i.e., collectively working together to develop control over the variant (see Poehner & van Compernolle, 2011 on different frames of interaction in DA).
but you know there are three bedrooms we could maybe
trouver une autre personne. + pour partager le loyer.
*find another person to share the rent*

Mary: oui. um.
yes um

Tutor: tu veux pas? ou=
*do you not want to or*

Mary: =um ++ je ne suis pas + umm
*um I am not umm*

Tutor: hm? ((with raised eye brow))

Mary: ++ ((nods head)) je suis pas um I don- I’m not + against?
*I’m not um*

Tutor: contre?
*against*
*I’m not*

Mary: je suis pas contre, + um trouver + uh
*I’m not against um finding uh*

un autre camarade de chambre,
*another roommate*

mais ++ je sais pas. + uh quelqu’un.
*but I don’t know uh someone*

Evidence for Mary’s increasing control over the variation comes in her response to the tutor’s *hm?*, which co-occurred with a raised eyebrow as Mary and the tutor made eye contact (line 6). Mary paused for a moment, then nodded her head once as if to say “right” or “oh yeah,” before reformulating her utterance as a *ne*-absent structure. In contrast to the interaction in excerpt 4.13 (above), here Mary immediately oriented to *ne*’s presence as the problem source in her utterance. Although the tutor still needed to signal that there was a problem, Mary demonstrated increasing self-regulation. More importantly, after receiving lexical assistance with the word *contre* ‘against’ (lines 7-8), she completed her full response (lines 9-11), which included
both a repetition of *je suis pas* ‘I am not’ (line 9), as well as a new negative construction that excluded *ne: je sais pas* ‘I don’t know’ (line 11). Although her choice of verb was inappropriate in this instance (the verb *connaître* ‘to know/be familiar with’ should have been used), this example nevertheless provides evidence that Mary was increasingly coming to control her use/omission of *ne* in spontaneous speech. In addition, Mary produced another six tokens of *ne-* absent negation during the remainder of the scenario, but zero instances of *ne* presence. In the formal scenario that followed, Mary planned to use *ne*, which she did without hesitation the two times she produced a negative utterance, which provides further evidence of her developing control over the variation. In other words, the data point to an emerging ability to control both the presence and omission of *ne*.

The scenarios that occurred two weeks later (session 5) simultaneously show Mary’s continued ability to use and omit *ne* as well as her loss of control when things became complicated. In the informal scenario, Mary produced only one negative utterance, from which she omitted *ne*, yet in the more formal scenario (arranging an office hours meeting with a professor) Mary demonstrated some variation. She had planned on omitting *ne*; however, she twice produced a *ne*-present construction. Excerpt 4.15 shows the first of these examples.

**Excerpt 4.15**

1 Tutor: oui?

   yes?

2 Mary: j’ai des questions um. ++ uh pour + l’ex- l’examen?

   *I have some questions um for the exam*

3 Tutor: ah d’accord. d’accord. euh ++ bon j’ai pas beaucoup de temps

   *ah okay okay uh right I don’t have a lot of time*

4 + maintenant, euh + mais euh est-ce que vous pouvez revenir

   *right now uh but uh can you come back*

5 peut-être euh + aujourd’hui à deux heures? + parce que j’ai
maybe uh today at two o’clock because I have
mes heures de permanence de deux heures à trois heures.
my office hours from two to three

Mary: (4.5) ((silently rereading scenario description))

um + je ne suis pas + er je suis pas + libre?
um I am not er I’m not free

Mary and the tutor were attempting to arrange a meeting that fit into their respective
schedules (indicated on the scenario descriptions). The tutor explained that he held office hours
that day from 2:00 to 3:00 in the afternoon (lines 3-6). Mary turned to her scenario description
card to reread part of it (most likely her schedule) (line 7), and then in response began to tell the
tutor that she was not free at the available time (line 8). Mary’s first negative utterance included
ne (i.e., je ne suis pas-); however, she stopped and corrected herself, producing the construction
je suis pas + libre? ‘I’m not free’. Although she initially used ne, this example does show that
Mary was capable of self-regulating her performance, or at least of noticing when she diverged
from her planned performance and repairing the problem.

The next example, however, shows where Mary’s independent control began to falter. In
the lines preceding this fragment of the interaction, Mary had demonstrated difficulty
remembering her schedule and other pieces of information provided on the scenario description
card (see also, excerpt 4.15, above). In line 2 of excerpt 4.16, below, she was looking at the
description of her role as she responded to the tutor’s question from line 1.

Excerpt 4.16
1 Tutor: est-ce que vous pouvez venir me voir euh=

can you come see me uh

2 Mary: =ah oui. oui. + je n’ai pas de + classe. +++ je suis libre + tout ((looking at
scenario description))

ah yes yes I do not have class I’m free all
Mary demonstrated some difficulty delivering her response in line 2, as indicated by the multiple pauses in this turn. However, this was likely not a linguistic problem as much as it is one related to cognitive overload or the division of her attention: she was consulting the scenario description as a means of remembering her schedule, which was the content of her response. The result was that she momentarily lost control over her use/omission of *ne* when she uttered *je n’ai pas de classe.* ‘I do not have class’ (line 2), a *ne*-present structure. During the long pause that followed, the tutor can be seen on the video looking at Mary with a raised eyebrow to bring her attention to this; however, Mary continues to consult the scenario description and to complete her utterance, at which point the tutor verbally intervened (line 3). To be sure, Mary required very little support from the tutor, who only needed to say *mhm, + go back,* (line 3). Mary hesitated slightly (cf. the pause in line 4), but then recognized where the problem was and revised her utterance. This excerpt therefore illustrates the extent to which Mary controlled the variation: although she could omit *ne* consistently (as demonstrated during other scenarios), this control faltered with increasing cognitive demands related to the task itself, where she reverted to the more habituated forms present in her repertoire (i.e., in this case, *ne*-present negation). This finding articulates with Paradis’ (2009) theory of the procedural and declarative determinants of adult SLA in that
Mary relies heavily on her declarative memory capacities (e.g., conceptual knowledge of when and how to alternate between *ne*’s presence and absence, remembering to omit the *ne*) during performance. When other cognitive demands were present, she reaccessed an earlier, and more habituated, learned form (see also, Tarone, 1988; van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a).

4.4.3 Summary

The analysis of Mary’s omission of the negative particle *ne* during actual performance illustrated the role of cooperative support from the tutor in mediating the development of her speaking ability. Although Mary’s sociopragmatic (conceptual) knowledge had already begun to emerge through her participation in the enrichment program, her capacity to use the variants she wanted to use required assistance in attention-focusing from the tutor, in particular in identifying instances where Mary had diverged from her plan to omit *ne* from negation. The excerpts presented above have documented two aspects of Mary’s performance abilities. On the one hand, she developed increasing control over her use of the negative particle, as evidenced by a decrease in the amount and explicitness of supported required from the tutor (see Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994 on shifts in mediation as an indication of development). On the other hand, this control began to break down as Mary was confronted with other cognitive demands related to the task itself (e.g., remembering her schedule).

To be sure, these findings are only possible because the tutor intervened to provide support to Mary during her performance. Had such cooperative interaction not taken place, it is unlikely that an accurate diagnosis of the extent of Mary’s performance abilities could have been made. Independent performance would seem to suggest that despite Mary’s developing sociopragmatic knowledge, she was not capable of producing the *ne*-absent form during spoken interaction. However, as shown above, such use of language was within her emerging capacities...
and, at first, required support from the tutor before Mary was able to assume increasing control
over it. In addition, it was through cooperative interaction that the extent of Mary’s abilities—
related to the limits of her attentional resources (i.e., form vs. task)—was rendered visible.

4.5 Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has explored a number of developmental processes observed over the course
of the enrichment program, focusing on four short studies of independent and cooperative
verbalized reflection tasks, cooperative interactions around ambiguous AJQ items, and the
mediated development of performance abilities during scenarios. The principal goal of the
analyses was to illustrate how the pedagogical program worked through in-depth qualitative
treatments of representative cases. In conjunction with the formal assessment of sociopragmatic
development presented in chapter 3, these findings provide a holistic picture of both the product
of development and the processes through which development occurred. One of the common
themes throughout the analyses is that of tutor-learner cooperation. It is clear that simply
presenting the materials and tasks to learners alone was not enough; instead, the tutor’s role as a
cooperative interactant is implicated in processes related to both conceptual development and
performance abilities.

Verbalized reflection tasks assisted the participants in linking their existing functional
and semantic knowledge (i.e., rules of thumb) to the concepts presented in the materials (i.e.,
concept cards and pedagogical diagrams). In turn, these tasks enabled the learners to begin to
reinterpret their rules of thumb within a coherent, meaning-based system. Although the functional
knowledge represented by rules of thumb was never totally abandoned, it nevertheless took on a
qualitatively new meaning because the concepts formed the orienting basis for making
sociopragmatic choices. Independent verbalized reflections functioned as an initial opportunity to
develop conceptual knowledge (Susan). However, cooperative dialogue with the tutor was important for expanding and clarifying aspects of the concepts with which learners demonstrated difficulty (Mary). In short, while most of the learners were able to take an initial step toward developing an understanding of the concepts independently, interactions with the tutor served to further support the formation of more mature concepts. In this way, cooperative verbalized reflections not only allowed the tutor to assess learners’ comprehension of the concepts but in fact to engage them in pedagogical activity.

During cooperative AJQs, items in which some element of ambiguity was introduced proved to be a catalyst for further concept formation. Ambiguous items made salient the inherent conflict associated with rule-of-thumb-bound thinking, leading learners to confront such conflicts and to resolve them by thinking through the concepts presented to them. In cooperation with the tutor, they were able not only to apply the concepts as such but also to develop new and personally significant syntheses of them (e.g., Nikki’s concept of “equal-distant relationships”). This is an important part of the internalization process because it implies more than merely learning prepackaged concepts: it demonstrates an emerging ability to make them one’s own (Wertsch, 1998) by using the concepts to create personally relevant meanings. As such, the concepts functioned not simply as coherent rules to follow to arrive at a correct answer but as tools for thinking, problem-solving, and meaning-making.

The development of performance abilities as evidenced in the scenarios was also supported by cooperation from the tutor. In addition to his role as the other party in the scenarios, the tutor was also responsible for engaging learners in pedagogical activity aimed at focusing their attention on form and revising their performance when they happened to diverge from their plan of action. Such cooperative interactions had the dual roles of assessing learners’ emerging abilities as well as supporting their continued development. As illustrated by Mary’s case, this not only took the form of attention-focusing but also modeling forms for the learners and prompting
them to repeat the modeled utterance. In addition, cooperative interaction helped to elucidate the
degree of control over variation demonstrated by learners when confronted with other cognitive
demands related to the task itself (e.g., remembering information on the scenario card), which has
implications for assessing the extent to which using a particular form requires conscious attention.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the case studies presented here are
representative of the group of learners as a whole. However, this does not imply that all the
learners’ developmental trajectories were identical. Indeed, one of the objectives of this chapter
has been to particularize the qualities of learning and interaction in a limited number of cases.
Each individual certainly demonstrated unique patterns of development, and each found different
aspects of the concepts and tasks to be more or less difficult than others. Nonetheless, this chapter
has provided a concise illustration of the principal developmental processes through which
concept formation and improved performance emerged.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Discussion of Findings

The study presented in this dissertation aimed to enhance advanced L2 sociopragmatic capacity through instructional intervention centered on promoting the internalization of holistic, systematic sociopragmatic concepts as an orienting basis for language use (i.e., concept-based instruction). The investigation sought to answer three principal questions:

(1) Does concept-based instruction lead to the development of coherent sociopragmatic knowledge?

(2) In what ways, if at all, does concept-based instruction influence the development of learners’ performance abilities (i.e., use of sociopragmatic features of language)?

(3) What is the relationship between the development of sociopragmatic knowledge and performance abilities?

The formal assessment of sociopragmatic development (chapter 3) clearly demonstrated that learners’ sociopragmatic knowledge and performance abilities improved. It was also suggested that sociopragmatic knowledge developed ahead of performance abilities; however, learners’ understanding of the concepts in turn constituted the basis for developing their capacity to use the language forms presented to them. These three questions were further explored through four studies of individual learners in chapter 4 to include the processes by which sociopragmatic knowledge and performance abilities develop (e.g., verbalized reflections, cooperative interaction with the tutor). In the following sections, I address each of the research questions, synthesizing the findings reported in chapters 3 and 4.
5.1.1 Sociopragmatic knowledge

This study focused significant attention on the development of sociopragmatic knowledge through the internalization of concepts. As discussed in chapter 2, this emphasis follows from the central importance that Galperin (1989, 1992) attributed to the orientation (i.e., planning) function of mental activity. Orientations determine how one executes a particular action and help one monitor, evaluate, and revise the execution in light of potentially changing circumstances (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2010; for L2 research, Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). In the present study, sociopragmatic concepts (i.e., orders of indexicality, self-presentation, social distance, power, emphasis, exclusion) served as orienting bases for the use of the second-person pronouns tu and vous, the first-person plural pronouns nous and on, and the presence versus absence of the negative particle ne.

The analysis of preenrichment and postenrichment language awareness interviews (LAIs) presented in chapter 3 revealed two phenomena. On the one hand, the learners developed a better understanding that variation in language is possible and what the available variants are. This was particularly true for the nous/on and ne variants. During the preenrichment phase of the study, the learners were essentially unaware that variation existed, with the exception of a few fixed phrases (e.g., j’sais pas ‘I dunno’) that were characterized as slang. However, during the postenrichment phase, all of the learners were able to describe accurately what the variants were and how they could be used. The postenrichment LAIs revealed that the learners had incorporated the concepts into their thinking. This was particularly salient in explanations of tu and vous. During the preenrichment stage, the participants described the use of these pronouns in terms of various interlocutor-determined and/or context-specific rules-of-thumb (e.g., “use tu with friends”). Yet, during the postenrichment phase, learners explained the use of tu and vous in terms of the concepts of self-presentation, social distance, and power hierarchies.
The comparison of preenrichment and postenrichment appropriateness judgment questionnaires (AJQs) (chapter 3) provided further evidence of the development of sociopragmatic knowledge. Decisions regarding the use of *tu*/vous, nous/on, and *ne* during the preenrichment phase were based on either rules of thumb (*tu*/vous) or on previous learning experiences in which the use of *nous* and the presence of *ne* were taught as invariable forms. The only exception was Conrad, who was able to deduce, based on the response options, that the use of *on* and the absence of *ne* constituted the more informal alternatives to the use of *nous* and the presence of *ne*. During the postenrichment phase, however, the learners were all able to make choices that were informed by their emerging conceptual knowledge and orientations to the situations presented to them. Crucially, their choices on the postenrichment AJQ were not only responsive to the situations (e.g., interlocutor relationship, formality of context) but reflected the learners’ orientations to how they would like to shape social-interactive contexts through the use of sociopragmatic variants. This finding is evidence of the internalization of the leading concept *orders of indexicality*, which emphasizes the fact that language both reflects and shapes contexts, activities, identities, and relationships (Eckert, 2008; Silverstein, 2003; van Compernolle, 2011). Results reported for orientations to scenarios corroborate these findings—learners’ emerging conceptual knowledge played a critical role in determining how they planned to use language to reflect and shape the situation and relationship between interlocutors.

The source of sociopragmatic knowledge development was traced in chapter 4 to three types of tasks: (1) independent verbalized reflections; (2) cooperative verbalized reflections; and (3) cooperative interaction around ambiguous AJQ items. Independent verbalized reflections served to introduce learners to the concepts and to push them to confront the ambiguities and inconsistencies in their functional and semantic knowledge (i.e., rules of thumb). In turn, these tasks assisted learners in reinterpreting functional and semantic knowledge within a more coherent system of meaning—that is, conceptual knowledge. However, independently, learners
were not always able to fully grasp the concepts and their implications for language use. Cooperative verbalized reflections in which the tutor simultaneously evaluated learners’ understanding of the concepts and promoted their continued development functioned to elaborate the concepts and to clarify aspects of them that created problems for the learners. In short, independent verbalized reflections supported learners in developing an initial understanding of the concepts while cooperative verbalized reflections pushed them to go even further. Cooperative interaction around ambiguous AJQ items then served to push learners to extend their emerging conceptual knowledge to situations in which unsystematic functional and semantic knowledge was insufficient because two or more “rules” were in direct conflict. Through cooperative interaction, the learners were able not only to apply the concepts as such but, more importantly, to consider the ways in which the concepts interrelate. As illustrated in chapter 4, the result was in many cases the emergence of qualitative new and personally significant synthetic concepts (e.g., Nikki’s concept of distant-equal relationships).

5.1.2 Performance abilities

The results regarding the development of performance abilities indicate that as the learners became increasingly familiar with the types of variation available to them and how sociopragmatic variants indexed conceptual meanings, they moved toward greater controlled use of the variants in line with their orientations to scenario scenarios. The scenarios provided learners with an opportunity to link their conceptual knowledge to practical activity. As noted in chapter 2, Vygotsky’s (1997, 2004) notion of praxis—the unification of theory and practice—requires that knowledge and performance be treated as a dialectical unity. Knowledge alone is never enough, but neither is it sufficient to improve performance without a concomitant shift in conscious awareness and control over one’s actions (Negueruela, 2003, 2008; Vygotsky, 1997).
In relation to sociopragmatic variation, conceptual knowledge affords learners agentive control over their use of variants and enables them to create the meanings they want to create (van Compernolle & Williams, forthcoming a).

The figures presented in chapter 3 showed marked improvements at both the group and individual level. Quantitatively, the results for *tu/vous* use indicated moderate improvements in consistency of use. (Recall that rates of appropriate use were already relatively high in the preenrichment data.) A closer look at the data and student comments revealed that some students were habituated to using certain preformed sequences, most notably the tag question *et toi?* ‘and you.’ In contexts in which the use of *vous* was judged to be appropriate, the use of this single lexicogrammatical item resulted in variability in performance. However, as the study progressed, several of the students gained enhanced control over their use of tags, opting for the *vous*-form alternative, *et vous?* The quantitative results for the *nous/on* and *ne* variables were more striking. Not only did the learners incorporate the previously unknown informal variants into their productive repertoires, in informal strategic interaction scenarios they in fact began to match and surpass rates of *on* use and *ne* omission reported in immersion (Mougeon et al., 2010) and study abroad (Regan et al., 2009) research in informal strategic interaction scenarios. Even more important, however, is that the participants also demonstrated advanced control over both formal and informal variants, using them with increasing consistency in ways that aligned with their orientations to communicative situations. This is a crucial component of the study because it is not enough simply to promote the uncritical use of informal or colloquial features of language; instead, control over the full range of variants available to speakers as meaning-making resources must be also promoted. Indeed, it is the ability to style-shift intentionally that makes such variation meaningful.

Although learners’ emerging sociopragmatic knowledge was certainly responsible for much of the development of performance abilities observed in this study (see below), another
important facet of the enrichment program was the cooperative interaction between the tutor and learners that took place during the strategic interactions scenarios themselves. As highlighted by the analysis of Mary’s developing control over the variable presence and absence of *ne* in chapter 4, learners sometimes diverged from their orientations to strategic interaction scenarios, which prompted the tutor to intervene in order to focus learners’ attention on the forms they were producing and, at times, to model the appropriate structures. As a result, the learners were increasingly able to self-regulate their use of sociopragmatic variants with greater consistency. Importantly, however, this was not evidenced solely by independent performance (i.e., consistent use of sociopragmatic variants in line with the orientation), but also by the amount and quality of mediation required from the tutor for learners to attend to, and potentially revise, their performance when needed. In other words, the dynamically administered scenarios not only served as opportunities for learners to apply what they had learned (i.e., to assess the result of learning) but, more importantly, as an additional form of pedagogical activity aimed at promoting the further growth of still-maturing sociopragmatic capacities.

### 5.1.3 Relationship between conceptual knowledge and performance

The relationship between conceptual (i.e., sociopragmatic) knowledge and performance has been implied at a number of different levels throughout this study. Indeed, the pedagogical enrichment program illustrated here took as axiomatic that conceptual knowledge both develops ahead of performance abilities and in turn serves an orienting function for their development (Galperin, 1989, 1992; Negueruela, 2008; see chapter 2). To be sure, this is not meant to suggest that there is a unidirectional relationship between knowledge and performance. Instead, the relationship is dialectical: although knowledge may mature more quickly than control in performance, both influence each other in development. The findings reported in chapters 3 and 4
illustrated how the learners’ sociopragmatic knowledge helped them to orient to (i.e., plan) performance and to assign meaning and significance to the forms they wanted to use and how they wanted to use them. At the same time, performance during strategic interaction scenarios assisted the learners, in cooperation with the tutor, in making connections between their conceptual knowledge of sociopragmatics and concrete communicative situations. This last point resonates with Negueruela’s (2008) articulation of revolutionary pedagogy, which in part proposes that the internalization of categories of meaning (i.e., concepts) creates the conditions under which language learners may further develop their communicative abilities. Negueruela’s argument is that development is not linear, but rather it entails ups and downs, progress and regression, all of which is part and parcel of processes leading to enhanced and personally significant communicative development. In the context of the present study, part of the revolutionary process of development included leading learners to recognize the incoherence of sociopragmatic rules of thumb, which initially confused them—although they had not realized this until they were pushed to confront this knowledge when asked to explain their initial understanding of the features—and then to accept the abstract concepts presented to them as coherent and systematic ways of designing and interpreting meanings through the use of sociopragmatic variants. Through engagement with the concept-based materials and in problem-solving and performance tasks, the learners were able to unlearn what they had previously learned and to begin the process of concept formation and internalization, thereby setting the stage for the development of more advanced sociopragmatic capacity.

This approach stands in stark contrast to more traditional perspectives on the relationship between knowledge and performance in instructed second language acquisition in general and sociopragmatics in particular. The traditional, or mainstream, understanding of this relationship, depicted in Figure 5.1, assumes a linear-causal relation between independent competence and input, participation, and/or instruction over time (see, e.g., Kasper & Rose, 2002; Mougeon et al.,
2010; Regan et al., 2009; Rose, 2005). The one-way arrows between the boxes displayed in Figure 5.1 are meant to suggest a linear process in which independent competence (e.g., metapragmatic knowledge, pragmatic performance) can be modified or enhanced by some form of intervention (e.g., the right kind of input, participation, or instruction) that raises conscious awareness and/or enhances implicit knowledge of language (i.e., one-way causation). At issue here is that enhanced independent competence—however operationalized and evaluated—is depicted as the result of intervention/learning but not part of the intervention itself.

An alternative, praxis-based perspective reconceptualizes the knowledge-performance relationship in a radically different way, which also implies rethinking the notion of pedagogical intervention such that there is no separation between learning/teaching and performance because these are integrated as components of the same process. Figure 5.2 displays the praxis-based perspective illustrated in the present study. The diagram depicts the development of sociopragmatic capacity—which entails a unity of knowledge and performance abilities—as the central process comprised of three components: learning and revising concepts, applying concepts to solve problems, and engaging in practical activity (see chapter 2). These components are united by two-way arrows, which are meant to suggest that each component is simultaneously distinct from but also responsive to and constitutive of the others, as explained below. In this way,
knowledge and performance form a dialectical relationship in which each exerts an influence on the other over time. It is important to point out that sociopragmatic capacity is not merely the sum of the three components (i.e., conceptual knowledge + application + performance = sociopragmatic capacity), but rather it is a qualitatively different whole in which the three components together transform and are transformed by pedagogical intervention.

**Figure 5.2.** Praxis-based perspective on the knowledge-performance relationship.

In the present study, learning concepts initially occurred during students’ engagement with the concept-based materials and through independent and cooperative verbalized reflections. In turn, participants applied the concepts to solve problems on AJQs and to orient to scenarios. However, by applying this emerging conceptual knowledge, the learners simultaneously had the opportunity to revise their conceptual knowledge, which was often required in order to solve the
communicative problem at hand. Applying the concepts to plan performance in the scenarios assisted learners in using sociopragmatic variation with greater consistency according to their plan, but using the variants when and how they wanted to use them simultaneously promoted accelerated access to their sociopragmatic knowledge (cf. Paradis’s [2009] concept of “speeded-up” access to metalinguistic knowledge; see chapter 2). The debriefing stage of scenarios also provided learners with an opportunity to self-assess their performance and satisfaction with it, which in turn fed back into the learning and revision of their sociopragmatic knowledge. In short, the development of each component of sociopragmatic capacity was at the same time the result and source of the development of the others.

5.2 Implications and Future Directions

5.2.1 Implications for research and pedagogy

In L2 sociopragmatics research, as in the mainstream SLA literature in general (DeKeyser & Sokalski, 2001; Ellis, 2005; Norris & Ortega, 2000), the role of explicit instruction aimed at promoting conscious knowledge of language is a contentious issue (Ishihara, 2010; Kasper, 2001; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2011; Takahashi, 2010). Although research findings have indicated that some form of pragmatic instruction appears to be more beneficial than no instruction at all, there is no general consensus as to what optimal instruction actually entails, nor is there agreement on the relationship between metapragmatic knowledge and performance abilities. As noted above, traditional perspectives on this relationship suggest that proper instruction ought to lead directly and straightforwardly to enhanced independent performance. However, the findings of this study indicate a dialectical relationship between knowledge and performance in which each exerts a dynamic influence on
the other. In short, conceptually based sociopragmatic knowledge transforms performance, which in turn recursively impacts upon sociopragmatic knowledge. The findings of this study therefore corroborate and expand upon previous research into concept-based pedagogy (Negueruela, 2003; Swain et al., 2009), thereby providing an alternative praxis-based perspective on the knowledge-performance relationship in L2 sociopragmatics research.

The central argument presented in this study is that holistic scientific concepts form a systematic orientation to language use (see chapter 2). In contrast to most L2 sociopragmatics research in which the acquisition of forms is assumed to be a prerequisite for developing knowledge of the meanings they instantiate, the present study reversed this orientation, teaching concepts (meanings) first, and then leading learners to map these meanings onto forms. As such, the focus of pedagogical activity was on the internalization of such concepts as orders of indexicality, social distance, and power, which were then illustrated by various sociopragmatic features of language that instantiate these meaning potentials. The advantage of such an approach is that the meanings learners internalize are not bound to particular language forms; instead, they unite a broad array of sociopragmatic features of discourse and will potentially serve learners as orienting bases for interpreting and using other language features beyond formal, structured educational settings.

However, conceptual sociopragmatic knowledge—while certainly a distinct component of sociopragmatic capacity—cannot be construed as separate from the ability to act, nor can it be teased apart from the particular activities in which it is used. This study used a variety of tasks to assess multiple dimensions of sociopragmatic knowledge. LAIs and verbalized reflections offered insights into learners’ understanding of the concepts as such, whereas interactions around AJQ items and orientations to scenarios revealed learners’ abilities to apply, adapt, and repurpose their emerging conceptual knowledge in order to respond to new and different circumstances as is the case in the everyday world. In short, evaluating learners’ sociopragmatic knowledge is not a
question of whether or not they understand a concept but instead one of exploring how they use
the concept to mediate their goal-directed, material activity.

Although all 8 participants in the present study developed along both conceptual
knowledge and performance dimensions, there was interindividual variation in the qualities of
their achievements. In future research, further exploration of the qualities of conceptual
knowledge and their relationship to performance abilities would likely provide much needed
insight into differences in individual developmental trajectories. Along these same lines, this
study has noted in various places how the qualities of learners’ past educational and socialization
experiences influenced how they understood and began to internalize the concepts presented to
them and how these past experiences were potentially reinterpreted through the lens of the
concepts they were learning (e.g., in chapter 4, Susan’s struggle to understand social distance and
potentially ambiguous social relationships, or Mary’s understanding of her former teacher’s
speech as “snobby” as she was confronting the concept of orders of indexicality). More focused
explorations of this dimension would certainly prove beneficial to research in this domain.

Another major direction for future research would be to test the theoretical claim that the
internalization of scientific concepts affords learners the opportunity to develop their
communicative abilities beyond the illustrative forms presented in the pedagogical program. In
other words, such a research initiative would explore whether—and to what extent—conceptual
knowledge of orders of indexicality, self-presentation, social distance, and power may function to
assist learners in recognizing, interpreting, and using the potential meanings of other patterns of
language use (e.g., interrogative structures, directness and indirectness, honorifics and other terms
of address, interactional patterns, nonverbal/embodied aspects of communicative activity). Future
studies might investigate the degree to which conceptual knowledge alone is sufficient for leading
learners to discover other meaning-form relationships either within or beyond formal pedagogical
contexts (i.e., autonomous learning). It may be that some guidance from a teacher or expert
language user that points to other discursive features is required, but that the resultant meaning-
form mappings are relatively efficiently formed because the concept is already present in the
learner’s cognitive system. Within a structured pedagogical environment, this issue could be
addressed by introducing more complex scenarios in which (a) social relationships are ambiguous
and (b) the demands of the tasks present more conflict between participant roles and therefore
require more negotiation.

Outside of a formal educational context, an ideal testing ground for such research would
be in immersive social-interactive contexts such as telecollaboration (Belz & Kinginger, 2002,
2003; Belz & Thorne, 2006; Belz & Vyatkina, 2008) and study abroad (Kinginger, 2008), where
language use has real and immediate social consequences. Not only would observing and
documenting learners’ interactions in such environments reveal the extent to which their
conceptual knowledge is consequential for the use of the forms illustrated in the pedagogical
intervention, and vice versa, but it would also allow researchers and teachers to document
whether learners are able to extend their conceptual knowledge to other language features as
described above. The idea would be to use concept-based pedagogy to promote the initial
artificial (i.e., intentional) development (Vygotsky, 1997; see chapter 2) of sociopragmatic
capacity within a formal, structured educational context, which in turn has the potential to
facilitate and ultimately transform the process of socialization through participation. In short,
concept-based pedagogy not only has consequences for development during the instructional
program itself, but the resulting conceptual knowledge may form the basis upon which learners
interpret and assign meaning and significance to patterns of language use that they observe and to
the interactions in which they participate beyond a school setting.

A final direction for future research includes developing a computerized version of the
pedagogical program illustrated in this study. Although intensive one-on-one face-to-face
interactions between a student and a teacher may be ideal, they are likely unfeasible in regular L2
classrooms. A computerized version designed to walk learners through the concepts, including computer-based AJQs, would allow a greater number of learners to benefit from this approach to pedagogy. Verbalized reflections on concept components and explanations of performance on AJQs may be replaced by written reflections elicited by on-screen prompts (e.g., open textboxes). In addition, audio/video recordings of learners as they work through the computer-based tutorial would provide researchers (and possibly teachers) with complementary data (e.g., vocalizations, private speech) to trace conceptual development.

5.2.2 Implications for teacher education and curriculum design

If the ability to interpret and assign social meaning and significance to variable features of language is held to be an important aspect of L2 development, then pedagogical materials and practices specifically centered on sociopragmatics must be integrated into L2 curricula. This study has illustrated one approach to teaching sociopragmatics that was effective both in raising learners’ awareness of the meaning potential of variation and in guiding them to improve their spoken performance. Yet, recommendations for changing or supplementing existing L2 curricula to include units focusing on sociopragmatic variation encounter resistance from many language educators. As Etienne and Sax (2009) point out, “concerns of ‘correctness,’ time, and complexity make the issue difficult to address in the classroom” (p. 584). There are often negative evaluations of nonliterary and/or less formal ways of speaking as being improper or even grammatically incorrect, which stem from many teachers’ confusion over the social meaning and significance of a speaker’s ability to vary his or her level of discourse across contexts and activities. In addition, many teachers understandably argue that there simply is not enough time in class to incorporate lessons on sociopragmatic variation in addition to the vocabulary and grammar presented in the textbook, and that attempting to incorporate additional pedagogical
material that addresses variation in language may risk confusing students already struggling to
learn so-called “basic” words and structures prescribed by the curriculum. It seems, therefore, that
a fundamental change in teacher’s own understandings of language, language learning, and
language teaching is needed. As Lantolf and Johnson (2007) write:

L2 teachers typically enter the profession with largely unarticulated, yet deeply
ingrained, everyday concepts about language, language learning, and language
teaching that are based on their own L2 instructional histories and lived
experiences. . . [A]lthough L2 teacher education programs present teachers with
up-to-date research on SLA, linguistics, psychology, methodology, and so on,
they reinforce, rather than challenge, teachers’ everyday concepts about
language, language learning, and language teaching. (p. 884)

Although this study is not directly concerned with L2 teacher education, there are
implications for this important domain. The pedagogical approach adopted in this dissertation
took a radical departure from traditional perspectives on both the nature of sociopragmatic
variability and its relationship with appropriateness as well as what teaching and learning entails
(i.e., mapping meanings onto forms rather than forms to meanings). From this perspective, L2
teacher education programs ought to include coursework designed to challenge pre-service
teachers’ deeply ingrained beliefs about language—typically centered on a system of
grammatically correct and incorrect forms—by introducing the concepts of orders of indexicality,
self-presentation, social distance, power, and so on as they relate to the language they intend to
teach. This has the potential to transform their understanding of the appropriateness of
sociopragmatic variants, often conceived of as rules governing “proper” and “improper” social
behavior, in terms of the two appropriateness criteria discussed in chapter 1:

- The degree to which a particular instance of language use—whether conventional or
  unconventional—is interpretable by one’s interlocutor(s) or audience given the
discourse situation in which language is being used.
The degree to which a particular instance of language use—whether conventional or unconventional—is effective in reflecting and (re)shaping activity types, social relationships, and/or social identities.

Expanding L2 curricula is a complex issue, however, because of the constraints of seat time and class meeting schedules. Indeed, adding lessons or units centered on sociopragmatic variation to an already overloaded and hectic course schedule (following learner textbooks) may be unfeasible within existing programs. What is therefore needed is a reconceptualization of the syllabus, one that is not designed around a perceived natural progression of specific language forms but is instead organized around concepts that can progressively lead learners to develop their communicative agency (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007; Negueruela, 2008). Although no specific articulation currently exists of what such a syllabus would look like, one possible approach might include centering first-year (beginning) L2 courses on the concepts of language as situated, communicative activity (as opposed to an abstract system), orders of indexicality, social distance, power, and turn-taking. These concepts could be illustrated throughout an academic term with particular language forms (e.g., *tu* and *vous* for French) and patterns of interaction (e.g., greeting and leave-taking sequences) that are fundamental to communicative development. In this way, concepts (meanings) would be privileged but never separated from concrete communicative practices. While such an orientation to language teaching and curriculum design may at first blush seem to be a radical departure from current thinking in applied linguistics and L2 education, it is noteworthy that these concepts already figure into existing models of L2 communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, 2007). Privileging meaning (concepts)

---

27 This idea articulates in some respects with functional-notional syllabuses (e.g., Wilkins, 1976), where language pedagogy is organized around *functions* of language (e.g., speech acts) and *notions*, or semantic concepts. However, the functional-notional approach privileges the teaching of concrete communicative practices (functions) in relation to conventional patterns of appropriateness (notions). In a concept-based syllabus, the concepts do not privilege conventional patterns of meaning; rather, they are systematic representations of meaning potentials that are in turn illustrated by linguistic forms.
is, therefore, not a conceptually difficult leap, but it is one that requires that we overcome traditional wisdom that L2 learners need to learn/acquire forms before meanings.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study have demonstrated how a concept-based approach to sociopragmatic instruction can function simultaneously to promote coherent, systematic (conceptual) knowledge of the object of study (i.e., sociopragmatic concepts, meaning-form mappings) and improved, agentive performance abilities (i.e., goal-directed use of sociopragmatic variants). Although this research has a number of implications for research and pedagogy as well as teacher education and curriculum design (discussed above), it is also important to bear in mind its limitations. One potential limitation of the study stems from its radically different orientation to teaching and developing L2 sociopragmatic capacity in comparison to previous L2 pragmatics research. The majority of data collected represent cooperative, intermental activity rather than individual competence. In addition, while in some ways similar to well established data collection instruments (e.g., discourse completion tasks, role plays), the appropriateness judgment questionnaires and scenarios used during the course of the enrichment program were designed to integrate assessment and pedagogy as a unified activity. Furthermore, this study was primarily concerned with the role of conceptual knowledge in the development of sociopragmatic capacity (i.e., mapping concepts onto forms), which entails a reversal of the traditional form-acquisition-to-meaning-association orientation within the field. As a result, directly comparing and contrasting the findings of this research with those reported in previous studies is at best tenuous because, despite having a common focus of interest, each originates from different, and ultimately incommensurable, theories of the relationship between learning about and learning language. However, this is not, in my estimation, a limitation or problem that needs resolution, but instead
an important issue to recognize so that the questions, methods, and findings of researchers working within one theory are not confused with, or reinterpreted within, the constructs and objectives of another (Dunn & Lantolf, 1998; Kinginger, 2001; Lantolf, 1996).

There are also limitations of the scope of the research design and methodology. This study included a small number of participants (N = 8) enrolled in only one particular intermediate-level US university French class. In addition, the qualitative treatment of developmental processes presented in chapter 4 centered on only four brief case studies of individual learners. Although the limited number of participants and careful selection of representative cases have allowed for a relatively in-depth look at sociopragmatic development from several angles, it will be necessary in the future to expand the breadth of the research design to include a greater number of participants as well as learners at different instructional levels and/or who are studying other languages. It should also be pointed out that this study was designed as a sort of test case for a concept-based approach to sociopragmatic instruction and, as such, was not intended to compare learners’ achievements with a control group (i.e., no instruction) and/or a comparative group (i.e., an alternative pedagogical approach). Future comparative studies certainly have the potential to inform L2 sociopragmatics research, although such research focuses on product rather than process. As noted above, researchers should be careful not to confuse the constructs and goals of one theory of pedagogy and cognitive development with those of another. Instead, explorations of the particular qualities of development (i.e., what actually develops and how) may be more worthwhile than direct comparisons in which one approach is pitted against another and effectiveness of instructional intervention is measured on the basis of a single, standardized set assessment instruments.

It is also noteworthy that this study involved one-on-one tutorials with an expert in French sociopragmatics and Vygotskian pedagogy rather than in a typical classroom. Although the materials and tasks designed for this study may not be wholly feasible in a typical classroom,
they certainly lend themselves to being adapting for such use, and teachers would certainly be able to incorporate them into their courses. Nonetheless, it will be necessary to explore the extent to which teachers accept, reject, and adapt concept-based approaches to pedagogy based on their previous learning and teaching histories and (folk) theories of language and learning (Abraham & Williams, in preparation). It may be that a reconceptualization of teacher education is needed that leads teachers to think about language and learning in new ways (Lantolf & Johnson, 2007).

Limitations of the scope of data collection are also apparent. Because this study focused heavily on putting concept-based pedagogy under a microscope, other potentially important sources of or influences on development were not emphasized. This is particularly clear when one considers that little information about learners’ histories beyond the number of years of French study and current course enrollments as language learners was formally collected. Stories about past learning experiences evidencing a number of sources of language socialization did, however, emerge during the course of the study, often as anecdotes integrated into learners’ explanations of performance and questions about the concepts. Likewise, this study did not formally attempt to collect data about the learners’ concurrent educational experience in a formal classroom and how their participation in enrichment program may have impacted upon it, nor did it include data (e.g., interviews) from the perspective of these students’ regular classroom teachers. More formal approaches to collecting such information would certainly be beneficial to future studies.

Limitations of the scope of data analysis also exist. It would be impossible to analyze everything each learner did over the course of the study (approximately 25 hours of videorecordings) from every conceivable angle; therefore, limitations on the scope of analysis had to be imposed. The focus of the formal assessment of sociopragmatic development (chapter 3) was limited to comparisons of preenrichment and postenrichment language awareness interviews and appropriateness judgment questionnaires, and descriptive statistics and qualitative analyses of performance in scenarios throughout the entire study. The scope of chapter 4 was...
limited to four brief studies of individual learners whose cases were representative illustrations of the qualities of interactions and learning. However, the data lend themselves to a wide range of other analytic foci. These include the practices by which the tutor and learners collaboratively made sense of what they were doing, how mediation emerged through and was oriented to and negotiated in interaction, embodied aspects of learning and development (e.g., gaze, nodding, gesture), learners’ folk/everyday theories of language and language learning, and resistance to a new and unfamiliar approach to learning (about) language. Each of these issues—and certainly others not mentioned here—deserves greater attention in future research.

5.4 Concluding Remarks

This study represents an expansion of concept-based approaches to language teaching into the domain of L2 sociopragmatics. In so doing, it offers insights for Vygotskian research on language pedagogy and at the same time for the field of L2 sociopragmatics. The findings have helped to clarify to role of conceptual knowledge as an orienting basis for action and to elaborate on the relationship between conceptual knowledge and performance. Although there are a number of important implications for research, pedagogy, L2 teacher education, and curriculum design, there are also a number of limitations and questions left unanswered. As an initial attempt at designing a concept-based approach to teaching sociopragmatics, it is hoped this study can serve as a guide for future research that refines, modifies, and expands its scope, methodology, and data analytic procedures. I have suggested a number of ways to do so, and there are certainly many other avenues for future research to explore. Such efforts have the potential to bring about much-needed changes in the way we conceive of L2 sociopragmatic capacity and promote its development through instruction.
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Informed Consent

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Developing sociopragmatic capacity in French as a foreign language through concept-based instruction

Principal Investigator: Rémi A. van Compernolle
Department of Applied Linguistics
The Pennsylvania State University
305 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802
rav137@psu.edu
814-865-7365

Advisor: Dr. Celeste Kinginger
Department of Applied Linguistics
The Pennsylvania State University
305 Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802
cxk37@psu.edu
814-865-7365

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to help you develop your abilities to interact in French in socially appropriate ways through a teaching method called concept-based instruction. Learning to speak another language is about much more than learning new vocabulary and grammar—it also entails the ability to use new vocabulary and grammar in a way that reflects who you are as a person and the types of relationships you have or want to establish with other people. In other words, language learning is about learning how to use language as a social-interactive tool and, crucially, how speakers of other languages from other cultures conceptualize social appropriateness in language, which may differ from the way you do in your culture. Concept-based instruction focuses on these concepts and focuses on the type of language you can use to call upon these meaningful concepts.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to participate in six (6) video and audio-recorded one-on-one teaching sessions with a researcher/teacher. The focus is on learning concepts relevant to presenting yourself in French the way you want to be perceived (that is, your social identity) and concepts relevant to creating and maintaining different kinds of social relationships in a variety of social settings. During teaching sessions, you will participate in a number of tasks in collaboration with the researcher that are similar to activities you regularly do in the classroom, including explicit instruction and discussion about the concepts and language forms, language completion worksheets, and spoken role plays. All of these tasks are designed to help you become a more capable speaker of French in a range of social contexts.

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

4. Benefits: The benefits to you include learning more about French and improving your abilities to use French (including speaking and writing) in a variety of social situations. The benefits to society include
learning more about how languages are learned and the role of instruction in foreign language education. Additional benefits include the potential to inform language learning materials developers.

5. **Duration/Time:** You will be asked to participate in six (6) sessions with the researcher at your convenience over the course of not more than six (6) weeks. Each session will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour, for a total of 3 to 6 hours if you complete the study.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. The videotapes will be stored and secured in password-protected digital files. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, video clips and/or written transcripts may be employed to exemplify how concept-based instruction works and/or how the various tasks and teaching activities were carried out (see below). Other forms of data (e.g., worksheets) collected during the study will also be stored in electronic (scanned) password-protected files and archived for future research projects, educational, and/or training purposes. Your name and any other personally identifiable information will never be used. Instead, pseudonyms will be used when referring to specific participants. Only the Principle Investigator, Rémi A. van Compernolle, and his Advisor, Dr. Celeste Kinginger, will have access to the recordings. The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Research Protections, the Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study.

Please indicate below whether or not you agree that segments (clips) of the recordings made of your participation may be used for the following purposes:

- Clips may be used for **conference presentations:** ___ YES ___ NO
- Clips may be used for **publications:** ___ YES ___ NO
- Clips may be used for **educational/teaching purposes:** ___ YES ___ NO
- Clips may be used for **training purposes:** ___ YES ___ NO

7. **Data Archiving for Future Use:** Normally, video and audio files will be destroyed five (5) years after your participation in this study. However, video and audio files can be valuable resources for research, educational, and training purposes. Please indicate whether or not you agree to allow the researcher to archive video and audio files of your participation in this research for future research, educational, and/or training purposes in the field of second language learning and teaching. In all cases, your data will remain password-protected and confidential.

- Video/audio files may be archived for **future research:** ___ YES ___ NO
- Video/audio files may be archived for **educational purposes:** ___ YES ___ NO
- Video/audio files may be archived for **training purposes:** ___ YES ___ NO

If you do not wish for your video and audio files to be archived, please indicate so here _______. By so doing, your data will be destroyed within five (5) years of completion of this study and will not be used for future research, educational purposes, or training purposes.

8. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact the researcher, Rémi A. van Compernolle (rav137@psu.edu; 814-574-7284), or his advisor, Celeste Kinginger (cxk37@psu.edu), with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also contact the researcher or his advisor if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, or problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for
Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. Questions about research procedures can be answered by the research team.

9. **Voluntary Participation**: Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer or participate in any activities you do not want to participate in. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

10. **Compensation**: You will receive financial compensation for your time in the amount of $10 per session, for a maximum total of $60 if you complete the study. You will receive compensation in cash at the end of each session you attend. You will be compensated only for the sessions you attend.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

_____________________________________________  _______________________
Participant Signature                          Date

_____________________________________________  _______________________
Person Obtaining Consent                      Date
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Appropriateness Judgment Questionnaires

AJQ 1

Directions: Please indicate which of the following language forms—tu or vous ‘you’, on or nous ‘we’, and ne...pas or Ø...pas for negation—you would use in each of the situations described below. You will also be asked to explain your choices as you complete this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>tu or vous ‘you’</th>
<th>on or nous ‘we’</th>
<th>ne...pas or Ø...pas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are at a local café one evening and a friend of yours, Jean, comes in. He walks over to your table and greets you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just before you and your friend order your drinks, your friend’s girlfriend, Sophie, enters the café, sees the two of you, and comes over. You’ve never met her before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re walking down the street with some of your friends on a Saturday afternoon when you run into one of your favorite teachers, M Robinet. He’s about 40 years old.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a question about your course schedule so you go to the main office of the department. There, the administrative assistant—a woman in her 50s—greets you. You’ve never talked to her before, but you know that she is relatively formal with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are going to see your professor, Mme Triolet, during her office hours because you have a question about an up-coming French culture exam. You haven’t scheduled a meeting so you don’t know if she’s available right now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: Please indicate which of the following language forms—*tu* or *vous* ‘you’, *on* or *nous* ‘we’, and *ne...pas* or *Ø...pas* for negation—you would use in each of the situations described below. You will also be asked to explain your choices as you complete this questionnaire. Also remember that you can use the diagrams to help you make your decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th><em>tu or vous</em> ‘you’</th>
<th><em>on or nous</em> ‘we’</th>
<th><em>ne...pas or Ø...pas</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are headed downtown to meet a group of friends for lunch when you happen to run into a classmate, Christophe. He’s about your age and you’ve known him for a few months, although you haven’t really hung out with him outside of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have applied for a summer work-study program in France where you would be working in a hotel in Montpellier while taking some business and tourism courses at the university. The program director, Mme Fétouh, has arranged to call you for a phone interview today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re going to a café that you’ve been frequenting regularly for about three months because it’s a nice place to watch soccer matches. You’ve gotten to know the owner, JF, fairly well. He’s about 40 years old and very friendly to all his customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re at the grocery store looking for some cheese for a small dinner party you’re having with some friends. Unfortunately, you don’t see the cheese you wanted. You decide to ask the clerk, a young woman in her mid twenties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s Saturday afternoon, and you want to go out for dinner at a place called Le Bistro. You call your good friend, Amélie, to see if she wants to go.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Directions:** Please indicate which of the following language forms—*tu* or *vous* ‘you’, *on* or *nous* ‘we’, and *ne...pas* or *Ø...pas* for negation—you would use in each of the situations described below. You will also be asked to explain your choices as you complete this questionnaire. Also remember that you can use the diagrams to help you make your decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th><em>tu or vous</em> ‘you’</th>
<th><em>on or nous</em> ‘we’</th>
<th><em>ne...pas or Ø...pas</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are at the bus stop on your way home, and you accidentally step on someone’s toe. You look and see that it’s a woman dressed in business attire who looks to be in her mid 40s, and she seems angry. You want to apologize and tell her you didn’t do it on purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re at a party when you see a friend, Marc. You go over to talk to him. You’ve known each other for a couple of years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the same party, Marc introduces you to his friend, Paul, whom you’ve never met. Paul is in his early 20s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re on your way to discuss studying abroad with the French professor in charge of the program you want to participate in, Mme Danielle, who is about 35. You’ve never had a class with her, but you have exchanged pleasantries with her in the hallway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You’re shopping for new shoes, and you’re trying to decide between two pairs that you like. The sales clerk—a man in his 30s—comes over to help you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scenario Prompts

Session 1

Scenario 1: [Informal scenario]

**Student’s role:** You recently met an exchange student from France. He doesn’t know many people at PSU because he’s only been here for a couple of weeks. The two of you have gotten together a couple of times for lunch and seem to get along well. You and your roommate are having a party at your place on Friday and want to invite him, so you call to invite him.

**Other’s role:** You’re an exchange student from France, and you don’t know many people at PSU because you’ve only been here for a couple of weeks. However, you have met one person, [student’s name], and been out to lunch a couple of times. You’d like to go out and meet more people, but it’s difficult because you don’t live very close to campus. Also, you don’t know your way around State College very well yet. This weekend will be especially busy because you have a lot of work to do and also one of your friends from France, who is studying in Philadelphia, happens to be in town.

Scenario 2: [Formal scenario]

**Student’s role:** Two weeks ago, a French professor from PSU came to your class to talk about a one-year study abroad opportunity in France. You and a friend really want to go study abroad, so you go to his office to talk to him (your friend isn’t available right now, so you go alone to ask for the two of you). However, you’re not sure whether you meet the requirements to participate in the study abroad program, so you’ll have to convince him you’re qualified. Also, you really need to talk to him now because you and your friend have to tell your parents soon that you’re interested in going.

**Other’s role:** You are a French professor at PSU and in charge of a study abroad program in Paris. You have been recruiting students for a couple of weeks, and there has been quite a bit of interest. You have to set up formal interviews with program applicants, but some students come by your office unannounced to talk to you even if they haven’t applied for the program. The application deadline is tomorrow.
Session 3

Scenario 1: [Informal scenario]

**Student’s role:** You and friend from France have decided to share an apartment in State College. Because your friend isn’t very familiar with State College yet, you have taken care of finding some potential places to live. Your main concern about the apartment is the rent. You have a budget of $500/month for your share, but you’d really rather spend $350/month or less. In fact, you’d be fine living relatively far from campus/downtown if it means spending less money – there’s always the bus! You’ve found four possible places in State College that have different prices and locations, so you need to discuss them with your friend. Based on what you’ve found, though, there is one in particular that you prefer – it’s far from campus (too far to walk and at least a 30 min bus ride) but it’s cheap!

**Other’s role:** Your American friend and you have decided to get an apartment together in State College. Since you don’t know SCE very well, your friend has researched apartments and is going to show you a few that he/she likes. Your budget is about $600/month, and although you’d like to pay less, you don’t mind paying more if it means being close to campus/downtown because you prefer to be within walking distance (30 min or less). In fact, proximity to campus is your main concern. Alternatively, being close to a bus stop would be okay, but only if the apartment is very nice and inexpensive.

Scenario 2: [Formal scenario]

**Student’s role:** You are planning a trip to Paris with a friend for next summer, so you need to get some information about places to stay. You call a travel agency in France to ask for some recommendations. You and your friend would like to stay close to the center of Paris – for example in the Quartier Latin or near la Tour Eiffel – but you have a budget of 50€ per night for both of you together. Of course, you want something clean but it doesn’t have to be fancy. You also want a private room. Your budget is very strict, so you’re also willing to stay farther away from the center of town if it means a cheaper place. You plan on being in Paris for 10 nights.

**Other’s role:** You are a travel agent in Paris. An American student calls you to arrange lodging for a 10-night stay. Because of the budget, you recommend a couple of youth hostels and one hotel in the suburbs of Paris. Hostel A is 60€/night and in the Quartier Latin. Hostel B is 45€/night but is located on the north side of Paris, far from the center. Hostel C is only 40€ per night, but the room would be shared with 2 other people. The hotel is in the suburbs and costs 50€/night.
Session 5

Scenario 1: [Informal scenario]

**Student’s role:** You’re supposed to have lunch with a friend, and you’ve agreed to meet in front of the library at noon. However, you haven’t decided where to go. You don’t want to spend too much, but you’re sick of eating in the HUB. You think it would be nice to go somewhere downtown for a relaxing lunch, especially since you don’t have to be anywhere before 3pm. You’re not sure what your friend likes to eat, so you’ll need to ask and recommend some places the two of you could go to.

**Other’s role:** You’re meeting a friend for lunch at noon, but you don’t know where you’re going. You’re pretty busy, so you want to go somewhere that’s fast, like the HUB, although you don’t really have to be anywhere soon.

Scenario 2: [Formal scenario]

**Student’s role:** You need to meet with your professor to discuss an upcoming exam, so you go to his office to ask if he’s available now or sometime soon for the two of you to talk. Since the exam is next Monday, you need to talk with him soon. Normally, you’re available in the mornings between 10 and 11 and in the afternoons from 3 to 5. On Fridays you don’t normally come to campus, but technically you’re free since you don’t have any classes then.

**Other’s role:** A student comes to see you about an upcoming exam. You can talk now for only a few minutes because you have a meeting soon. Otherwise, your office hours are Tuesday, 11-12, and Thursday, 2-3. In addition, you’re normally around Friday mornings, so you could meet then.
Session 6

Scenario 1: [Informal scenario]

Student’s role: You recently met an exchange student from France. He doesn’t know many people at PSU because he’s only been here for a couple of weeks. The two of you have gotten together a couple of times for lunch and seem to get along well. You and another friend of yours are planning to have a small dinner party at your place, so you call to see if he’s available.

Other’s role: You’re an exchange student from France, and you don’t know many people at PSU because you’ve only been here for a couple of weeks. However, you have met one person, [student’s name], and been out to lunch a couple of times. You’d like to go out and meet more people, but it’s difficult because you don’t live very close to campus. Also, you don’t know your way around State College very well yet. You’re kind of busy tonight with work and you have a friend over from France.

Scenario 2: [Formal scenario]

Student’s role: You have a phone interview with a work-study program director in France today. The program is for a summer job in Montpellier where you would work part time in a hotel and take language courses at the university. You know you’re a finalist, but you don’t know what job you might get. On your application, you indicated that your top two preferences were front desk receptionist and wait staff (waiter/waitress) in the hotel restaurant because those jobs would allow you to interact in French with other people—one of your main reasons for wanting to go to Montpellier. Also, you don’t know when you would be expected to arrive because some jobs are expected to start at the beginning of July, while others start in mid July. This is a potential problem since you and several of your friends have planned a trip to New York from July 1-July 10.

Other’s role: You’re a work-study program director in Montpellier, and you’re calling a finalist to offer him/her a job. Unfortunately, his/her first choice—receptionist—is has already been offered to someone else. You want to offer the waiter/waitress job in the hotel restaurant, which starts July 1. Alternatively, although the applicant did not show interest on the application, there is also a position as an assistant in the kitchen (aide cuisine) that starts July 15.
Appendix D

Transcription Conventions

+ short pause
++ long pause
+++ very long pause
(2.0) timed pause (2.0 seconds or more)
. full stop marks falling intonation
, slightly rising intonation
? raised intonation (not necessarily a question)
(word) single parentheses indicate uncertain hearing
(xxx) unable to transcribe
((comment)) double parentheses contain transcriber’s comments or descriptions
- abrupt cutoff with level pitch
underline underlining indicates stress through pitch or amplitude
= latched utterances
[. . .] indicates that a section of the transcript has been omitted
[ onset of overlapping speech
] end of overlapping speech
CAPITALS capital letters indicate markedly loud speech
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