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Abstract

Means to an End: Communication Strategies in French Immersion

by

Stephanie Burdine

This dissertation analyzes patterns of communication strategy usage in the speech of 41 French immersion students in Toronto, Canada collected from informal student interviews with a native French speaker. The study contributes to a more complete understanding of communication strategies in French immersion by addressing such issues as the relative range and frequency of strategies; the interplay between strategies; the interaction between participants related to strategy usage; and the effect of extralinguistic factors on strategy usage (e.g. students' sex; age/grade; French language media exposure; time in a Francophone environment; stays with a Francophone family; home language).

Strategies were coded and frequency counts obtained. The strategies identified included: L1-based (language switch and foreignization); L2-based (circumlocution, word coinage and approximation); sociopragmatic (appeal for assistance, message abandonment, and mime); and ambiguous/potentially L3-based strategies. While students use a range of strategies, the tendency is to rely on language switch. Rather than risk inaccuracy in the TL, students prefer to be economical and, assuming that the interviewer is bilingual, are confident that she will understand the strategy. Appeals for assistance from the interviewer are also frequent, demonstrating that the presence of an interlocutor plays an essential role in how students deal with lexical problems.
The emergence of a strategy continuum provided support for the notion that some strategies are riskier than others by showing that frequency and perceived level of risk associated with that strategy is related to the amount of follow-up that a strategy receives. Follow-up strategies occur (i) for the purpose of correcting a prior usage; (ii) due to awareness of French/English translation difficulties; (iii) due to uncertainties about TL usage; and/or (iv) as means to treat the interview as a learning experience or to meet expectations of speaking French during the interview.

Statistical analyses revealed that L1-based, sociopragmatic, and ambiguous/potential L3-based strategies are correlated with some of the social factors examined, including extracurricular exposure to French and age/grade, but not students' sex.

It is concluded that in spite of the non-conventional lexical choices in students' TL messages, they are still comprehensible (i.e., meaningful) to the interlocutor and communication goals are achieved successfully.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

J'aime parler mais je dois savoir ce que je veux dire.
Je ne peux pas être peur de parler
I like speaking but I have to know what I want to say. I can't be afraid of speaking' (FI 6)

Given the understanding that the "essential condition for communicating successfully is to get the intended meaning across" (Wagner and Firth 1997:341), the motto 'work with what you have' is particularly fitting for second language (L2) learners who must rely on limited linguistic resources while speaking in the target language (TL) to actually convey what they intend and be understood. While the conventionally 'correct' lexical item in the TL is certainly helpful in accomplishing this goal, it is not the only means to an end (Wagner and Firth 1997:340). The use of language switch or a lengthy paraphrase in place of an unavailable or unknown TL item, or an appeal for assistance from the interlocutor for a TL equivalent, for example, are but three possible options available to L2 learners to compensate for insufficient knowledge of the TL and avoid breakdowns in spoken communication. Each of these lexical communication strategies is based on different principles: students' first language (L1), students' second language (L2), and sociopragmatic skills, respectively, which shows just how far a student can extend his/her linguistic and sociopragmatic abilities to overcome a communicative problem in the TL.

L2 lexical communication strategy research has been somewhat overshadowed by the field of error analysis, where one of the goals is to classify students' 'deviant' or

What is overlooked as a result of this narrow focus, however, is that L2 students' non-TL usage, while in some cases clearly lacking TL 'correctness' in the formal sense, is not necessarily an impediment for communication. Rather, L2 students may be observed to demonstrate an, often, creative means to extend their linguistic skills and thereby strategically fulfill the short term goals of overcoming a lexical difficulty and conveying an intended message, and the long term goals of maintaining the flow of discourse and maximizing their involvement in it. The interest of L2 communication strategy research, then, stripped to its barest sense, is to describe the patterns of strategic language usage and analyze how L2 learners overcome communication difficulties in spoken discourse.

The majority of L2 lexical communication strategy research has been dominated by data collected almost exclusively by means of formal elicitation tasks (Bialystok and Kellerman 1997:34), such as story retellings in which a learner must refer to a number of objects using the TL. These studies are grounded in a psycholinguistic approach to communication strategies, whose interest lies primarily in the cognitive processing that underpins individual production features: any social interaction is viewed as irrelevant (Kellerman 1991:154), hence an interlocutor, in the traditional sense, is absent and the data is strictly learner-focused. There are obvious disadvantages to this approach; namely, that the number of strategies available to the student to overcome a lexical problem is forcibly limited to those that can be exercised independently by the student, free of any interaction with an interlocutor. Consequently, the data are not particularly reflective of actual language usage since the learner is essentially performing in isolation.
In response to this drawback, a contrasting, more usage-based approach to studying communication strategies has emerged. Proponents of an interactional approach to communication strategies are concerned with interindividual production differences in the use of lexical strategies to facilitate communication and "studies which take into account the situated nature of real communication" (Williams et al. 1997:306). The basis for this research trend comes from the perspective that communication strategies are interactional elements of discourse with "differential relevance vis-à-vis the participants' communicative concerns" (Wagner and Firth:1997:330). Accordingly, the presence of an interlocutor is seen to have a strong influence on speaker behavior and the types of strategies s/he tends to implement (Yule and Tarone 1997:26).

However, there are methodological concerns about this latter approach, as was the case with the former, that it, too, is not completely reflective of actual language usage. Since the claim in the interactional approach is that communication strategies are purely cooperative and that the speaker and interlocutor must work together to overcome the communication difficulty in order for there to be a communication strategy, the implication is that the speaker cannot independently overcome a problematic spot in the discourse without the aid of the interlocutor. Moreover, certain performance features, such as the presence of hesitation phenomena as indicators of planning and production problems that may play a role in identifying instances of communication strategy usage are largely neglected in this approach, which suggests that the entire communicative picture is not being considered.

This dissertation contributes to a more complete understanding of L2 communication strategies by implementing a broader approach to their study, one that
focuses on the interactional facets of language use, but considers the psycholinguistic facets, as well (cf. Wagner and Firth 1997:342). Under these terms, communication strategies are thereby defined as students’ attempts to overcome a communicative difficulty either independently, or conjointly with the interlocutor. It will be demonstrated that a study of both the interactional and psycholinguistic features of production found in the context of a communication strategy, rather than one or the other, offers new and stimulating points of view about what L2 students do with language.

The focus of the present study is to describe the patterns of lexical strategy usage observed in the spoken French of 41 advanced¹ French immersion students in Ontario, Canada whose speech was captured in the context of informal, semi-directed interviews with a native speaker of French. The interest in examining the speech of French immersion students, as opposed to students from the regular French as a second language program (FSL), stems from the idea that as advanced learners of French, the French immersion students are expected to have a full range of communication strategies in the TL at their disposal. However, despite the belief that mastery of communication strategies constitutes an important dimension of proficiency in a language (Canale and Swain 1980; Canale 1983; Savignon 1983), we do not know very much about how adolescent French immersion students use their language strategically since the extent of their repertoire of communication strategies remains largely unexplored.

Part of the rationale for the present study is thus based on the need to explore issues that have not been treated in previous research or that are still in need of further examination. There are a number of criticisms of prior work in the field of

¹ The term 'advanced' is based on students' grade and not tied to the ACTFL definition.
communication strategy research. Listed below are those criticisms, which the present study aims to overcome.

- *Lack of research on the strategic competence of adolescent advanced L2 speakers:*

Several studies have focused on the communication strategies of L2 adult learners and a few studies have focused on young L1 learners. Little research, however, has been undertaken on adolescent L2 speakers, particularly those who are at an advanced stage in their education (Dean 1996), who have more experience with the TL, and may be in a position to demonstrate a unique range of communication strategies. The French immersion corpus under study here is based on the speech of 41 high school students (grades 9 and 12) who, at this stage, are considered advanced L2 learners of French and can be assumed to have developed an ability to use a wide variety of tactics to overcome lexical difficulties in the course of informal conversation in the TL;

- *Lack of usage-based data:*

Most data have come from methods of direct elicitation, rather than from naturalistic or quasi-naturalistic communication settings (Williams et al. 1997:305-306) and hence there is a lack of information on how students and their interlocutors react to each other during problematic moments in the discourse when use of a communication strategy may be imminent. In the present research the communicative situation under study is a semi-directed interview where the students respond to open-ended questions and are free to interact with the interviewer and vice-versa;
• **Lack of quantitative analysis of spoken learner data:**

Quantitative and statistical analyses are generally absent in previous communication research and therefore studies have been unable "to address such issues as the relative frequency of specific strategies, the relations of those strategies to selection factors... or the effect of those strategies on communication" (Bialystok 1990:76). In other words, most studies of communication strategies report little formal analysis of the results. Usually, a typological system is proposed and illustrated by means of utterances obtained in some corpus, but only rarely is a quantitative analysis applied to the corpus. Although many efforts have been made to quantify erroneous speech patterns in French immersion students' French, there is a need for studies attempting a systematic classification or typology of communication strategy usage for this group, particularly in an interactional approach that values the contributions of both learner and native TL speaker in working to overcome lexical difficulties. The present study provides quantitative results regarding the range and type of communication strategies observed in the students' speech and a General Linear Model analysis is performed to reveal what correlations, if any, exist between strategy usage and a variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

• **Lack of data on the effect of extralinguistic factors on the use of communication strategy usage**

Previous studies on communication strategies in French immersion have focused primarily on the effect of L2 proficiency on communication strategy usage by comparing students across ages/grades and by comparing groups of effective and less effective learners. Additional parameters to be examined in the present study include the effect of extracurricular exposure to the French language (e.g. length of time spent in a
Francophone environment or length of stay with a Francophone family and amount of exposure to French media, etc.) on students' use of communication strategies and the influence of a third language on strategy usage. To my knowledge, this is the first communication strategy study of its kind to evaluate the effect of these factors on students' strategy usage.

Several research questions are posed. First, what types of communication strategies do immersion students tend to rely on when they encounter difficulties in lexical referencing in the TL? How does the interviewer respond to students' strategic usage and what role does the interviewer play in helping students to convey a particular message? Since the students may assume that the interviewer is a bilingual French/English speaker based on the idea that many of the native French speakers they encounter in Canada are (including their teachers), how do they use the interviewer's level of bilinguality to their advantage? What is the extent of variability in how individual French immersion students use lexical communication strategies and where is this variability observed? Finally, how are the differences in communication strategy usage constrained by linguistic and extralinguistic factors, such as level of L2 proficiency, influence of L1, and the nature of the communicative situation?

The dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents a review of the pertinent literature. It begins by providing the reader with some historical background of French immersion programs in Canada, followed by a review of the major trends in both French immersion research and communication strategy research and, finally, it focuses on studies on communication strategies in French immersion. Chapter 3 orients the reader to (i) the procedures followed in data collection; (ii) definitions of key concepts;
(iii) the communication strategy typology used in the study; (iv) a description of the French immersion corpus; (v) the hypotheses investigated in the study; and (vi) potential limitations foreseen in the study. Chapter 4 consists of a presentation and analysis of the findings regarding general patterns of communication strategy observed in the French immersion students' speech. Hypotheses regarding frequency and range of communication strategies in the students' speech are addressed. In Chapter 5 the results of a statistical analysis are presented and hypotheses regarding the effect of linguistic and extralinguistic factors on students' strategy usage are addressed. The question of individual speaker variation is also addressed, as individual profiles are presented and overall comparisons are made. An overall summary of the study, recommendations for potential future research, and concluding remarks are offered in Chapter 6.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The following chapter is extensive given the need to review literature from two equally widespread research domains; on the one hand, French immersion research and on the other, communication strategy research. The chapter is divided into three parts. Initially, the domains will be treated separately, in order to cover the general trends in each, and then together, in a review of relevant studies performed specifically on communication strategies in French immersion.

Part A. French immersion

1. Historical background: French immersion programs in Canada

The aim of this first section, based primarily on Mougeon (2000), is to situate French immersion within Canadian history with a brief explanation of some of the political motivations that saw the programs come to fruition.

The induction of French immersion programs in Canada in the 1960s brought a unique second language learning experience for Anglophone students, where "French is not only taught as a subject, but is also used as the medium of instruction" (Heller 1994:85). During this era, the Quebec nationalist movement had gained power. This prompted recognition by some minority Anglophones in Quebec of the importance of strengthening ties with the francophone majority, of bridging the cultural and linguistic gap between English and French-speaking communities and, ultimately, of fostering a deeper understanding and empathy between the two groups. The first experimental
program in French immersion began in a kindergarten class in St. Lambert, Quebec (a Montreal suburb) and was launched by a team of psychologists from McGill University who were largely motivated by the same concern; in order to facilitate closer relations between English and French-speaking Quebeckers, there had to be a significant improvement in Anglophones' ability to communicate in French.

In the late 60s and early 70s, the federal government, under the control of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, took several legislative measures, such as passing the Official Languages Act, in response to demands made by the Quebec National party. Such measures worked to expand federally funded and subsidized services offered in French and also led to an expansion of such services within the private sector. Consequently, the Canadian job market experienced an increase in the number of bilingual positions available in both public and private sectors, which ultimately served to validate what some Anglophones viewed as "a new value of French" (Heller 1994:5).

Anglophone parents were concerned that their children would lack the bilingual edge necessary to compete in the job market if they did not possess the linguistic ability to interact with Francophones in Quebec society. Thus, a lot of the parents' initial interest in French immersion stemmed primarily from a desire to improve their children's chances at attaining bilingualism and not necessarily in assimilating into the Quebeois population. Hence, the existence of French immersion programs as separate programs within English-language schools (Heller 1994:87). In other words, parents were not willing to let their children learn French if it was at the expense of their English-language and other academic skills; French had to be supplementary to the skills and subjects to which they were already committed to learning (ibid.).
Meanwhile, the federal government allocated funds to help improve programs in French language instruction, most notably at the elementary school level, to ensure that a greater number of Canadians would develop a good command of French during their childhood years. French immersion programs clearly benefited from this funding; by the end of the 70s their popularity was felt across Canada and French immersion programs, now considered the ideal way to produce bilingual speakers, were accessible in every province.

The initial success of French immersion is largely attributable to the public's assessment of Lambert and Tucker's experimental research in St. Lambert, Quebec. In 1972, seven years after the study began, these psychologists concluded that the subjects experienced no cognitive or developmental set backs in L1 and performed equally well in English as compared to their regular academic program classmates. The added bonus was that the French immersion students gained a functional ability in French that was unequivocally better than the results that could be attained in a traditional French as a second language class. The researchers cautioned that becoming productively bilingual would be a challenge because students lived in an English-dominant milieu. On the other hand, they also maintained that with the firm foundation for bilingualism that French immersion established, the students could effectively "become indistinguishable from native speakers of French in their oral production" (Lambert and Tucker 1972:152). This reassurance was all the parents seemed to need and in addition to requesting French immersion for their children, they continued the initial parent group's tradition of researching and analyzing the effects of the program on their children. Through the years
this has resulted in vast amounts of research and statistical data on French immersion and substantial government grants for programs and research.

Initially, the immersion research focused mainly on the issues of detrimental setbacks on the students' L1, possible negative effects on core-curriculum learning, and attitudinal issues. When it was put forth that students involved were not experiencing any cognitive or developmental difficulties by learning their curriculum in an L2, the positive feedback was considered highly significant. First, this is because it gave parents the reassurance that they were hoping for; i.e., that students could fulfill a second language requirement in an academic setting. Secondly, it affirmed that the system worked and thus served an important function for school administrators and the government as a means to justify the increased budget costs of the programs and the financial strain on school boards. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it perpetuated the federal government's desires to promote bilingualism in Canada.

Since the early experimental days of French immersion, "enrollment has increased every year" (Heller 1994:86). Between 1977 and 1989, the number of Anglophones in immersion programs in Quebec remained steady at between 17,000 and 19,000 students or 8%-9% of student population of English-language schools, but between 1989 and 1999 the total surpassed more than 28,000 Heller (1994:fn23).

2. French Immersion Research in Canada

Following years of research conducted on the academic performance of French immersion students, studies (cf. Lambert and Tucker 1972; Lapkin 1984; Pawley 1985;
Pellerin and Hammerly 1986; Lyster 1987; Swain and Lapkin 1989) appear to converge on the following points:

- In subjects other than French, French immersion students perform equally well as students enrolled in the regular academic program;

- In French, the performance of French immersion students is clearly superior to those who learn French in regular French as a second language classes;

- French immersion students have a good mastery of the spoken language and will participate spontaneously in conversation, but their speech is decidedly non-native and contains a not insignificant amount of more or less fossilized errors.

These last two distinctions have especially intrigued researchers and teachers alike. It has notably been suggested that because French immersion students use French almost exclusively for academic purposes and lack interaction with native French-speaking peers, there may be insufficient opportunity and a lack of social motivation for them to achieve native-like mastery of the registers of French (cf. Harley and King 1989; Swain and Lapkin 1989; Tarone and Swain 1995; Rehner and Mougeon 1999; Mougeon and Rehner 2001). To the more skeptical, this simply means that French immersion has failed to meet the expectations of producing speakers with marketable skills in French (cf. Hammerly and Pelletier 1986; Hammerly 1989).

Several researchers have claimed that French immersion students', often, flawed use of the target language is the result of a fossilized interlanguage (cf. Hammerly and Pelletier 1986; Lyster 1987). It has been suggested that this is because French immersion students are forced to speak French before they have acquired all of the structure of the language and have an impoverished environment in which to learn, given that they have only one native speaker to model their French upon (i.e., the teacher) and classmates who
speak in the same "pidgin" (cf. Hammerly and Pelletier 1986). In keeping with the French immersion program's emphasis on content rather than form, once students are able to communicate ideas, and the teacher fails to correct students' grammar, their interlanguage fossilizes. Lyster's (1987) observations as an immersion teacher have led him to conclude that French immersion student's interlanguage is affected by both crosslingual negative transfer from English as well as intralingual errors caused by an imperfect mastery of French structure early on in their education. In one paper Lyster (1987) suggests that prevention of this early fossilization lies within gearing classroom material specifically towards French immersion learners, rather than continuing to base curriculum upon material for native French speakers, and emphasizing more constructive correction by teachers. At the same time, Lyster (1987:717) cautions that while native-like fluency is neither a reasonable nor realistic goal for French immersion students, they "should, however, be expected to communicate with some degree of accuracy".

Several studies have been performed, primarily on oral and written test data, to assess the extent to which immersion students' French differs systematically from that of native French speakers. For example, Harley and Swain's seminal study of the verb system used by young learners of French suggests that immersion students operate with the most generalized target verb system, one that is much "simpler and less redundant" than that of native speakers (Harley and Swain 1978:75). The French immersion students in their sample appeared to avoid constructions where the syntax of the French verb is more structurally complex than in English and tended to opt instead for simpler patterns that more closely approximated English syntax. For instance, in a case where one can choose either a pronominal or non-pronominal expression, the immersion students tended
to choose the non-pronominal expression (ex. *j'ai brisé la jambe*, instead of *je me suis cassé la jambe* for 'I broke my leg') (Harley and Swain 1978:65). If no other means of expression except a pronominal verb was possible in the context, the immersion students tended to simplify the verbs by omitting the pronoun (ex. *je ne souviens pas*, instead of *je ne me souviens pas* for 'I don't remember') (ibid.). The researchers (1978:75) interpreted the systematic differences between the immersion speech and native French speech as being "clearly connected with the language acquisition setting", concluding that once the students have reached a level in their language development where they can be comprehended by their teachers and peers, "there is no strong social incentive" to achieve more native-like fluency and many of their forms tend to become fossilized (Harley and Swain 1978:76).

In light of such studies, there has been considerable work dedicated to determining what pedagogical objectives and principles should be followed in order for French immersion students to develop communicative competence in the target language. Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983), and Savignon (1983) have all expressed the importance for students to develop four elements in the target language: grammatical competence (i.e., mastery of the language code), sociolinguistic competence (i.e., knowledge of language appropriateness for various contextual situations), discourse competence (i.e., the ability to use language to achieve cohesiveness and coherence), and strategic competence (i.e., the ability to use communication strategies when one perceives difficulty in communication). The present project is wholly concerned with the last element, however, as Savignon has expressed (1983:129), it must be underscored that:
Each of the components of communicative competence is extremely important as a goal in the foreign-language classroom - a student who has failed to develop competence in any one of these components cannot truly be said to be proficient in the foreign language.

Prior to exploring some precursory studies dedicated specifically to French immersion students' use of communication strategies (cf. Part C of this chapter), the second part of this chapter will discuss what strategic language behavior entails and what it means for SLA research.

**Part B. Communication Strategies**

3. Defining communication strategies

The definition for "communication strategy" is critical since it is strongly linked to the theoretical perspective adopted by the analyst and identification and subsequent classification are dependent upon it (Kasper and Kellerman 1997:1). There are two opposing definitions for the concept of communication strategy represented in the literature. The first definition is imposed by an intraindividual and psycholinguistic viewpoint. Communication strategies are seen as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Færch and Kasper 1983c:36). The definition relates specifically to the learner and the difficulties s/he experiences in speech planning, production and reception, and the form of self-help that s/he uses to resolve the issue. There is no claim about the role of the interlocutor or about the cooperative nature of communication strategies:

strategies may be cooperative, i.e., the learner may try to solve his [sic] communicative problem by appealing for assistance from his [sic] interlocutor, but this is not a necessary condition: the learner may also decide to find a solution himself [sic], without the cooperative assistance of the interlocutor (Færch and Kasper 1983d:212).
In contrast, the second definition locates communication strategy within an interindividual and interactional perspective and characterizes the concept of communication strategy as

a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared...attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the second language learner, and the linguistic knowledge of the target language interlocutor in real communication situations (Tarone 1983:65).

The basis for the interactional definition is that the discrepancy between the linguistic codes (in a wide sense) of the learner and native TL speaker necessitates a negotiation of meaning of the message as it was intended by one participant and perceived by another; both participants are aware of a communicative problem, thus they proceed to solve it on a cooperative basis (Færch and Kasper 1983d:212). The interlocutor occupies an important place based on the assumption that "the nature and role of the addressee may have a powerful influence on the speaker's performance" (Yule and Tarone 1997:26), including strategy usage. For example, in an interactional setting, the speaker has the option of relying on appeal for assistance strategies, whereas in contexts involving one participant alone, the option is obviously not available.

4. Identifying communication strategies

Both the psycholinguistic and interactional definitions are, in a sense, extreme and both have an impact on the procedures by which a communication strategy is identified in the data. One criticism of the interactional definition is that it implies that both the communicative problem and its resolution must surface in the discourse to enable the analyst to identify instances of communication strategy usage directly in the performance
data (ibid.). In this view, communication strategies are "available to the analyst only to the extent that they have been produced and reacted upon by the parties in the talk" (Wagner and Firth 1997:326). Data sources come from authentic contexts for language usage included recordings of semi-structured interviews (cf. Haastrup and Phillipson 1983:141; Raupach 1983:200); playground interaction (cf. Rampton 1997:289); work-related telephone calls (cf. Wagner and Firth 1997:309); and chemistry lab session (cf. Williams et al. 1997:309).

The main criticism of the psycholinguistic definition is that if the implementation of a communication strategy does not require the interlocutor's support for resolution, then the analyst must rely on the inference of strategic language use activity, rather than direct observation of it (Kasper and Kellerman 1997:3). Færch and Kasper's (1983d:224) response to this is that, while

no performance feature can itself be taken as unambiguous evidence for strategic planning - what indicates a communicative problem is the increased frequency and co-occurrence of performance features, making it likely that the subsequent utterance is the result of a communication strategy.

Thus, psycholinguistic researchers place significant weight on the role of hesitation phenomena in the data observed in the context of a troublesome point in the discourse, including: unfilled (silent) pauses, filled pauses\(^2\), syllable lengthening, false starts, change in intonation, repetitions, metalinguistic comments of the 'I don't know how to say X' type, and self-correction. Instances of self-correction reveal to the analyst that the speaker has encountered difficulty in executing the strategy or that s/he is unsatisfied
with how the intended message has been communicated. They are frequently preceded by filled pauses, which may reflect planning, while lexicalized filled pauses, such as *I mean*, which are connected with self-corrections, also serve the interactional purpose of "communicating to the interlocutor that what follows or what precedes is to be interpreted as a repair on previously communicated information and not as additional information (Færch and Kasper 1983d:216)". Finally, apart from markers within the performance data itself, a secondary source of evidence that psycholinguistic researchers rely on in their identification of communication strategies is the use of retrospective procedures or self-reporting. This involves "play-back of the original discourse and self-identification of strategic activity by the informant" (Kasper and Kellerman 1997:4). Self-reporting has been subjected to much of the same criticism as intuition-based linguistic analysis; namely, it is not empirical data and is misleading since, in most cases, there is a dichotomy between one's intuitions about language use and how language is actually used.

5. Reconciling the approaches

5.1 Hesitation phenomena as communication strategy cues

The analysis of hesitation phenomena in the identification of communication strategies tends to be associated with a psycholinguistic approach, since they are often connected with problems in discourse planning and the researchers are obviously interested in the cognitive processes underlying speech. In contrast, both approaches are compatible with

---

2 Færch and Kasper (1983d:215) distinguish between different kinds of filled pauses, (i) those which involve some non-lexicalized vocalizations, i.e. *ahm, ahh, euh*, (ii) "gambits like turn-internally used starters" (e.g. "well") or (iii) "cajolers" (e.g. "I mean", "you know").
the analysis of metalinguistic comments made by the speaker (or interlocutor, in the case of an interactional approach), however this kind of data is strongly associated with the interactional approach since the participants' public reactions to a particular problematic usage in the data are precisely what allows the usage to be considered a communication strategy. This idea is depicted in Figure 2-1, where the check marked area represents a communication strategy in a strictly interactive approach. Identification of a communication strategy can be made if the following elements are present: the communication difficulty is made public in the discourse by the speaker, the interlocutor interprets this as a signal for help, the interlocutor reacts cooperatively by helping the speaker to communicate the intended message (Færch and Kasper 1983d:216).

**Figure 2-1. Use of hesitation phenomena to identify communication strategies in a classic interactional approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical problem: marked by hesitation phenomena</th>
<th>marked by discussion in the discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutor's interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- appeal for assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ appeal for assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Færch and Kasper 1983d:234)

Although the subset bound by a strict interactional approach is considered highly significant and worthy of investigation in its own right, it is maintained in the present study that the non-hatched areas in Figure 2-1 represent equally important aspects of communication strategy usage and should not be ignored. This attempt at crossing
disciplinary boundaries due to interest in linguistic resources on the one hand, but seeing a place for cognitive processing on the other, is somewhat contentious, but the possibility of spanning the cognitive-social divide and reconciling psycholinguistic/individualistic perspectives on communication strategies with interactional/social perspectives has been raised before, both inside and outside the domain of communication strategy research (Wagner and Firth 1997:324) and more contributions of this kind are emerging in the literature (Kasper and Kellerman 1997:11). While it may be impossible to invoke a definition that completely settles the issues raised about both approaches, it may, nonetheless, be possible to reduce the degree of incompatibility with the idea that "individual-oriented studies...may well be accountable and sensitive to the social as well as individual facets of the interaction" (Wagner and Firth 1997:324,fn2) and vice versa.

5.2 Implications of the interactional-individualistic divide for the present study

At the outset, the present study appears to be in line with an interactional approach, given the nature of the data, where the presence of the interlocutor in the semi-directed interview unavoidably exerts some influence on students' performance, given that she is partially steering the discourse by the questions she asks. In fact, the presence of the native TL speaker in the face-to-face interview situation under study is a crucial element of the data as it sets up several options for students that affect the role of the interlocutor to different degrees in the context of a communication difficulty. This is not to say that cooperation between the student and interviewer in the form of a negotiation of meaning is a condition for a communication strategy, but that this is precisely one option through which students can enlist the interviewer for linguistic help, but, alternatively, can also exercise the option of overcoming a communicative problem independently. This latter
point is based on findings to be described in Chapter 5, which suggest that often during moments in the discourse the learner appears not to be soliciting anything from the interlocutor other than approval that his/her strategy has been understood, and therefore is not looking for a reaction from the interlocutor in the form of aid. If the strategy has been accepted, then students may decide against asking the interviewer for the correct TL usage because it will unnecessarily slow down the momentum of the discourse. In such cases, i.e., where no explicit interaction about to a particular usage is observed, then the presence of increased hesitation phenomena, such as a rise in intonation or multiple pauses, is interpreted as suggestive of a communicative difficulty and that a communication strategy is imminent.

To summarize then, interactional research does not have to neglect studying individualistic features of language in favor of social features, but both facets can be represented in the way that strategies are defined and identified in interactional data. Communication strategies are speakers' attempts to overcome a communication difficulty. The difficulty will be marked by hesitation phenomena (pauses, etc.) and/or other more explicit signals (e.g. metalinguistic commentary) that are identifiable to both the interlocutor and the analyst and speakers will generally have recourse to a communication strategy. The communication strategy itself may be followed by clarification or repair that is established by the speaker, independently, or, alternatively, through shared efforts with the interlocutor to work towards a mutual understanding.
6. Separating Communication Strategies from Other Features in L2 Usage

One approach to trying to understand communication strategies is to fully detach them from other features of L2 usage; in other words, make explicit what they are not.

6.1 Error analysis versus communication strategy analysis

The concept of communication strategies was first evoked by Selinker (1972) to account for certain classes of errors made by learners of a second language. These errors were regarded as a by-product of a learner's attempts to express his/her meaning in spontaneous speech with an inadequate understanding of the TL (Corder 1983; Paribahkt 1981).

The approach to communication strategy research pursued by Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1983) is entrenched in the tradition of error analysis, whereby the analyst attempts to account for erroneous features of the L2 by explaining them as the product of various processes such as transfer (i.e., applying L1 rules in the TL) and overgeneralization (i.e., applying incorrect L2 rules in the TL). It is notable that communication strategies in this case are not viewed by these authors as a specific way of communicating in an interlanguage (IL), as is the case with subsequent definitions. Moreover, communication strategies are related to the analyst's point of view, not the learner's: it is of no consequence whether a specific item produced by a learner is in agreement with the learner's IL system or not, as long as it is erroneous as compared to the target norm; in this case the item would be characterized as the product of a communication strategy (Færch and Kasper 1983b:1).

Corder's (1983) research represents a distinctly different way of defining communication strategies. These are established in order to account for performance
data, not when these, in the analyst's opinion, are erroneous, but whenever they have been produced by learners, irrespective of whether or not they are in accordance with a TL norm. Thus the point of view that Corder (1983) adopts is one of the learner, "and the phenomena accounted for by means of communication strategies are, in principle, the totality of the learner's performance" (Færch and Kasper 1983b:1).

Still, occasionally, communication strategies are equated with errors, as understood by Richards' (1973) statement: "under communication strategies we may include errors which derive from the fact that heavy communication demands may be made on the second language..." (cited in Raupach 1983: 199). Moreover, certain classifications, such as those presented in Faerch and Kasper (1983c), "suggest that L2 communication strategies lead primarily to non native-like performance" (ibid.). For this reason, as Corder (1983:16) has pointed out, it is often difficult to unequivocally identify a given feature of an utterance "as the result of one or the other strategy, i.e., the result of the learner's IL or an ad hoc result of some communication strategy". Corder (ibid) alludes to cases in which features of an utterance resemble features of the speaker's L1; they may be regular characteristics of his/her language at the time of study, in which case they could be interpreted as resulting from the IL grammar and are therefore the product of a strategy for which the L1 is used as a heuristic technique, i.e., interference produced by transfer. On the other hand, a learner may simply 'borrow' for immediate purposes items or features from L1, but this does not necessarily mean that the item gets incorporated into the IL (Corder 1983:16).

The relationship between communication strategies and errors reflects a fundamental problem that the analyst must face: a clear distinction must be made
between the two in order to operationalize the concept of communication strategy so that communication strategies are not equated with errors. As alluded to in previous sections, there must be evidence that the speaker is conscious of the usage. This may come in the form of recurring hesitation phenomena and/or metalinguistic commentary in the context of a communication problem.

7. Classifying communication strategies

There are various approaches to classifying communication strategies according to how a speaker attempts to use his/her linguistic ability to express an intended meaning. All of the approaches agree that the basis for such classification should be the extent to which a message conveyed, or a portion of it, is modified, omitted, or avoided by the speaker. As will be illustrated below, however, there is little consensus as to exactly how this classification should be applied. In some cases similar terminology is used among the approaches, however, often times the assigned meanings are quite different. The essential distinctions made by each of the mainstream approaches are outlined below.

7.1 Message adjustment strategies versus resource expansion strategies

Corder (1981:105) suggests that learners may rely on two types of macrostrategies. The first are message adjustment strategies or "risk-avoidance strategies", used to tailor a message to fit the learner's linguistic capabilities (Corder 1981:104-105). The second type is resource expansion strategies or "success oriented though risk-running strategies" (ibid.), used to increase, expand, or modify a learner's interlanguage system so that it can handle the intended message. The degree to which the intended message becomes compromised when using message adjustment strategies is determined on a scale of most globalized, on one extreme, and most localized, on the other. Topic avoidance, "a refusal
to enter into or continue a discourse within some field or topic because of a feeling of total linguistic inadequacy" (Corder 1981:105) is the most extreme form of adjustment strategy. Message abandonment or "trying but giving up" (ibid.) and semantic avoidance, i.e., "saying something slightly different than what you intended but still broadly relevant to the topic of discourse" (ibid.) are less extreme forms. The most localized and least extreme form of adjustment strategy is message reduction, which is often characterized as "vague general talk" or where one says less than one intended to or less precisely than was intended (ibid.).

In contrast to message reduction strategies, resource expansion strategies are the most risky types of strategies to use because of the potential for "misunderstanding or communication breakdown" (Corder 1981:105). In Corder's opinion (ibid.), attempting to use invented words and code switching is seen as very chancy, while paraphrasing or circumlocution, i.e., trying to circumvent the problem using the limited linguistic resources available, are considered the least risky strategies.

7.2 Reduction strategies versus achievement strategies

Færch and Kasper's (1983c) classification of communication strategies is reminiscent of Corder's (1981). Learners have two choices: they can circumvent communication problems and thereby avoid difficulties, or confront communication problems and develop alternative plans. The choice depends on overall learner behavior and personality and whether s/he is avoidance-oriented (in which case the first choice, use of a reduction strategy, would be favored) or whether s/he is achievement oriented (in which case the second choice, an achievement strategy, would be preferred). Færch and Kasper's (1983c) primary focus is on the latter strategy type and in particular, the ways in
which learners develop these strategies in the planning phase to compensate for a lack of linguistic knowledge that is preventing them from reaching a specific communicative goal (Bialystok 1990:32). We examine this typology further in section 8.3.3.

7.3 Adjusted meaning versus adjusted form

Váradi (1983) first attempts to distinguish between meaning (of the message) and form (of the expression), after which he distinguishes between reduction strategies and replacement strategies. According to the author (1983:83), if a speaker cannot formulate his/her message in the most ideal way, i.e., in order to convey the exact intended meaning, then s/he "often adjusts his [sic] meaning so as to bring it within the sphere of his encoding capabilities". The speaker accomplishes this in one of two ways: by saying less than what was intended and, as a consequence, losing part of the originally intended meaning or by replacing the entire message or parts of it with elements that s/he is capable of expressing. The former method by which to derivate adjusted meaning is the equivalent of Corder's (1981; 1983) strategy of message reduction, while the latter corresponds to Corder's (1981; 1983) strategies of topic avoidance, message abandonment, and semantic avoidance (Bialystok 1990:32).

Váradi (1983) assigns the term formal reduction strategy to instances where the learner must operate from a reduced system since certain formal properties, i.e., words, phrases, and structures, are absent from the interlanguage system. Formal replacement strategy is used to refer to cases in which the learner replaces those forms that are typically used in the target language with alternative forms of expression (ex. using synonyms, lengthy descriptions, etc.) as a means to achieve his/her communication goal. These substitutions do not affect the originally intended meaning. If neither reduction
nor replacement is a strategy option for the learner, s/he may give up entirely on expressing that meaning.

7.4 Compensatory strategies: Conceptual and code

Researchers interested primarily in how learners "compensate for the absence of a particular lexical item in the L2" (Kellerman and Bialystok 1997:34) have proposed that all learner utterances can be separated into one of two strategy types: conceptual strategies or code strategies. As Kellerman and Bialystok (1990:34) explain,

*Conceptual strategies* manipulate the individual's knowledge of properties of the concept itself, including part-whole relationships, attributes and functions.... *Code strategies* manipulate the user's knowledge of word form by the construction of *ad hoc* labels for referents via languages other than the L2, or via derivational rules within the L2.

Proponents have suggested that the division is "rooted in the distinction between the two types of knowledge representation (meaning and form) in long-term memory [and] each of these types of knowledge is the basis for one of the strategies" (Kellerman and Bialystok 1990:35).

8. Describing Communication Strategies

The presentation below surveys researchers' attempts to systematically organize communication strategies using typologies based on various empirical findings.

8.1 Typology as a descriptive classification tool

Part of the advantage of using a typological classification is the fact that regardless of the complexity of a system, a typology is flexible enough to be able to expand its grid to include as many categories and levels of categories as necessary in order to organize the items at hand.
While the aim of using a typological system is to be as objective as possible, it is also understood that the overall structure of the typology exists mainly at the discretion of the researcher. The implication of this subjectivity for organizing communication strategies is that "the strategies could change their assigned position if another feature were selected....[and a] different organizing principle could conceivably restructure the groupings" (Bialystok 1990:38). In spite of this, it remains more or less agreed upon that typologies may still serve as

a productive first approach to investigating a new domain [whose emergent structures will enable a researcher] to pursue more rigorous theoretical and empirical examination of that domain (ibid.).

Most, if not all of the studies performed on communication strategies have worked with such an organizational tool.

8.2 Approaches to proposing communication strategy typologies

The same opposing views that were evident in the definitions provided for the concept of communication strategies and in the distinctions made between strategy types are manifested in the approaches to proposing communication strategy typologies. The interactional "[exhibits] a preference for investigating variability in linguistic performance" (Yule and Tarone 1997:18), while the psycholinguistic researcher researcher "[emphasizes] the generalizability and psychological plausibility of their categories" (ibid.).

The most apparent way in which the approaches differ is in terms of the number of categories each considers necessary. Group A recognizes both achievement strategies (also known as compensatory strategies) and reduction strategies as part of a typical communication strategy typology. In contrast, group B focuses solely on compensatory
strategies. The fundamental principles that underlie these two perspectives are clearly divided. Group A's primary focus is "the external and interactive", given its explicit interest in describing the language output of L2 learners and "implicit inferences being made about the differences in the psychological processing that produced them" (Yule and Tarone 1997:19). In contrast, group B's focus is on the "internal and cognitive", its concern being with the psychological processing that L2 learners use to accomplish language tasks (ibid.).

8.3 Communication strategy typologies

Despite researchers' differences in their theoretical and methodological approaches to developing communication strategy typologies, they have more or less reached an agreement as far as what second language learners actually do in order to communicate (Bialystok 1990:56-57). The following will outline some of the similarities and differences between the major communication strategy typologies used by researchers in the field.

8.3.1 Tarone (1977)

Tarone's typology was the first of its kind to systematically organize communication strategies and became the basis for much of the work that would follow. The source of her model came from empirical observations of a group of 9 intermediate second language English learners with three different L1 backgrounds. The elicitation method involved showing students three different drawings: two simple drawings and one complex drawing, and then recording students' descriptions of all three in both their native language and in English. The data were comprised of students' attempts to name the seven objects in the pictures designated as target items and Tarone (1977) used this
information to compare the students' different strategic approaches in referential communication. This methodological approach or modifications of it was adopted in studies subsequently performed in this area (Bialystok 1990:39; cf. Bialystok 1990:59-60; Russell 1997:72 for examples). Even though Tarone's (1977) early study was small, it was adequate enough to reveal most of the communication strategies that would be discussed in future studies (ibid.).

Tarone's (1977) typology comprises five major strategies, each suggestive of a different decision a learner makes for resolving a communication difficulty. They are outlined below:

- **Avoidance**: Characterized as a speaker's deliberate decision to remain silent, when they would otherwise participate in a conversation, because some lexical or grammatical aspect of the target language is not known.
  - topic avoidance: the speaker manages to avoid specific topics or words that are likely to present difficulties\(^3\).
  - message abandonment: a topic arises that is too difficult for the speaker to handle and s/he gives up and moves on to another.

For a speaker, avoidance "is one way to assure that communication continues" (Bialystok 1990:40). For the researcher, however, avoidance is a tricky strategy to detect (ibid.) and it is "sometimes a value judgement to claim that a learner has avoided a topic as opposed to simply chosen not to discuss it" (ibid.). Message abandonment is also difficult to pinpoint as it could very well "indicate a change of intention and not a fear of linguistic challenge" (ibid.).
• **Paraphrase**: Defined as "the rewording of the message in an alternate, acceptable target language construction, in situations where the appropriate form or construction is not known or not yet stable" (Tarone 1977:198).

  • approximation: the speaker knowingly substitutes a TL vocabulary item or structure for a more accurate term (e.g. dog for poodle or sink for faucet).
  
  • word coinage: "the learner makes up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept" (ibid.), for example the creation of airball to mean 'balloon' (cf. Váradi [1973], cited in Bialystok [1990:41; 42] and Yule and Tarone [1997:17]) or heurot to mean 'clock' in French (Bialystok and Frohlich 1980) created from French heure meaning 'hour'.
  
  • circumlocution\(^4\): "a [wordy] extended process in which the learner describes the characteristics or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate target language structure" (Tarone 1977:198).

Circumlocution, thus, is the strategy realized in cases where the speaker fumbles for descriptive features that may help the interlocutor guess at the intended meaning and then, possibly, supply him/her with the appropriate target language term (Bialystok

---

3 When a participant in Tarone's (1977) study omitted a salient, but lexically difficult object from his/her description of the picture (such as mushroom), it was interpreted as evidence of a topic avoidance strategy.

4 Bialystok (1990:41) points out that Tarone's use of paraphrase as the major strategy and circumlocution as the subtype is not typically found in other typologies, where paraphrase and circumlocution share more equivalent status.
1990:41). In their study of young Anglophone learners of French Bialystok and Frohlich (1980) cite several examples of circumlocutions provided for tabouret 'stool', such as une petite chaise de bois ('a little wooden chair') and elle n'a pas de dos ('it doesn't have a back').

- **Conscious Transfer**
  
  - literal translation of words or phrases, e.g. "he invites him to drink" for "they toast each other" (Tarone 1984:131)
  - language switch: the use of items (words or phrases) from another language, e.g. "I would like to use your ordinateur" for "I would like to use your computer" (ibid.)

- **Appeal for Assistance**: the speaker consults a source of authority: the interlocutor, a native speaker, the researcher, a dictionary, etc.

- **Mime**: includes all nonlinguistic forms of communication that are used in place of an unknown target language word, such as clapping hands to indicate applause, the gesturing towards an object, and the use of onomatopoeic language.

**8.3.2 Modifications on Tarone's typology: Bialystok and Frohlich (1980)**

Bialystok and Frohlich's (1980) typology identifies the same strategies as Tarone's; however, it organizes them differently. In this case the researchers are concerned with identifying the source of information from which the learner has drawn to solve the communication problem. The structure of the typology is organized around three categories: L1-based strategies; L2-based strategies; and paralinguistic strategies. The

---

5 In earlier work Tarone (1981) refers to conscious transfer as "borrowing".
L1-based strategies include transliteration and language switch, both of which correspond directly to Tarone's two subcategories of conscious transfer, as well as an additional form referred to as "foreignizing" (i.e., the learner alters a term in L1 phonologically or morphologically to create a possible L2 term; for example, pronouncing English 'pressure' with a French accent, instead of using the correct French term *pression*). The L2-based strategies include semantic contiguity (corresponds to Tarone's approximation); description (whose subcategories correspond to Tarone's circumlocution) and word coinage (much as described by Tarone).

8.3.3 *Færch and Kasper (1983c)*

This typology, touched on earlier in section 7.2, organizes communication strategies in terms of whether a learner chooses a reduction strategy in an attempt to avoid a communication difficulty or alternatively, chooses an achievement strategy in an attempt to achieve a solution to the problem. The outcome is different depending on which strategy the learner selects (Bialystok 1990:43). If motivated by avoidance, hence the selection of a reduction strategy, then the learner will change or alter the originally intended communicative goal (ibid.). If motivated by achievement, hence the selection of an achievement strategy, then the learner will maintain the originally intended communicative goal, but makes changes to the plans that lead to the realization of that goal (ibid.). In this way, "the two categories of strategies operate by altering different aspect of the language production process (at least as that process is described by Færch and Kasper)" (ibid.).

The subcategories of strategies in Færch and Kasper's (1983c) typology are more convoluted than in the other typologies. Reduction strategies are viewed as points along
a continuum where "at the one end, the learner says "almost" what he [sic] wants to say about a given topic (= meaning replacement), at the other end he [sic] says nothing at all about this (= topic avoidance)" (Færch and Kasper 1983c:44). Nevertheless, these distinctions still correspond closely to Tarone's avoidance strategy (Bialystok 1990:43).

Achievement strategies are also subdivided into two subcategories: retrieval strategies and compensatory strategies. The retrieval strategies refer to a learner's attempts to retrieve the correct form from memory and include six types: waiting for the term to appear; appealing to formal similarity; retrieval via semantic fields; searching via other languages; retrieval from learning situations; and sensory procedures (Færch and Kasper 1983c:52). Such a list of strategies is unique to this typology and not normally included in others, perhaps because of redundancy. As Bialystok (1990:44) notes:

Most classification systems are based on the assumption that the learner has already attempted a thorough search of available knowledge in order to recall the required form and is truly experiencing a gap. We assume, that is, that learners prefer to use the optimal form, if only they can remember it!

The subcategories of compensatory strategies in this typology correspond directly with Tarone's five major strategies, with the exception of one additional strategy: inter-intralingual transfer. This strategy is defined as "[the result of] a generalization of properties of the corresponding L1 structures" (Færch and Kasper 1983c:47) and is applied "especially in situations in which the learner considers the L2 formally similar to his [sic] L1" (ibid.). Examples included here are cases where "learners of English might generalize the regular -ed suffix to irregular verbs...(e.g. swim - swirmed)" (ibid.). Note, however, that this final category is problematic. Without information about the learners' L1, however, it is difficult to know whether such an example illustrates an
overgeneralization reinforced by L1 verb conjugation or if it is simply and only the result of the learners' hypothesis that *swim*, like *trim* or *slim* or *skim*, is a regular verb. In other words, Færch and Kasper (1983c) fail to distinguish between overgeneralization processes that are reinforced by the learners' L1 and overgeneralization processes that are purely intralingual.

8.3.4 *Paribakht (1982; 1985)*

In this typology, there are four approaches that may be used deliberately to compensate for communicative problems: linguistic approach; contextual approach; conceptual approach; and mime. Each approach is presumed to be involved in the communication process and exploits a different kind of knowledge that is incorporated into the strategy (Bialystok 1990:45). For example, the linguistic approach relies on the knowledge of the semantic features of the term associated with the referent; the contextual approach relies on contextual knowledge surrounding the referent; the conceptual approach relies on the speaker's overall world knowledge; and mime relies on knowledge of conventional gestures (ibid.). The linguistic approach comprises most of the strategies from the other typologies, including circumlocution, word coinage, etc. In contrast, "the contextual and conceptual approaches are intended to account for information that the speaker provides about the intended concept and are object- and culture-specific" (ibid.). For example, an explanation of the term *fate* by Persian-speaking subjects as *'some say, it's written on your forehead'* is a transliteration of a Persian idiom and classified here as the contextual approach. The appeal of this classification is that it captures speakers' differences in background information and yet, does not necessarily suggest that there must also be an increase in the number of strategic choices available to speakers.
8.3.5. *The Nijmegen Project*

An alternative typology has been borne out of studies by a group of researchers in Nijmegen on the communication strategies used by Dutch learners of English (cf. Poulisse 1990). There are several major differences that distinguish the methodology of this research group from those described above, the first being that the organizing principle of the typology is based on describing the processes underlying the production of utterances and is used by researchers seeking evidence to support claims that "strategies reflect psychologically valid communication processes" (Bialystok 1990:115). A second important difference is that their research focus is restricted to referential communication, and specifically to "the lexical strategies invoked in communication that would be classified as compensatory strategies by Faerch and Kasper" (Bialystok 1990:110). Finally, the research focuses "overwhelmingly on individual production (versus achievement of comprehension and the mutual construction of discourse)" (Williams et al. 1997:306) and is based for a large part on the retrospective commentary of participants (Bialystok and Kellerman 1997:34).

The Nijmegen typology reduces the traditional five major strategies into two, conceptual and code. There are two approaches to conceptual strategies: holistic, in which a single item is used to substitute for one in the TL (similar to Tarone's approximation) and analytic, which refers to longer descriptions the learner produces in place of a TL term (corresponds to description and circumlocution strategies in other typologies) (Bialystok 1990:111). The code strategy comprises borrowing, foreignization, and transliteration, much the same as those defined by Tarone (1977).
Recent modifications to this typology have added two of the strategies from the traditional typologies that were not explicit in the original model: word coinage and mime (Kellerman and Bialystok 1997:36). Word coinages that are semantic in nature, such as those using compounding to convey essential features of the referent (e.g. cuiller en bois) (Bialystok 1990:114) have been treated examples of conceptual strategies (cf. Kellerman and Bialystok 1997:36). These are differentiated from instances of word coinages that are "direct linguistic manipulations, such as handicappe" (Bialystok 1990:114) which are included as examples of code strategies (cf. Kellerman and Bialystok 1997:36). Mimetic or iconic gesture is added to the conceptual strategy category (ibid.).

Of interest to this dissertation are the criticisms that this typology has received from proponents of interactional communication strategy researchers, both in terms of its structure: "[the typology distils] a wealth of experimental evidence down into two (or three) basic types of compensatory strategy" (Rampton 1997:280) and argument for its usage: "[it] leads to several radical conclusions" (ibid.), including two that directly oppose those found in an interactional framework: (i) social interaction is considered irrelevant (cf. Kellerman 1991:153) and (ii) the distinction between L1 and L2 processes is dismissed (cf. Kellerman 1991:154). These claims have strong methodological and theoretical implications. First, the researcher is limited to examining the speaker in isolation, which is not reflective of actual language usage and secondly, no distinction seen between L1 and L2 suggests that the systems must be one and the same and that one cannot be influenced by the other, which many would dismiss. Even Færch and Kasper's (1983c) typology is not quite as extreme, despite, its situating of communication
strategies within a purely psycholinguistic model of speech processing, since "quite a lot of emphasis is given to practical usefulness as a criterion for assessing the adequacy of any theoretical formulation" (Rampton 1997:281).

8.4 Concluding remarks

If one puts aside the structural differences among the typologies and the different assumptions they hold about their relation to the learner's linguistic system "a core group of specific strategies that appear consistently across the [typologies] clearly emerges" (Bialystok 1990:61), regardless of the theoretical model behind them. Tarone's (1977) typology "best captures this core group of strategies" (ibid.). The analysis of results in the present research will be partially based on Tarone's typology. There will be instances where it will be useful to incorporate additional details and definitions in order to classify describe some of the data as accurately as possible. For a detailed account of the methodology adopted in the present study, refer to Chapter 3.

C. Findings in Communication Strategy Research

9. Factors influencing communication strategy selection

There are a number of factors that have been suggested in the literature as potential predictors for learners' selection of communication strategies. While several of these factors, such as personality, have been alluded to (cf. Tarone 1977; Corder 1981), "only a few of them have been extracted from empirical research on the issue" (Paribakht 1985:133), including L2 learner proficiency, influence of L1, and the nature of the data collection.
9.1 L2 learner proficiency

Tarone (1977) pursued an informal investigation of the relation between L2 learner proficiency and the selection of communication strategy. The examination was based on a ranking of the nine subjects according to Tarone's estimation of what their proficiency in English was (Tarone 1977:202). The results indicated a distribution of different selection patterns for each of the subjects, with paraphrase serving as the preferred strategy for all.

Subsequent studies have been more systematic in explicitly testing Tarone's (ibid.) hypothesis that there is a correlation between strategy preference and second-language proficiency level. Bialystok (1983) studied twelfth grade students from regular and advanced French as a second language classes. She used grades, classroom test scores, and a specially administered cloze test to confirm the designation of students as advanced or regular. It was found that "the advanced students used proportionally more L2-based strategies than did the regular students, who relied more on the L1-based strategies" (Bialystok 1990:49). Interestingly, a group of highly proficient adult learners were found to demonstrate patterns of selection that more closely resembled those of the regular L2 French students, than those of the advanced L2 French students. In other words, the advanced adult students did not avoid the L1-based strategies to the same extent as the younger advanced students (ibid.). Bialystok (ibid.) suggests that the difference between the advanced and regular students, in terms of an overall selection of L1- or L2-based strategies, "may be a tendency to compliance". She (ibid.) explains that "successful students are those who follow the rules in school, and one rule in the French class is not to use English. For this reason, students in the advanced class make a greater
effort to avoid English". What is claimed to lower the interest in such a finding, however, is "the absence of any indication of a relation at a finer level of analysis, that is, in the selection of specific strategies within these [typological] categories" (Bialystok 1990:50).

Other research has produced similar results. Paribakht's (1982) study used her typology to specifically examine the relation between strategy choice and learner proficiency. While there were some differences between the groups, i.e., the linguistic approach was used most frequently by the advanced learners and native speakers, whereas mime was used more often by learners than native speakers, no consistent patterns were found to emerge. In contrast to these findings, however, is Harley's (1992) study of immersion students who strategically use basic verbs to fit specific verbs when they are unavailable. Differences related to age and amount of exposure to French were both reported. This study is reserved for further discussion in section 10 below.

9.2 L1 influence

In studies on the effect of L1-L2 lexical similarity on students' performance in vocabulary tests, the persistent finding is that students whose L1 is most similar to L2, in terms of sharing the most cognate vocabulary, are considerably more successful on vocabulary questions than those whose L2 does not share as much lexical similarity (Odlin 1989:78). The effect of L1-L2 similarity on communication strategy selection, yet, is less definitive. Tarone's (1977) study included students from three different linguistic backgrounds, however the research found no evidence that home language influenced patterns of communication strategy selection. This is not to say that a larger sample would not generate different results. One distinction reported by Yule and Tarone (1990) was that
their Spanish L1 learners tended to produce descriptive phrases of the referent objects they were asked to talk about, while the Chinese, Japanese and Korean students favored single lexical items in their references (Yule and Tarone 1997:24). Clearly more research is necessary in this area to establish whether a correlation exists between language spoken at home and the types of communication strategies on which L2 students tend to rely.

9.3 Nature of the data collection

The method of data collection has an influence on the type and number of strategies that will be observed. Wagner and Firth (1997:327), for example, report that their study, which examined the telephone calls between employees of different companies in Denmark and their foreign partners, yielded a significantly smaller number of communication strategies than that reported by the Nijmegen project, which uses elicitation techniques. Wagner and Firth (ibid.) refer to the elicited Nijmegen data, citing Poulisse's (1993:165) claim that, 3,203 "clear cases of [communication strategies]" had been identified in "approximately 110,000 words", which is estimated to be over three percent of all words a lexical communication strategy (ibid.). While the Wagner and Firth (1997) data were not quantified, the authors estimate that the number of identifiable communication strategies in their data would be much less. What was surprising to them was not the reduced number of communication strategies found in their own data, i.e., instances where a speaker uses hesitation markers to flag a lexical difficulty, but rather, the frequent finding of cases where speakers used non target-like items without flagging them (Wagner and Firth 1997:327; 332). Three explanations were put forth to account for the examples: (i) in some cases, the employees code switched between the lingua
franca and another at least partially familiar code; (ii) in some cases they used a provisional argot; and (iii) in other cases, communication strategies were not flagged when they were viewed by the participants as playing a minor role in the establishment of a meaningful message (Wagner and Firth 1997:337-338). This latter explanation fits with Bialystok's (1990:52) claim "that learners will adjust the way in which they approach a problem according to their perception of what is relevant".

9.4 Social value of second language learner status

The social value of being a second language learner and, specifically, the status of learner "as an interactional resource rather than as a debilitating condition" (Kasper 1997:353) has also been examined within the context of communication strategy usage. In other words, some researchers have proposed that a non-native status be reconsidered as a resource, rather than a problem (Kasper 1997: 355-356; cf. also Firth and Wagner 1996). Rampton's (1997) analysis of interracial discourse between Anglo- and Afro-Caribbean adolescents and their Punjabi friends found that the former group tended to converge to the latter by code switching to Punjabi, thereby reconstructing their social identity as members of a joint interethnic group. These patterns of convergence were not explained as compensations for linguistic deficiencies, but seen as a versatile use of communication strategies as a means to foster friendships in diversity (Rampton 1995:293). Other studies report similar observations of the use of code switches that were not compensatory in nature, but rather, served a socio-pragmatic function to either index students' participation in multiple identities (Legenhausen 1991, cited in Kasper 1997:354) or behave politely (Burt 1993, cited in Kasper 1997:354).
10. Communication Strategy Research in French Immersion

Communication strategy research in French immersion reflects the general research trends that were described in the preceding sections: (1) a variety of specific research interests, e.g., developing profiles of individual speakers (Dean 1996; McGrath 1999), investigating strategies used by early learners (Marrie and Netten 1991) or advanced learners (Mcgrath 1999); (2) various methodological approaches to the data, e.g., comparing older students and younger students (Harley 1992; Hart et al. 1989; Marrie and Netten 1991); comparing effective language learners with less effective language learners (McGrath 1999; Marrie and Netten 1991); comparing immersion students and native speakers (Harley 1992; Hart et al. 1989) and finally, (3) different methods of data collection, e.g., story telling (Marrie and Netten 1991); picture description tasks (Harley 1992); written and oral skills testing (Hart et al. 1989), written and oral translation (Harley 1992); self-assessment questionnaires (Hart et al. 1989) and one-on-one interviews with a native speaker of French (Dean 1996; Harley 1992; McGrath 1999).

Some French immersion researchers have investigated learner proficiency as a possible influence on learner strategy selection, as described in the preceding section. Marrie and Netten (1991) and McGrath (1999) both began their studies with the use of a rating system to judge the oral performance of their students and assign levels of proficiency that correspond to the labels "effective communicator/language learner" and "less effective communicator/language learner". Marrie and Netten's (1991) study of twenty-two grade three students reveals some differences between effective and less effective communicators. It was found that most of the effective communicators'
strategic usage was dominated by achievement strategies (87%). The less effective
communicators used achievement strategies approximately to the same degree as
reduction strategies (51% vs. 49%); however, the effective communicators still used
achievement strategies twice as often as the less effective communicators (47 to 23)
(Marrie and Netten 1991:452). Marrie and Netten (1991:454) also noted that the specific
strategy used most frequently by both groups was approximation, while neither group
used foreignizing as a strategy; a finding which the authors claim "may indicate a
difference between core French and immersion second language learners" (ibid.).

McGrath's (1999) study of twenty-five grade twelve students showed equivocal
results. Her findings indicate that both the effective learners and less effective learners
used a mix of reduction and achievement strategies and both favored interlingual
strategies over intralingual strategies, particularly the use of English language switch,
which was the most common communication strategy used overall (McGrath 1999:18-
19). McGrath (1999:87) claims that the effective language learners were "far more
selective" when they used a English language switch strategy and appeared to use L1 as a
last resort, while less effective language learners "seemed to choose L1 words without
hesitation". No further description or support of this observation is provided. The less
effective language learners in McGrath's study were also found to use more reduction
strategies, while the effective language learners used more achievement strategies.
McGrath (1999:96) suggests that the overall lesser use of intralingual strategies by both
groups might be rationalized by "years of their not being pushed further in the direction

---

6 The descriptions in these studies incorporate the typologies of both Tarone (1977) and Færch and Kasper
(1983c): circumlocution, borrowing, foreignizing and retrieval are considered achievement strategies, while
message adjustment and avoidance are considered reduction strategies.
of intralingual strategies, with the resulting kind of predominant linguistic 'laziness' of
interlingual strategies taking over". While motivation clearly affects a student's
eagerness or willingness to make the effort to stick to the TL, it is difficult to conclude
that most students are lazy and if they simply tried harder, they
would use intralingual strategies more often.

A more plausible explanation may be that some strategy use becomes fossilized.
Thus, related to the factor of learner proficiency is the issue of fossilization and the
question of what kind of progress is observed in the oral production of immersion
students as they advance from one grade to the next. The aim of Dean's (1996) study was
to develop speech profiles of eighteen students from grades ten through twelve by
outlining the oral production features characteristic to each grade level to address such a
question. After examining interview transcripts, lists of language traits were compiled
specific to each grade. Dean (1996) collected two types of data. On the one hand were
instances of communication strategy use, labeled as "general" speech characteristics.
These were defined as "(1) those characteristics which relate to communication strategy
use and (2) those speech traits which do not belong to any specific category of
grammatical structure in the French language" (Dean 1996:40). This definition is vague
and it suggests that Dean (1996) may be treating the concept of communication strategy
and IL errors interchangeably, which would be misleading, although the former appears
to refer to L1-based strategies (e.g. borrowing, foreignizing, etc.) and the latter to L2-
based strategies (e.g. paraphrasing, circumlocution, etc.). Dean (1996) also examined
what she termed "specific" speech characteristics. This part of her investigation focused
on "those speech traits which are particular to specific grammatical structures in the
French language" (Dean 1996:40). Again, this characterization is ambiguous; however, the data included in this part of the study appear to entail an error analysis of students' use of grammatical elements (e.g. verb tense, subject pronouns, articles, negation, etc.).

Dean (1996) reports two general trends in her findings: first, some progress is made in several areas of oral production as students move from grade ten to twelve, "however many inaccuracies are still evident (e.g. grammatical, lexical, syntactic)" (Dean 1996:89). Secondly, students will regress in some areas between grades ten and eleven (e.g. make no attempts at complex verb structures and use less self-correction); however, once in grade twelve, students' oral production skills "appear to return to a level of competency similar to that of grade ten students" (Dean 1996:84). Regarding the few findings in Dean's (1996) study on strategic communication proper: the grade eleven students were found to use less circumlocution (as well as less self-correction) than students in grades ten and twelve (Dean 1996:81, 84) and students in grade ten had less of a tendency to foreignize English items than students in grades eleven or twelve (Dean 1996:85). No explanation for these results was offered, which appears to be the main drawback to Dean's (1996) study. While a purely descriptive study does have its merits, little, if any explanation to account for the language behavior that Dean (1996) describes is provided and, moreover, since no quantification of the data is provided the reader is left to speculate about the meaning of vague descriptions such as "circumlocution occasionally used" (Dean 1996:81) by grade 10 students.

A second criticism, one that comes purely from the perspective of a research interest in communication strategies, is that any focus on how students use

---

7 The finding of foreignization strategies contrasts with those of Marrie and Netten's (1991) study.
communication strategies proper appeared to be greatly overshadowed by a concentration on their use/misuse of various grammatical elements in French. While it could simply be that there was more information to report in the students' profiles about the latter, communication strategy usage could have been more clearly separated out in the data from other performance features to avoid any misconception to suggest that the concept of communication strategies is being treated in the study as the equivalent of an IL error.

Part of the data collected in Hart et al.'s (1989) study included French immersion students' responses to a questionnaire that was intended to explore perceptions of their most important problems in speaking and writing in French. In the case of speaking, students were asked about the strategies they used to deal with problems encountered during oral communication. The results of the questionnaire responses are summarized here.

Students were asked to rank, in order of importance, a set list of possible problems related to speaking in French. The problem of 'not having the right words to say what you want to communicate' is ranked first by a near majority of the respondents (47%) and ranked second by a further 20 percent (Hart et al. 1989:19). Forty percent of the students cite grammar-related problems (e.g. 'not being able to get things like verb endings or prepositions right') as a first or second choice, as compared to 32 percent for difficulty with pacing speech (e.g. 'speaking too slowly or hesitating too much') (ibid.). Pronunciation difficulties and problems with pacing are far behind the other options in the ranking of difficulties in speaking; only 14 percent of students and 11 percent, respectively, ranked these options as the most problematic area for them in oral production (ibid.).
A few of the students ranked 'not being able to get into thinking about your audience or the situation because you're concentrating on speaking correctly' in their first three choices of problems. Hart et al. (1989:19) suggest that

[while this may indicate a preoccupation with other options as the source of such difficulty, a more likely interpretation is that students' problems of vocabulary, grammar and syntax do not severely undermine involvement in communicating.]

Support for this explanation is found in the way in which students rank communication strategies used to cope with difficulties in oral communication. In answer to the question 'when you have problems in speaking in French, what do you normally do?', the option of rephrasing in French the intended message and continuing in French is ranked first by nearly 60 percent of the respondents and is the first or second choice of more than 80 percent of respondents. Hart et al. (1989:19) report that the only remaining options that are cited by substantial proportions of students entail the use of French in sustaining communication; namely, appealing for assistance in French or guessing at the French words needed and continuing in French. The use of English language switch, appeal for assistance in English or message abandonment were the communication strategies least ranked among the students' top three options for coping with speaking difficulties (ibid.). Further along in the present study it will be shown that students' perceptions about what strategies they think they use to overcome communicative difficulties in French versus what strategies they actually use is quite different.

While not considered a study on communication strategies proper, a focus on verb usage is the point of entry for Harley (1992) in her analysis of how students use a limited verbal vocabulary to encode events in descriptive tasks and her results are certainly
relevant to the field of communications strategy research. Harley's (1992) participants include 36 early immersion students (i.e., they receive French-only instruction for first few years of schooling, starting in kindergarten) at three different grade levels, in addition to comparison data from twelve grade ten students in late immersion programmes (i.e., their immersion experience began in adolescence) and twelve native French speakers in each of grades one and ten.

Overall, the study finds that early on, rather than avoiding a topic of discussion, immersion students are able to draw on a limited set of general purpose verbs (e.g. faire 'to do/to make') and "stretch them strategically" to cope with instances where more specific verbs are unavailable or unknown (Harley 1992:166; 179). The younger learners were observed to use onomatopoeic language successfully to cover some of the meanings they needed to convey (Harley 1992:167; 180), as in *l'horloge fait [drin]* 'the clock goes ringing' (Harley 1992:167, translation mine). An increase in immersion grade level is found to correlate with an expanded verb vocabulary (Harley 1992:167; 180) and a corresponding tendency was also observed in the native speaker groups (Harley 1992:163); however, "none of the immersion groups produced as much variety of verb types as did the grade 1 and grade 10 native speakers" (ibid.). This is not to say that the native speakers always used specific verbs. On the contrary, the native speakers tended to use general purpose verbs "when the action to be described is not readily encoded by a specific lexical verb" (Harley 1992:167); for example, in a case referring to a diving display: *il fait toutes sortes de styles en l'air* 'he does all kinds of moves in the air' (ibid., translation mine). Harley (1992:167) also notes that the general purpose verbs selected by the immersion students
are likely to be those most frequently used by teachers, and in their extended use represent the learners' already developed understanding of the elastic, negotiable nature of such verb meanings, which are readily identifiable with similar lexical items in the L1.

Thus, it is concluded that while there is a gradual build up in L2 students' verbal vocabulary, i.e., from general purpose verbs to more specific ones, the former continue to function as default terms when specific terms are inaccessible, in the same manner seen demonstrated in the speech of native speakers (Harley 1992:169).

Finally, there is evidence that the immersion students rely on their L1 English background in their use of French verbs in at least two ways. First, Harley (1992) cites cases in which the students appear to use the English lexical system as a frame of reference in assigning meaning to French verbs (ibid.). One example is the inappropriate use of coincer 'to wedge' to express intentional pinching il est coincé dans le nez par un mécanisme 'he was pinched in the nose by a mechanism'. More apparently conscious instances of the influence of L1 lexis included in the analysis are the outright use of English verbs such as 'pinch' or 'dive' in place of TL equivalents. A second indication of L1 based strategies in the verb use of both early and late stage immersion students is evidenced by their use of English-influenced syntactic frames together with French verbs that require different argument structures (Harley 1992:176; 180). Thus, with a variety of transitive French verbs, the immersion students demonstrate some problems in the placement and/or forms of clitic pronoun complements, for example:

*je fais du um toast, prends du lait et un peu de la jus d’orange, et prends le dans mon salle à manger, et mange le
'I make some um toast, get some milk and a bit of orange juice, and take it into my breakfast room and eat it' (Harley 1992:177, translation mine).
Harley (1999:180) emphasizes that all of the developmental patterns observed in her data "reflect natural L2 acquisition processes that apply not only to these immersion students but to learners in other contexts too".

11. Previous research on the French immersion corpus used in the present study

Several studies have been performed on the same French immersion student corpus that is being utilized in the present research (cf. Chapter 3 for corpus description). The majority of this previous work has been centered on the exploration of the immersion students' learning of TL aspects where native speakers display sociolinguistic variation. One example of a sociolinguistic variant that has been well-documented in many varieties of contemporary spoken French is the alternation between subject pronouns nous and on to designate a group of individuals including the speaker ('we' in English) (e.g., ma soeur et moi nous allons à la même école versus ma soeur et moi on va à la même école for 'my sister and I we go to the same school'). The basic premise underlying the innovative approach followed in these studies of sociostylistic variation in French immersion extends from the notion that learners who have mastered a variable aspect of the TL will not only use all the variants used by L1 speakers, but will also evidence the same kind of native-like ability to observe the linguistic constraints and extralinguistic constraints (e.g. socioeconomic status, sex, style) bearing on variant choice, in addition to factors specific to L2 learners (e.g. opportunities to interact with native French speakers, level of L2 proficiency, languages spoken at home) (Rehner, Mougeon, and Nadasdi 2002:4-5). The French immersion students are an interesting group with which to examine the breadth of L2 sociostylistic competence because they are considered to be advanced L2 learners
and, according to the Ontario Ministry of Education's curriculum objectives, at this stage should be developing a working knowledge of the different registers of French.

A number of sociolinguistic variants in the speech of immersion students have been examined and the reader is directed to Rehner et al. (2002) for a synthesis of recent studies. In general, the immersion students have been found to observe some of the same linguistic and extralinguistic constraints bearing on sociolinguistic variation that are found in L1 speech; however, several exceptions are documented (Rehner et al. 2002:9;22). For example, in the study of restrictive adverbs seulement 'only' versus juste 'just', L2 learners are found to use juste to the left of the verb, unlike L1 speakers, which appears to be evidence of transfer from English.

Regarding the effects of extralinguistic constraints on sociolinguistic variation, extracurricular exposure to the TL and culture, for example, is one factor found to correlate with a higher frequency of use of most of the informal variants studied. For instance, students with more extracurricular exposure demonstrated a preference for use of informal on over formal nous (Rehner et al. 2002:26). Another trend reported is that female and/or middle class immersion students have been generally found to use variants typical of standard usage more often than their respective counterparts (Rehner et al. 2002:21;26). For instance, these students are found to demonstrate a preference for inflected forms (e.g. j'irai 'I will go') over analytical forms (e.g. je vais aller 'I will go') to express futurity; use of seulement over juste; maintenance of particle ne; and use of nous over on. The influence of third language spoken at home (i.e., neither English nor French) is another extralinguistic factor that has been found to bear on variant choice.

Multilingual students were found to favor TL variants that had a morphophonetically and
semantically similar counterpart to their home language. For example, students from homes where a Romance language other than French is spoken clearly favored seulement as a marker of restriction, whose counterpart in Italian and Spanish is solamente, and also exhibited the lowest rate of negative particle ne deletion, whose counterpart, non, in these two languages, cannot be deleted. Other correlations between social factors and variant usage are reported in Rehner et al. (2002).

In some cases, the immersion students have also been found to evidence use of non-native variants. For example, students used non-standard verbal forms in the third person plural indicative present (e.g. *ils pourront) and also omitted the post-verbal negator pas in 4 percent of their negative statements (e.g. *je ne vais à l'école) (Rehner and Mougeon 1999). It is suggested that the presence of these forms in the immersion students' speech illustrates that if these students have attained an advanced level of proficiency in French, it is still not native-like, and hence, their oral French remains an interlanguage. In other words, it would appear that the immersion students' speech, while not entirely devoid of informal variants, still lacks the full repertoire of variants available to the native speakers. Rehner et al. (2002) propose that the kinds of findings that their studies and others have brought to light represent an initial step towards developing curriculum objectives and materials to improve immersion students' sociolinguistic competence in French.

11.1 Use of English discourse markers in French immersion students' speech

Rehner's (in progress) research on French immersion students' variable use of discourse markers is relevant to the present study to the extent that her work examined the use of English items "like" and "so" in the speech of the 41 French immersion students and the
present research will also consider the use of these items in its investigation of students' tendency to use English code switching as a means to cope with communicative difficulties. It should be noted that the problem with Rehner's (in progress) results, as far as the present study is concerned, is that she included all of the several hundred occurrences of like and so in the immersion corpus and did not distinguish these from (or focus on) the occurrences of like and so that are precursors to or are embedded in a communication strategy, as was attempted in the present study. Consequently, the relevance of Rehner's (in progress) for the present research is, at best, indirect, since most of her occurrences of like and so have been assigned the status of borrowing or ingrained errors, rather than communication strategies. Some of the main findings are summarized below.

One of the principal investigations of Rehner's (in progress) study is to determine to what extent students incorporate "like" and "so" into their speech. According to Rehner (in progress), the majority of functional uses of "like" in the corpus (7 out of 9) are discursive in nature. In fact, the three most frequent functions fulfilled by "like" include:

- use as a punctor
  
  e.g.  
  \textit{je dois écoute "like"/ faire attention}
  'I have to ?listen like / pay attention';

- use to expand or clarify a statement
  
  e.g.  
  \textit{je pourrais mon propre "charity" "like" pauvres personnes}
  'I could my own charity like poor people';

- use to indicate intensity
  
  e.g.  
  \textit{il sait comment parler "like" très vite}
  'he knows how to talk like really fast'.

The use of "so" is also primarily discursive in the immersion data. The most frequent discursive functions of "so" include:

- use as a turn yielder
  e.g.  *ma amie a le guitare électrique mais je j'aime comme ça "so"*
  'my friend has an electric guitar but I I love like that so';

- use for the purpose of clarification/expansion
  e.g.  *je va pas au cinéma beaucoup "so" n' y a pas le cinéma*
  'I don't go to the cinema a lot in fact there isn't a cinema';

- use as a punctor
  e.g.  *je ne sais pas qu'est-ce que je veux/ "so" "like" je sais c'est "I like" science*
  'I don't know what I want /so like I know it is I like science').

Overall, the majority of the immersion students (N=29) exhibit higher rates of discursive usage rather than non-discursive usage\(^8\). This finding suggests that most of the immersion students appear to have attained a level of TL proficiency in which discourse markers are readily used. It could be that they are capable of producing longer utterances that warrant the use of discourse markers, as suggested by Rehner (in progress), or that some discourse markers may be associated with longer utterances, since, presumably, discourse markers occur in the shorter utterances that students are capable of producing, as well. Interestingly enough, Rehner (in progress) notes that of the students whose speech did not display such patterns (N=12), all but two had not spent time with a Francophone family. This is suggestive of a possible correlation between higher levels of extracurricular exposure to French and the learning of French discourse markers (Rehner, in progress).

---

\(^8\) This finding also matches that found for the native speakers of Ontario French and the French immersion teachers.
With regard to the role of students' home language on their discursive usage, Rehner's (in progress) findings indicate that a primary use of English at home appears to be an influential factor in promoting the discursive use of expressions with English equivalents\textsuperscript{9}; namely, *comme* 'like' and *donc/alors* 'so', but not for those without English equivalents: *là* 'there' and *bon* 'good'\textsuperscript{10}. In fact, students from English language homes had the highest rates of English "like" and "so". Rehner (in progress) suggests that students' familiarity with the L1 discursive range of an expression appears strong enough to lead them to select an English expression in their L2 speech before a French one, whose discursive range is less familiar (Rehner, in progress).

Correlations were also found between the factors sex and social class and students' use of French discursive markers that have English equivalents. A high non-discursive use of *comme* 'like' was associated with upper-working class students, while the use of *donc/alors* 'so' was more typical of female speech and the use of English "so" was more typical of male students' speech. According to Rehner (in progress), these findings suggest that students are able to infer a social value for the English expressions through their L1, since they are most familiar with them, but not for those expressions which lacked such familiarity\textsuperscript{11}.

\textsuperscript{9} An English equivalent is understood here as an L1 discursive marker that shares a similar meaning and function as a TL discursive marker.

\textsuperscript{10} According to Rehner's findings, in general, the French immersion students are considerably below native French speaker norms in the discursive uses of expressions that do not have English equivalents and are at par with or outperform native speakers in the discursive uses of the expressions that have English equivalents.

\textsuperscript{11} Rehner (in progress) emphasizes that, to her knowledge, this is the first time that the factors sex and social class have been examined in the context of a study on the development of discourse marker competence by L2 students and must be confirmed by future analyses.
In the present study, it will be shown that, in some instances, "so" and "like", in addition to other English discourse markers not included in Rehner's (in progress) study (e.g. "well"), appear to serve as performance features that cue an ensuing strategy usage and thus, may be said to be embedded within a communication strategy. Accordingly, the language switch may be viewed as serving both the discursive purposes outlined by Rehner (in progress), in addition to purposes specific to strategic communication. While the interpretations are reflective of different lines of research, they are not mutually exclusive.
Chapter 3

Methodology

On n'a pas la chance beaucoup de faire quelque chose comme ça/ comme une interview/ juste/ juste parler un à un... on n'a pas la chance d'avoir une/ une une co' une conversation complète avec quelqu'un/ en français.

'We don't have the chance much to do something like this / like an interview / just / just to talk one on one... we don't have the chance to have a / a a co' a complete conversation with someone / in French.' (FI 39)

1. Orientation

Several issues have to be overcome in order to pursue a viable study in this research domain, namely: how to define communication strategy, how to operationalize the concept of communication strategy in the corpora, and how to formulate a typology that reflects the usage data realistically. The notion of learner consciousness as an indicator of strategy usage is clearly of limited value for the analyst who questions whether one can, in fact, show precise instances in which such consciousness obtained (cf. Chapter 2. section 3 for earlier discussion). Part of the problem is that communication strategies are frequently unflagged (Willems 1987:352), i.e., they are not made public in the talk via recurrent hesitation phenomena and/or metalinguistic commentary about a specific usage in the context of a communicative problem. In such cases, it becomes difficult to distinguish, with much certainty, between unmarked communication strategies or what may be instances of unconscious ingrained IL errors. One way to address this problem and, essentially, operationalize the concept of communication strategy in the data, is to
set definitive criteria by which erroneous utterances produced unconsciously as a product of the speaker's IL can be distinguished from utterances, which are also erroneous in the TL, but that are produced consciously for the purpose of maintaining the flow of the conversation and therefore suggestive of communication strategy usage. In order to make such a distinction, the present research relies on the analysis of two elements in speaker performance: first, the position and frequency of certain performance features, including filled and unfilled pauses, false-starts/repetitions, and intonation contours located within the context of a troublesome point in the discourse, and secondly, the speaker's or interlocutor's explicit commentary about a particular usage in the discourse.

1.1 Definition and identification of communication strategy usage in the present study

Table 3-1 illustrates the different cues or flagging of communication strategies observed in the data and the syntactic contexts in which they occur\textsuperscript{12,13}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-1. Classification of cues in the identification of communication strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Flagging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Temporal variables, self-correction and change in intonation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Environment preceding &lt;CS&gt;:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) [unfilled pause_ &lt;CS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. \textit{je considère à prendre} / &quot;weight training&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I'm considering taking / weight training' (FI 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) [filled/lexicalized pause_ &lt;CS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. \textit{c'est tout} &quot;like&quot; pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'it's all like pure' (FI 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) [hesitation_ &lt;CS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. \textit{je sais un peu de l'ara' ara'} &quot;arabic&quot; ⬆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I know a little ara' ara' &quot;arabic&quot; ⬆ (FI 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) [multiple flags_ &lt;CS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} For the sake of consistency, all of the flagging examples are taken from cases of language switch in the data, however, the framework for classifying hesitation phenomena applies to all of the communication strategies.

\textsuperscript{13} Unfilled pauses were not formally timed during data collection; however, as a general rule of thumb, a single backslash (/) indicates a short pause, while double backslashes (//) indicate longer pauses, all relative to the speakers' individual rates of articulation.
2. Environment following <CS>:
(a) [<CS>_self-correction]
  e.g.  \textit{il es[\textit{t}} comme un fondation um des / des / qualités familiales ahm des "values" ↑ ahm des valeurs (rire) les valeurs
  'it's like a foundation um of / of / family qualities um values ↑ um values (laugh) the values (FI 13)

3. Concurrent change in intonation and <CS> usage:
[<CS>↑]
  e.g.  nous \textit{veux faire de "skidooing" ↑}
  'we want to do some skidooing' (FI 2)

4. Multiple flags plus change in intonation:
[hesitation phenomena_ <CS> ↑]
  e.g.  \textit{j'aime faire des ahm // "drawings"↑}
  'I like to do ahm // drawings ↑' (FI 23)

B. Interactional flags
  Metalinguistic commentary about prior strategy usage:
  e.g.  FI 17.  \textit{j'essaie àààà à / "keep fit" (rire) / je sais pas comment \textit{on dit en français} \  'I try tooo / to / keep fit (laugh) / I don't know how you say in French'
    I.  \textit{garder en forme}
    'stay in shape'
  FI 17.  \textit{ouais} \textit{ouais} \textit{garder en forme durant l'année [xxx] quelque fois mais / c'est difficile à trouver le temps pour ça}
    'yeah yeah stay in shape during the year [xxx] sometimes but / it's hard to find time for that'

First, hesitation pauses are considered as cues in the present study since it has been demonstrated that such pauses are indicative of an ensuing lexical difficulty and tend to occur at lexical selection points (Færch and Kasper 1983:214). As shown in Table 3-1, a distinction is made between unfilled pauses and filled pauses and both may
precede actual communication strategy usage. A combination of a variety of hesitation phenomena, including different types of pauses and/or hesitation prior to strategy usage, is also possible. Self-correction subsequent to a strategy usage is a separate criterion that serves as an indicator in the present data that the speaker has run into difficulty in executing the strategy or that s/he is unsatisfied with how the intended message has been communicated. Likewise, a change in intonation contour, such as a rise in intonation, may accompany actual communication strategy usage, is often found in conjunction with other hesitation phenomena, and indicates a student’s uncertainty about a particular usage.

In addition to temporal variables, repetition/self-correction, and change in intonation, strategy usage may be marked by interactional flagging in the form of metalinguistic commentary made by the speaker or interlocutor specifically in reference to a preceding strategy usage. In the example included in Table 3-1, the student’s metalinguistic commentary flags the communication strategy, i.e., s/he refers in English to the concept “keep fit” after which s/he verbalizes not knowing the correct TL word. The interlocutor may or may not feel obligated to react to the commentary, but in this case she does and the interaction comes in the form of a correction, which the learner then adopts into his/her own speech.\(^{14}\)

Wood’s (2001:576) proposal for how one might utilize hesitation phenomena in analyzing speech data is appropriate for the present research:

\(^{14}\)Alternatively, metalinguistic commentary may come from the interviewer, i.e. by asking the student for clarification of a term used (e.g. c'est quoi une “minor league” ’what's a minor league’ [talking to Fl 9]).
To fully appreciate the significance of the placement of disruption\textsuperscript{15} phenomena, it is useful to combine a survey of empirical evidence with some explanations of why [they] occur where they do in fluent and non-fluent speech.

As discussed in Chapter 2 (cf. section 5), in the present research the use of an interactional approach has been modified somewhat based on the assumption that communication strategies are an important element in speech production and deserve to be examined within an approach that includes the interactional facets, as well as the cognitive facets of language usage (Wagner and Firth 1997:342). First, a communication strategy may be cooperative; however, interaction between the speaker and interlocutor is not an absolute condition for a communication strategy. For instance, the learner may enlist to solve the lexical problem her/himself or the interlocutor may not react to the strategy usage. In such cases, where no explicit interaction exists regarding a particular usage, then the frequency and the co-occurrence of hesitation phenomena may be indicative of an ensuing lexical communication strategy. This brings us to the working definition of communication strategies applied in the present study, partially based on Wagner and Firth (1997): communication strategies are students' attempts at dealing with lexical difficulties when the appropriate TL item is inaccessible, whether for purely linguistic or linguistic and conceptual reasons, and these attempts are identifiable in the discourse via verbal or non-verbal flags\textsuperscript{16}. The primary research interest lies with how the speaker, either individually or conjointly with the interlocutor, uses communication

\textsuperscript{15} 'Disruption phenomena' is used interchangeably with 'hesitation phenomena' in the communication strategy literature and the same applies in the present study.

\textsuperscript{16} Note that while the focus of the present study is centered on strategies that are overtly flagged by disruption phenomena, cases of non-TL forms which resemble communication strategies, but which do not fit the definitional criteria, are accounted for separately in the data since it is useful to examine the contexts in which they occur in order to pinpoint any usage based distinctions between these and cases of communication strategies proper.
strategies in response to communicative difficulties in an interactional setting. Thus, the
notions of problematicity and consciousness as definitive to the concept of
communication strategies are still discernible in this definition, as with earlier definitions
(cf. Chapter 2, section 3); however, in contrast to these, what is highlighted is the fact that
there must be overt evidence of conscious problem-solving activity in the discourse that
is suggestive to the analyst (and interlocutor) that a communication strategy has been
used.

1.2 Focus on lexis

The specific focus of the present research is on French immersion students' use of
communication strategies in place of lexical items in the TL. While the general
definition of communication strategy does not restrict the concept to any particular type
of linguistic problem, the majority of studies tend to focus on lexis and this concentration
appears to be a consequence of the definitional criteria of problematicity and
consciousness (Kasper and Kellerman 1997:7). As explained by Kasper and Kellerman
(1997:8), it appears that

Whatever conscious problem-solving learners may engage in when their
morphological or syntactic knowledge is defective or uncertain, it seems marginal
in information-focused tasks and difficult to operationalize. Lexical
communication strategies, on the other hand, are more readily identifiable.

One reason for this claim is that, at the outset, some communication strategy types (e.g.
circumlocution and all explicitly interactional strategies) (cf. next section) are, by nature,
more overtly strategic, while other IL productions (e.g. L1-based strategies, such as
foreignization) are suitable candidates for communication strategies, particularly in
instances where the resulting lexical item does not belong to the L2 lexicon (ibid.). A
second reason is that the problematic spot in the discourse at which lexical selection must
be made may be flagged by disruption markers (ibid.; Firth and Wagner 1997), for example, whereas longer spurts of production may be more difficult to isolate according to the same criteria.

1.3 Error analysis in the present study

In a way, learners' usage will always appear erroneous on some level; however, as will be shown, some cases may be explained by communication strategy usage. In communication strategy research there is no escaping error analysis completely, since communication strategies represent a form of non-TL usage. The more interesting component of the analysis lies in trying to explain the learner's non-TL usage, and hence, demonstrate how a certain limited knowledge of the TL can still be used in a strategic way and not impede communication. In the present study, a traditional error analysis is performed for the dual purpose of measuring learner proficiency and finding correlations between errors and variation in number and type of communication strategies. The error count is limited to verb usage, including non-TL use of tense (e.g. use of past for future) and number agreement (e.g. *nous sont (3pl.) for nous sommes 'we are'); the use of regularized forms (e.g. *j'ai couré for j'ai couru 'I ran'); the confusion between avoir and être auxiliaries (e.g. *j'ai allé for je suis allé 'I went'); and semantically incorrect verb choice (e.g. *entendre aux émissions espagnoles 'to hear Spanish shows' for écouter 'to listen to'). Instances of self-correction, unsuccessful correction, and unnecessary correction are also noted (cf. section 2 below).

1.4 Typology of communication strategies used in the present study

Tarone (1977) offers the researcher a more or less generic typology and many of her subcategories (e.g. word coinage, circumlocution, message abandonment, language
switch, appeal for assistance) are applied here in the traditional sense, while others (e.g. approximation) have been expanded to better reflect the French immersion data at hand as will be explained below. Generally speaking, it was felt that in order to emphasize the interactional nature of the data, the discursive and sociopragmatic aspects of lexical communication strategies had to be accentuated to a greater extent than would be enabled by Tarone's (1977) typology. For this reason Paribakht's (1985) conceptual approach category, which relies on the speaker's overall world knowledge is also loosely incorporated into the coding scheme applied in the present study. As will be described in detail below, it was felt that the strategic way in which students use their knowledge of the speaker-listener relationship and a shared linguistic background in order to facilitate their participation in the discourse warranted its own category.

Another addition to the present typology, not seen in Tarone's typology, was spawned from of the idea that it is useful to identify the source of information from which the learner has drawn to address the lexical difficulty, hence Bialystok and Frohlich's (1980) explicit distinction between L1-based strategies, L2-based strategies and paralinguistic strategies is also used in the present typology. Reflective of the fact that the data deal with a special subset of learners of French as a second language who are bilingual and often trilingual speakers, it also became necessary to add a category for strategies whose source is rather ambiguous and may, in fact, be based on both L1 principles and L2 principles, or even L3 principles.
A general description of the typology used in the present work is outlined in Table 3-2\textsuperscript{17}. Canadian French equivalents of the French immersion utterances are provided in closed brackets below English translations, where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-2. Typology of French immersion communication strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type I strategies: Linguistic approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. L1-based/English strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreignization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>j'ai pensé que ce n'était / &quot;like&quot; mon [ekspektæsfoʊ] c'était très haut</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I thought that it wasn't / &quot;like&quot; my expectation it was very high' (FI 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mon attente]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language switch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>je vais essayer comme de / gagner comme / un &quot;scholarship&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I'm going to try like to / win like / a scholarship' (FI 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[une bourse]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. L2-based/French strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word coinage (may involve some literal translation of L1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>j'ai /un route de papier</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I have/ a paper route' (FI 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[un trajet de livraison/de journal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) phonological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>les les écoles publiques sont plus libères lib[ax]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'the public schools are more ?free ?free' (FI 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[libres]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>C'était toute comme une une mystérieux</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'It was all like a a mysterious' (FI 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[un mystère]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>il'ont allé à un/place de// pommes †/ un pommier †</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'they went to a / place for // apples †/ an apple tree †' (FI 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[un verger]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} Speaker identification numbers (e.g. FI 5 'French immersion speaker 5') are provided throughout. The abbreviation 'T' stands for 'interlocutor'. Transcriptions in closed brackets ([ ] ) are written phonetically. An upright arrow (†) indicates rising intonation.
C. *Ambiguous cases/L3-based*

**e.g.**  
*ma sœur va // hem // laborer*  
'my sister is going // um // to ?work ↑' (FI 22)  
*travailler*

---

**Type II strategies: Sociopragmatic Approach**

**A. Knowledge of the interlocutor's role**

a) appeal for assistance  
**e.g.**  
*Comment est-ce qu'on dit "pre-school"?*  
'How do you say pre-school?' (FI 22)

b) message abandonment  
**e.g.**  
*OK/ c'est "wrestling"/ "it's not like ooh you know"/ ah je ne sais pas*  
'Okay / it's wrestling / it's not like ooh you know / ah I don't know' (FI 20)

---

**B. Extralinguistic strategies**

(i) mime  
**e.g.**  
*Je n'aime pas le couleur de / ça*  
'I don't like the color of / this [referring to part of school uniform]' (FI 12)

(ii) onomatopoeic language  
**e.g.**  
*je n'aime pas juste lire les livres qui sont "duh de duh de duh de duh" j'aime les livres avec beaucoup d'action*  
'I don't like to just read books that are "duh de duh de duh de duh" I like books with a lot of action' (FI 40)

---

As shown in Table 3-2, the typology is divided into two main categories of strategies. Type I strategies are language-centered; they rely on a knowledge of formal and semantic properties of the L1 or the L2. These strategies also appear to be learner-
speaker controlled, i.e., any explicit interaction of the interlocutor in the production of these communication strategies, beyond listening, is minimal. The speaker relies on his/her linguistic creativity in order to manipulate the formal and semantic properties of the L1 or the L2 in some way as a means to convey the intended message and maintain participation in the discourse. The subcategories reflect the fact that the linguistic means may be based on L1 frames of lexical reference, L2 frames of reference, or may be rather ambiguous as to the source of the strategy and potentially based on a third language.

There are three L1-based strategies posited. First is the use of foreignization, whereby an English term is altered phonologically or morphologically to create an L2 term. The use of false friends, i.e., words that are formally similar in L1 and L2 but semantically different, is included here. Next, there is the use of L1 code switching, whereby a single lexical item in English or a longer stretch of language in English replaces the TL item(s).

Among the L2-based strategies, four subtypes are posited. First is the use of word coinage or the creation of an innovative word in the TL, which in some cases may involve some degree of literal translation from English, but is still based on L2 principles. Formal approximation refers to the learner's attempts to get close to a TL term; either phonologically, by estimating the pronunciation of a word as close as possible to what s/he thinks the actual pronunciation of the word is, or morphologically, by using derivational forms of the intended TL term in place of the accurate TL form. Next, there is semantic approximation, which refers to students' use of a superordinate term in place of a subordinate term that carries more information in a given context or the use of a semantically-related term in place of the appropriate TL term. The final subtype of this L2-based strategy group is circumlocution, which refers to learners' use of a wordy
description of the characteristics of an object or elements of an action when the appropriate TL structure is unavailable.

Treated separately from L1 and L2-based strategies is the inclusion of an ambiguous subcategory. This subcategory is necessary in order to classify structures that appear to involve L1 and L2-based strategies simultaneously and hence, justification for assigning data to one or the other category would be inaccurate, or which appear to involve L3-based strategies.

Type II strategies are more overtly interactive than Type I strategies, in the sense that they are contingent on the dynamics of the speaker-interlocutor relationship and more specifically, of speakers' knowledge about how casual conversations operate and what the typical role of the interlocutor is. Thus, in some cases use of these strategies requires a mutual knowledge of convention, in addition to a certain heightened level of participation from the interlocutor, in order for the strategies to be successful. For example, the strategy may involve a speaker's explicit request for input from the interlocutor, hence the use of an appeal for assistance. Alternatively, the learner can choose to completely abandon an intended message when the TL means to express what is intended cannot be found. In the case of the latter, the discourse seems to stop abruptly and/or final sentences appear incomplete. The onus is, thus, effectively placed on the interlocutor to either infer what the learner intended, provide the linguistic means for the learner to complete the intended message, ask a follow up question to draw out information in a different way, or initiate a change of topics altogether. In other cases, it may simply be awareness by the learner of the presence of the interlocutor that contributes to the success of the strategy, i.e., in the case of mime, including students'
gesturing toward an object, the performing of an action or movement in lieu of reference to it by name or description, and the use of onomatopoeic language when the concept reference is unavailable.

The purpose of the organization of this typology is twofold: (i) to highlight the different approaches (linguistic and sociopragmatic) that the immersion speakers may follow to address communicative problems and (ii) to illustrate some of the functional similarities between the strategy types. Admittedly, some of the boundaries are fuzzy. For example, the success of any L1-based strategy is, at least in part, owed to the correct assumption about the interlocutor's shared knowledge of English (cf. section 3 below for more discussion). The use of circumlocution, an L2-based strategy, also hinges on a speaker's knowledge of the role of the interlocutor. While less explicit than an appeal for assistance, for example, circumlocution does, nonetheless, involve an implicit request of the interlocutor to participate in the speaker's search for a lexical term. Approximations, likewise, overlap into the interactive realm of strategy use; in order for phonological and morphological approximations to be successful, the interlocutor is implicitly asked to make certain inferences about the speaker's intended message relying on the linguistic context for clues. This kind of ambiguity between categories is not seen as problematic, but rather; (i) reflective of actual language usage; (ii) suggestive of the idea that along with the possibility for embeddedness of one or more strategies in another, there is also an interplay of approaches to actually using the strategies; and (iii) illustrative that an interactional element in the description and explanation of communication strategy usage is fundamental.
2. Data collection

2.1 Coding scheme

The procedure for the study began by assembling profiles of each learner on the basis of the transcripts from which overall comparisons could be subsequently performed. The transcripts were read and verified against the original tape recordings, making adjustments where necessary. Each communication strategy was identified, coded and enumerated. The opening and closing tags used to mark up the corpus were as follows (listed alphabetically):

<AA> appeal for assistance </AA>
<AB> message abandonment </AB>
<AMB> ambiguous </AMB>
<C> circumlocution </C>
<FOR> foreignization </FOR>
<II> interviewer’s influence </II>
<LS> language switch </LS>
<M> mime </M>
<OC> unsuccessful attempt at correction </OC>
<SC> self-correction </SC>
<UC> unnecessary correction </UC>
<WC> word coinage </WC>
<V> problematic verb usage </V>

Since unflagged cases were also accounted for (i.e., non-TL forms that resembled communication strategies, but were not strategic in the definitional sense) additional tags included <ULS> and <UFOR> used to mark unflagged language switch and unflagged foreignization, respectively, etc.

The basic principles followed in counting the strategy tokens are detailed in (a) through (d) below:

(a) Each token represents one strategy use. In some cases, one strategy is embedded in another. For example, *comment est-ce qu’on dit "pre-school"* "how do you say
pre-school?" (FI 22) is coded as an appeal for assistance with an embedded language switch.

(b) Place names that were stated in English instead of with the French equivalent or with English pronunciation were not counted as cases of language switch. There is too much speculation about which place names students should or should not know at this stage of their education. Place names for English language institutions were also omitted, e.g. "M ississauga School of Music" (FI 7), along with titles for English language movies, television shows, books or plays, e.g. "Gone with the Wind" (FI 5), since students would not be expected to translate such items. Proper names, e.g. "M el Gibson" (FI 3), "Raptors" (FI 16) were also omitted.

(c) Cases of French/English cognates were omitted where it was impossible to know whether an English lexical form was actually used or whether poor French pronunciation and/or grammar are responsible. Exclusions include: [instʃuktɔʁ] for standard French [ɛstʃykτɔʁ] instructeur (FI 18); le basketball and le volleyball (FI 37 et. al). Other items omitted were cases that appeared to be approximations or mispronunciations of an English lexical switch, including *cartridge (FI 7) for English 'cartilage' and *physological (FI 32) for English 'psychological', since the focus of the study is on how students overcome lexical encoding problems in the TL.

(d) Immediate corrections are classified as either self-corrections:

   e.g.  *il se grandit uh vite *vit'ment rapid'ment 'he is growing um fast *fastly quickly' (FI 13)
or corrections due to interviewer influence:

e.g. FI 10: *je ahm "buy"*/  'I um buy /
I: *achèterais*  'would buy'
FI 10: *je achèterais une maison*  'I would buy a house'

Also noted were cases of unsuccessful correction, where the speaker attempts to self-correct, but fails to do so by virtue of providing another incorrect usage.

e.g. *c'est proche de *mes / <OC>*mon </OC> maison*
'it's close to my (pl.) / my (masc.) house' (FI 26)
*[ma maison (fem.)]*

Use of unnecessary corrections was also noted. This includes cases where the speaker uses a correct TL form initially, but then provides an incorrect TL form or an L1 equivalent as verification (referred to as 'follow-up'), as in the example below:

e.g. *elle doit aller *au cour / pour être membre du jury / <UC> <LS>*
"jury duty" </LS> </UC>
'she has to go to court / to be a jury member / jury
duty' (FI 15)

Inclusion of such cases provides insight into the speakers' level of language awareness and desire for careful speech and overall linguistic proficiency in the TL.

2.2 Frequency counts and statistical analysis

The goal of the present research was to explicate how French immersion students overcome lexical difficulties by determining the range and frequency of the communication strategies they use, as well as the effect of certain linguistic and extra-linguistic factors on such usage. After each of the instances of strategy usage was coded, the concordance program *MonoConc Pro* (Barlow 1998) was utilized to itemize the
tokens for each strategy type and obtain frequency counts. Next, SAS software (version 8) was applied for the purpose of conducting a Generalized Linear Model analysis (Logistic and Negative Binomial) to identify the correlations, if any, between type of communication strategy usage and linguistic and extralinguistic factors under study, including: accuracy of verb usage; students' sex; age/grade; exposure to French language media; time spent staying with a Francophone family; time spent in a Francophone environment; and language spoken at home.

3. French immersion speaker sample

The data for these students come from a corpus of approximately 200,000 words compiled by Mougeon and Nadasdi in 1994 of 41 adolescents at three different schools in a Toronto suburb. Extended French programs, the type of immersion program in which the students are enrolled, are characterized by the Board of Education as consisting of 50 percent of instruction in the French medium grades five through eight, followed by 20 percent in grades nine through twelve. Most of the students interviewed had received between 25 percent and 40 percent of their academic education in the French medium. It should be pointed out that the immersion programs where the data were collected are offered in regular English-language high schools. In other words, given that the majority of the student body and staff members at the school are not French speaking, the classrooms and resource rooms reserved for French-medium courses are basically the only environments within the school where students receive any exposure to French (Rehner et al. 2001:4). This situation is not atypical in Ontario since most of the school
boards offer French immersion education via French immersion programs, rather than through designated French immersion schools (ibid.).

The corpus was collected from approximately 30 hours of tape-recorded semi-directed interviews that were conducted face-to-face in a small to medium sized meeting room in the students' schools. The woman who conducted the interviews is a middle-aged, native speaker of European French with a university education, who, at the time of data collection, had resided for more than thirty years in Canada and thus, her spoken French is not strongly marked as European. While the interviewer is a French/English bilingual, it should be emphasized that her level of bilinguality was neither revealed to the students in the letter of consent nor on first contact with the interviewer, where students were greeted in French. The only information the students received prior to meeting the interviewer was that they would participate in a "relaxed conversation" in French with a native speaker of French that would be recorded for the purpose of linguistic analysis and that the conversations would cover a variety of topics including leisure activities, school and home life, personal experiences, and future aspirations. Nevertheless, it should also be noted that students could assume that the interviewer was bilingual, given that most of the Francophones that they encounter in Ontario are bilingual (e.g. their own teachers). We return to the issue of the effect of the bilingualism of the interviewer as a predictor for strategy selection in section 4.
Table 3-3 summarizes details concerning the French immersion speaker sample.

There are roughly equal numbers of students from the ninth and twelfth grades\(^{18}\) and there are fewer males than females. Over half of the students are from middle class families, with the remaining being from upper working class families. The prevalence of females and middle class students is not unusual for immersion programs in Ontario (Rehner et al. 2001:5).

### Table 3-3. Chief Characteristics of the French Immersion Speaker Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Socio-economic status(^{1})</th>
<th>Average Amount of French Medium Schooling</th>
<th>Exposure to TV or Radio in French</th>
<th>Time in Francophone Environment</th>
<th>Length of Stay with Francophone Family</th>
<th>Home Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (N=21)</td>
<td>F (N=13) M (N=8)</td>
<td>Middle (N=10) Upper working (N=9)</td>
<td>0-25 % (N=2) 26-37 % (N=14) 38-100 % (N=5)</td>
<td>Never (N=16) Occasional (N=5)</td>
<td>0h-1d (N=8) 1-7d (N=6) 7d-3w(N=6) 3w + (N=1)</td>
<td>0h (N=15) 1-13d (N=5) 2w + (N=1)</td>
<td>English (N=10) Romance (N=4) Other (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (N=20)</td>
<td>F (N=17) M (N=3)</td>
<td>Middle (N=14) Upper working (N=6)</td>
<td>0-25 % (N=6) 26-37 % (N=13) 38-100 % (N=1)</td>
<td>Never (N=9) Occasional (N=11)</td>
<td>0h-1d (N=4) 1-7d (N=3) 7d-3w(N=9) 3w + (N=4)</td>
<td>0h (N=12) 1-13d (N=1) 2w + (N=7)</td>
<td>English (N=10) Romance (N=4) Other (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=41)</td>
<td>F (N=30) M (N=11)</td>
<td>Middle (N=24) Upper working (N=15)</td>
<td>0-25 % (N=8) 26-37 % (N=27) 38-100 % (N=6)</td>
<td>Never (N=25) Occasional (N=16)</td>
<td>0h-1d (N=12) 1-7d (N=9) 7d-3w(N=15) 3w + (N=5)</td>
<td>0h (N=27) 1-13d (N=6) 2w + (N=8)</td>
<td>English (N=20) Romance (N=8) Other (N=13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\)Two students did not provide sufficient information for their socioeconomic status to be determined.

\(^{18}\) The speaker sample includes 20 students in grade nine, 1 in grade ten, 16 in grade twelve and 2 in grade thirteen (i.e., Ontario Academic Credit level). For the purpose of the present study, which focuses on students in grades nine and twelve, those from grade ten are considered along with the ninth grade students and those from grades eleven and thirteen are considered with the twelfth grade students.
The corpus reflects the linguistic diversity commonly found in the city of Toronto. There are approximately as many students who speak a third language at home (to varying degrees) as there are students who speak English only at home. Of these multilingual students, 40 percent come from homes where a Romance language, other than French, is spoken (e.g. Italian or Spanish) and 60 percent are from non-Romance language homes (e.g. Chinese, Croatian, German, Korean, Polish, Tagalog, or Vietnamese).

Before being interviewed, students completed a self-evaluation questionnaire that, among other things, revealed information concerning students' use of French at school and outside of school. In general, the only situation in which the students make significant use of French is with their immersion teachers in the classroom. In-class communication with peers is reportedly sometimes in French; however, outside the classroom (e.g. in the hallways or cafeteria, etc.) their use of French is marginal. Outside the school setting (i.e., with friends, neighbors, etc.), the students rarely or never use French, a finding that reflects the scarcity of Francophones in the areas in which they reside (ibid.). While there is a limited availability of French-language media on the radio and TV in Ontario, 60 percent of the students never watch French TV or listen to French radio stations; however, of the ones who do, more twelfth grade students than ninth grade students did so on an occasional basis. The twelfth grade students had also spent more time in native Francophone environments and with Francophone families than was the case for the ninth grade students. The average length of these visits/stays, of which the majority is in Quebec, is a rather modest 16 days (ibid.).
4. Hypotheses

The following is a summary of what is expected in the immersion students' speech with regard to the number and frequency of communication strategy usage and effects of linguistic factors and extra-linguistic factors.

4.1 Number and frequency of communication strategy usage

As pointed out in the literature review, previous research on interactional data has revealed a fairly low number of communication strategies overall. In the present study, similarly low numbers of communication strategies overall are expected based on the fact that data come from a semi-naturalistic communicative setting and they were not specifically elicited for in the data collection. With regard to the types of strategies expected to be identified in the corpus, it is hypothesized that similar to the findings of McGrath (1999) and Dean (1996), the immersion students in the present research will demonstrate a wide range of communication strategy usage and that all strategy types will be represented in their speech. Secondly, it is expected that L1 transfer will strongly influence students' patterns of strategy selection. Such a finding would contradict the results obtained from Hart et al.'s (1989) investigation of students' perceptions about their own strategy usage, where the majority indicated that a reliance on code switching in English was not considered one of their top three choices for coping with difficulties in speaking French. In the present research it is surmised that the tendency will be for students to use language switch often, both (a) as the initial response to lexical difficulties and (b) as a follow-up to previously attempted strategy usage and/or as a follow-up to uncertain (but correct) TL usage. This latter hypothesis also challenges Corder's
opinion that code switching is one of the most risky strategies in terms of its potential for impeding communication, since, in both circumstances described in (a) and (b) the purpose of a language switch following a prior strategy is expected to be used to prevent further miscommunication and ultimately convey the intended message. The question of which strategies will be found subsequent to other strategies and which strategies will themselves be followed by other strategies relates to the expectation that overall frequency of a strategy will reflect the level of potential risk for miscommunication associated with using the strategy: the greater the chance that communication will be impeded, the greater the amount of follow-up to the strategy will be found. The same is also true in the reverse: follow-up is required less of strategies that are perceived as having little or no risk involved in using them. This expectation is based loosely on Corder (1981:105) in that of the strategies available to L2 speakers (and in the context under study) it is expected that word coinage will be considered one of the most risky strategies and circumlocution least risky in terms of the potential for causing misunderstanding or complete breakdown in communication. To reiterate; however, unlike Corder (1981), it is not expected in the context under study that language switch will be considered risky; in fact, the opposite is expected. This is based partially on the idea that the interviewer's assumed status as a bilingual French/English speaker will have an effect on the types of strategies the students use. To elaborate, it is expected that students will attempt to test their assumption about the level of bilinguality of the interviewer by using an L1-based strategy and then verifying the interviewer's level of comprehension. When the interviewer provides positive feedback or confirmation that the intended message was understood (e.g. by providing a TL equivalent), students will
perceive that the use of L1-based strategies as low risk in terms of the chance for
impeding communication and will return to them if needed.

4.2 Effect of linguistic and extralinguistic factors

With regard to the effect of linguistic factors; first, it is expected that strategies will be
cued by a variety of discourse phenomena in the data and in some cases, may be
influenced by patterns of English discursive marking based on Rehner's (in progress)
findings. Communication strategies may occur singly, but in fitting with the assumption
that some strategies will require follow-up, it is expected that some strategies will occur
in clusters and in particular, some strategies will frequently co-occur with language
switch. This is, again, based on L1-based strategies will be dominant and that students,
unsatisfied with their attempts at other strategy types will tend to switch to English in
order to convey the intended message.

With regard to level of language proficiency, it is hypothesized that this factor
will correlate with a variety of independent variables that are also expected to have an
effect on communication strategy usage, namely; amount of French schooling, length of
time spent in a Francophone environment or with a Francophone family, and level of
exposure to French language media. First, it is expected that if level of language
proficiency can be assumed to increase with amount of French schooling, then those with
more schooling in French are hypothesized to demonstrate (i) a higher proficiency in
French and (ii) less frequent use of L1-based strategies than those with less schooling in
French. Secondly, it is surmised that the more extracurricular time spent using French or
being exposed to French, the more varied will be the students' repertoire of
communication strategies and the less reliance on L1-based strategies. This is based on the assumption that students who have traveled in Francophone regions or lived with a Francophone family will have had more opportunity to converse with native speakers and that, out of necessity, will have become more accustomed to using the TL as the primary means to deal with lexical difficulties during conversations with native French speakers. Likewise, those students who have been exposed most often to French media are expected to have developed a larger repertoire of non-academic terms and are therefore expected to rely less on L1-based strategies than those who have not had such exposure. Thus, in general, students who have received greater exposure to French, whether through extended stays in a French environment, with a French family, or through the media, are expected to demonstrate a stronger overall level of proficiency.

With regard to the factors sex and socioeconomic status, the results of previous studies (cf. Rehner et al. 2002) performed on the same French immersion corpus report that the tendency is for female and/or middle class immersion students to favor usage typical of standard/prescriptive French. In the present study it is expected that in keeping with a desire to maintain a level of correctness in their speech (i.e., that might be expected to fit with the French heard spoken by their teachers), female and/or middle class students students will use more L2-based strategies than other students and secondly, that the female and/or middle class students will tend to self-correct more often than their male student counterparts.

With regard to the effect of home language on immersion students’ use of communication strategies, it is expected that students from English-only speaking homes will tend to rely strongly on L1-based strategies and students from non-English speaking
homes will produce ambiguous strategies, which would suggest the possibility of transfer of home language to the TL.

Finally, with regard to the effect of the interviewer's language on the students' speech it is expected that students' sex and/or grade will affect the tendency for students to incorporate the interviewer's language. This is based on the assumption that female students and/or students in a lower grade will treat the interview as a learning experience and will attempt to rely on the repetition of the interviewer's TL usage as a means for self-correction in the midst of lexical difficulty.

5. Potential limitations to the present study

Some potential limitations may be foreseen in the present study, but are not viewed as overly problematic. First, given that different researchers have various ways of classifying communication strategies, the study necessarily contains an element of subjectivity; however, efforts have been made to remain as consistent as possible. Secondly, since the focus is on verbal and lexical communication strategies, the results may not be applicable to other types of strategy usage. Finally, the spoken data come from one-on-one interviews; however, other data collection procedures may yield different results, i.e., some strategies that are identified the context of an interview may not be found in other natural communicative situations, and vice versa.
Chapter 4

Communication Strategies in the French Immersion Corpus:
Analysis of General Results

c'est plus facile de parler en anglais pour nous (soupir)
't's ca' easier for us to speak in English (sigh) (Fi 38)

si on parle en anglais tout le temps on*doi[v] um// on *doi[v]
ettoyer le tableau
'if we speak in English all the time we have to um / we
have to clean the blackboard' (Fi 35)

1. Overview

A preliminary analysis of the French immersion data reveals a total of 1112
communication strategies in the corpus. The number of strategies identified is
significantly smaller than the figures reported by studies in which direct elicitation
techniques were used; a similar observation made by Firth and Wagner (1997:327) of
their own interactional data (cf. Chapter 2, Part C, section 1.3). What is particularly
striking is not the relatively low number of observable strategies, but that the students do,
in fact, utilize a range of strategy types in the absence of direct elicitation and under
natural conditions, which shows that the phenomenon is 'real'.

Before discussing the usage patterns of each of the strategy types, it is necessary
to examine the overall token distribution of the strategies represented in the corpus.
Table 4-1 considers the raw frequencies of the four main strategy types: L1-based, L2-
based, Sociopragmatic, and Ambiguous. As originally hypothesized, L1-based strategies
are the most prevalent in the speech of these students and, in fact, represent over 60
percent of the total strategies used. Included among these strategies are language switch
and foreignization. With the exception of a very small percentage of ambiguous
strategies, i.e., cases that may involve the simultaneous use of L1-based and L2-based
strategies or the use of L3-based strategies, students use L2-based strategies the least
often (approximately 15 percent of total strategies identified), which includes word
coinage, the use of formal and semantic approximation and circumlocution.
Sociopragmatic strategies (e.g. appeal for assistance, message abandonment, mime)
represent nearly 24 percent of the total strategies used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-based</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopragmatic</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-based</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1. Summary of strategies identified in the French immersion corpus

Table 4-2 presents a breakdown of the raw frequencies obtained for each of the
strategy subtypes identified in the corpus. Cases of language switch clearly exceed the
use of other strategies by a substantial margin and represent more than half of the total
strategies used (N=611). Perhaps even more remarkable is the fact that language switch
represents 90% of the total L1-based strategies.
Table 4-2. Distribution of communication strategy subtypes identified in the French immersion corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy subtype</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language switch</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeal for assistance</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumlocution</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message abandonment</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreignization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mime</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word coinage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To briefly summarize, the preliminary results from the French immersion corpus display two general trends. First, one is much more likely to find the use of a language switch strategy incorporated into the speech of these students when lexical difficulties are encountered than any other strategy subtype. On the other hand, if one puts language switch aside, the general trend is for students to invoke certain sociopragmatic strategies. From a sociolinguistic point of view, this suggests that both the use of English and the interactional dynamics between student and interviewer may play a unique role in the communicative situation under study.

2. Examination of strategies identified in the corpus

This section profiles the usage patterns observed for each of the nine communication strategies identified in the corpus: language switch, foreignization, word coinage, approximation, circumlocution, appeal for assistance, interviewer influence, message abandonment, mime, and ambiguous strategies.
2.1 Language switch

The large number of language switch strategies identified in the corpus is comprised of two different types: the use of single lexical switches, i.e., which comprises one item (e.g. "skyscraper")\(^{19}\) and the use of complex code switches, i.e., which comprises more than one item (e.g. *nous ne voulons/ "get in trouble or nothing" we don't want to / get in trouble or nothing* [FI 10]). As indicated in Table 4-3, the use of single lexical switches occurs considerably more frequently than longer, more complex switches. The low number of complex code switches, as opposed to single lexical switches, is in line with the fact that these students are advanced second language learners of French. At this level, it may be less necessary for students to resort to language switch as a way of dealing with the difficulties of structuring complex sentences in the TL, as might be the case for less advanced students who still lack knowledge of fundamental grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single lexical switches</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex code switches</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, since the immersion students' vocabulary still remains somewhat limited, they will resort to language switch in order to plug various individual words into the discourse structure that are either unknown or unavailable in the TL. One possible explanation for the larger proportion of lexical switches is that students at this level may perceive the intermittent use of English lexical items to be less grave when talking to a
native speaker than the use of longer code switching based on a belief that, perhaps, a
greater degree of fluency would appear to be demonstrated in doing so. While beyond
the scope of this paper, it is also plausible that students may simply avoid complex
sentence structures in the TL because they anticipate an increase in the likelihood of
errors and want to avoid compounding the problem. Such a finding would be in line with
Harley and Swain's (1978) verb study results (cf. Chapter 2), where the French
immersion students in their sample tended to avoid constructions where the syntax of the
French verb was more structurally complex than in English and tended to opt instead for
simpler patterns that more closely approximated English syntax.

2.1.1 Language switch and linguistic environment

The reader will recall that the presence of disruption phenomena is an integral part of
identifying communication strategies, both for the interlocutor and the analyst, since they
effectively flag a lexical problem in the discourse, thereby suggesting that a
communication strategy is forthcoming (Wagner and Firth 1997:325). Table 4-4 outlines
the various disruption phenomena that are observed in the environments immediately
preceding and following language switch strategies.

---

19 Corpus extracts are always italicized. The use of double quotes indicates instances of language switch in the data. English translations of the data are indicated by single quotes.
### Table 4-4. Distribution of flagging among language switch strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Flagging</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple flags:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[(pre-strategy flagging)_ _&lt;LS&gt; (post-strategy flagging)]</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>ah oui le ah/ le ah/ euhh/ &lt;LS&gt; &quot;Christmas Eve&quot; &lt;/LS&gt;</em> ↑</td>
<td>'ah yes the ah / the ah / ahh / Christmas Eve ↑' (FI 37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single flag preceding &lt;LS&gt;:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[unfilled pause_ _&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[filled pause_ _&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition/false start_ _&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>j'aime écouter les ahm &lt;LS&gt; &quot;sound tracks&quot; &lt;/LS&gt;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I like to listen to um sound tracks' (FI 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-correction:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[&lt;/LS&gt;_ _&lt;SC&gt;]²⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| e.g. *c'était embarrassante parce que oui/ parce que mes/ mes* |
| <LS> "underwear" </LS> ↑ (rire) mes vêtements </SC> mes sous vêtements </SC> étaients exposés |
| 'it was embarrassing because yes / because my / my underwear ↑ (laugh) my clothes my underwear was showing' (FI 13) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of appeal for assistance</strong> [&lt;AA&gt; _&lt;LS&gt; _&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>j'ai une uh / une / comment c'qu'on dit &lt;LS&gt; &quot;pool&quot; &lt;/LS&gt;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I have a uh / a / how do you say pool' (FI 25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common flagging of language switch strategy usage is multi-disruption phenomena (N=375), i.e., various pauses and/or false starts/repetition preceding the language switch strategy, possibly in addition to a change in intonation that accompanies the actual utterance in English and/or subsequent metalinguistic commentary (i.e., of the

²⁰ This notation indicates the end of one strategy and the beginning of another.
'I don't know how to say X' sort). The range of positioning for flags serves different purposes *vis-à-vis* the actual strategy usage. On the one hand, a pre-strategy marker, such as pausing or false starts, signals to the interlocutor that a communication strategy is imminent, while a change in intonation marks the student's acknowledgement of the actual strategy usage and encourages feedback from the listener. A post-strategy marker, such as metalinguistic commentary by the student or self-correction following the use of the language switch, is one of the most explicit means by which to flag strategy usage, as it informs the interviewer of the specific lexical difficulty and the fact that the student is unsatisfied with the prior usage (cf. example 1).

(1) FI 17. *oh oui on échange les cadeaux le matin et puis on on* <V> voyageons </V> à / Belleville et Trenton pour voir mes cousines / qui sont là / et chaque/ <LS> "Boxing Day" </LS> ↑ <AA> je n'sais pas comment \le dire\ </AA> 'oh yes we exchange gifts in the morning and then we we ?travel to / Belleville and Trenton to see my cousins / who are there / and every / Boxing Day ↑ I don't know \how to say it\' I.

'le Lend'main de Noël'

'Boxing Day'

FI 17. *oui \<II> le Lend'main de Noel </II> nous allons ...' 'yes Boxing Day we go ...'

2.1.2 *Use of English"like"*

It was surmised that a wide variety of hesitation phenomena would be present in the context preceding a communication strategy and the previous section confirms this expectation. It was also predicted that the nature of some of the phenomena would be influenced by patterns of English discursive marking. This section discusses the use of *like*, with a primary interest in its occurrence in the context of a communication strategy.
There are 511 instances of English *like* in the French immersion corpus. It should be emphasized; first, in most cases, the students appear to use *like* in the same manner as it is used in spoken English, both syntactically and discursively. For example, the majority of instances of *like* in the immersion corpus occur in the post-verbal position, while the least number occur in the initial position (cf. Table 4-5), a similar finding made in Helt's (1997:100) study of *like* in spoken, informal English. Furthermore, most of the structures immediately following *like* in the corpus are nominal, another finding that parallels those of Helt (1997:165). Finally, with regard to the discursive similarities between the use of *like* in English and its use in L2 French, results reported in Rehner's (in progress) study (cf. Chapter 2, section 11.1) suggest that the use of *like* in the students' French fulfills, among other functions, similar intensifying and hedging functions that have been documented for use of *like* in informal, spoken English (cf. Helt 1997:27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in utterance</th>
<th>Structure immediately following <em>like</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Nominal 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding main verb</td>
<td>Verbal 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following main verb</td>
<td>Other 67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, there are 63 cases of *like* in the corpus whose functional qualities may be interpreted as being quite different from the core uses for *like* in L1 English. Consider for example, the following utterances:

(2) ... *mais tu sais que "like"/ euh c'est une *<LS>* "rumor" </*LS>*<br> '...but you know that like / ah it's a rumor' (FI 18)
j'ai essayé avec/ ahm "like" mon gauche et mon droit/ et je préfère mon droit
'I tried with / um like my left and my right / and I prefer my right'
(FI 14)

The main issue is whether both cases of like constitute communication strategies in the definitional sense used in the present study. It is proposed that neither case of like is a communication strategy proper, but rather, both are signals for some kind of collaborative interaction to indicate to the listener (and the analyst) that the L2 speaker is experiencing difficulty in planning his/her discourse in the TL and that the upcoming use of a communication strategy is possible as a means of overcoming the difficulty. The fact that a communication strategy is actually used in example (2), but not in example (3), is the key distinction between the two utterances. Arguably, both uses of like are suggestive of the speaker's attempts to gain time to find the correct TL wording. The difference is that in example (2), the hesitation leads to the production of a language switch strategy, presumably because the correct TL term for 'rumor' is still unavailable or simply unknown. In contrast, in example (3), while the use of like may signal a planning-related problem, there is obviously no production problem, since the student is able to retrieve the correct TL term.

2.1.2.1 "Like" as a communication strategy marker

There is support found for the proposal that like may serve as a form of hesitation in previous research on communication strategies (cf. Færch and Kasper 1983d) and corpus-based studies of informal English cf. Helt 1997; Schourup 1985). Similar to the reason posited for the presence of unfilled and filled pauses in an utterance, the

---

21 The student is referring to positioning her legs on a snowboard.
occurrence of lexicalized pauses in an utterance is also indicative of a speaker's attempt to
gain time in the midst of a retrieval problem, i.e., while s/he is in the process of searching
for a linguistic rule/item or perhaps even testing language hypotheses internally before
executing any of them (Færch and Kasper (1983d:216;224). Rehner (in progress), cites
Kerr-Barnes (1998) who suggests that the use of discursive like may be so frequent and
automatized in informal spoken English that it actually 'creeps' unbidden into the
students' L2 production. It is assumed that by this statement Kerr-Barnes (1998) did not
intend to imply that these unbidden uses are free of functional value, since such an
assumption would be contentious. While the use of like in informal spoken English
serves multiple discursive functions that will not be expanded upon in the present study
(cf. Helt 1997 for an overview), one description of its usage that is compatible with
Færch and Kasper's (1983d) general claim about lexicalized pauses comes from Schourup
(1985:42) who proposes that like serves the evincive purpose of connecting the speaker's
private world to the public world. In Schourup's (ibid.) opinion, like has the function of
marking "a possible discrepancy between what the speaker is about to say and what the
speaker feels ideally might or should be said". This reading applies in cases, among
others, where like serves the function of pausal interjection when it co-occurs with pauses
and/or false starts (ibid.; cf. Helt 1997:30) and thus, are possibly linked to problems in the
discourse planning phase.

There are 63 cases of like observed in the French immersion corpus that occur in
alongside various other hesitation phenomena, appear to be in the context of an encoding
problem and, thus, appear to fulfill an evincing function or stalling function described by
Schourup (1985) and Færch and Kasper (1983d). In each case, the use of like is
ultimately followed by a lexical communication strategy. Example (4), similar to example (1), illustrates the co-occurrence of like with hesitation phenomena preceding the language switch, and suggests that like serves as a lexicalized pause that, along with the other hesitation pauses, helps to indicate to the listener that a communication strategy is imminent, i.e., the speaker is aware that the appropriate TL word is unavailable and the use of the language switch, while perhaps not ideal, will serve in its place\textsuperscript{22}.

(4) *ils se battent pas/* "like" <LS> "rough" </LS> ↑

'they don't fight / like rough ↑' (FI 2)

Table 4-6 illustrates the various communication strategies that are cued by like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Proportion of strategy type</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;M&gt;]</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;FOR&gt;]</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;A&gt;]</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;AMB&gt;]</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;AB&gt;]</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the majority of uses of like in the corpus are not found in the context of a communication strategy in the definitional sense that is being used in this study, thus one

\textsuperscript{22} Bear in mind that this proposal does not preclude explanations for like offered in other research domains; in fact, in examples (3) and (4) it may be said that like serves a dual function: on the one hand, it functions discursively to intensify in (3) and to expand in (4), while on the other hand, it serves as a cue for the language switch strategy and, along with the various forms of hesitation, suggest that the student is experiencing some encoding problems as a result of not knowing the specifically required L2 term (Rehner, personal communication). The two interpretations of the data are, therefore, not mutually exclusive.
must assume that if planning problems existed, they were resolved by students' retrieving
the desired TL item, or simply that no problems existed in the first place.

2.1.2.2 Use of 'comme'  
Similar to the usage patterns for English *like*, there is use of French *comme* 'like' as a
means to alert the interlocutor to an upcoming language switch strategy (cf. example 5).

(5)  *Colombie Britannique c'était comme um <LS> "scenic" </LS> ↑
'British Columbia it was like um scenic ↑' (F1 19)

As with *like*, again, in most cases *comme* is not observed in the context of a lexical
strategy; however, as demonstrated in Table 4-7, there are a total of 87 cases where
*comme* does cue a strategy. A reasonable assumption may be that students have
transferred the discursive functions of *like* as a discourse marker in spoken English to
their use of *comme* in spoken French. While the use of *comme* is slightly more limited in
the strategies it is observed to cue than was found for *like*, overall it occurs more
frequently than *like*, suggesting that *comme* may substitute for English *like* when students
are attempting to be more conscious about using French during the interview. In other
words, *comme* would, presumably, be considered more appropriate than *like* in the
communicative situation at hand.
Table 4.7. Use of *comme* as a cue for an ensuing communication strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Proportion of strategy type</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;M&gt;]</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;A&gt;]</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;AB&gt;]</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ _&lt;FOR&gt;]</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3 *Language switch and embeddedness*

A frequent environment in which language switch is observed is within the context of an appeal for assistance strategy, where, in fact, 64 cases of language switch are embedded, representing over 50 percent of all appeal for assistance strategies. The presence of language switch embedded within an appeal for assistance entails the student explicitly asking the interviewer to supply the correct TL word (e.g. *comment est-ce qu'on dit* "ripped" 'how do you say "ripped"' [FI 28]). In line with the finding of a higher number of single lexical switches as compared to cases of complex language switch, 62 cases of an appeal for assistance involve the *comment est-ce qu'on dit X* 'how do you say X' pattern, where X constitutes a language switch (cf. example 6), while only three cases involve students asking the entire question in English (cf. example 7). It is surmised that students may have developed the habit of using the prefabricated pattern *comment est-ce qu'on dit X* 'how do you say X' in the classroom during their interactions with their teachers and such a lexical strategy may have, in a sense, fossilized. More evidence to support this claim is provided in section 2.6.
In addition to the evidence that language switch can be entrenched in another strategy; namely, appeal for assistance, the possibility for internal embeddness within the category itself can also be substantiated; in this case by what appears to be related to a process of foreignization (cf. section 2.2). This interaction of language switch and foreignization is illustrated when students modify a lexical switch to (partially) fit the morphophonemic rules of the TL. Thus, unlike clear cases of foreignization in which L1 words are phonologically adapted to 'sound French', here the pronunciation is English, but the suffixation is French (cf. examples 8-9). In 24 out of 88 possible cases, students omitted plural [-s], normally realized in English, to fit with French morphophonemics, where plural [-s], if present, would not be heard23.

\[ (8) \quad \text{les "rapper" 'rappers'} \quad (FI 12) \]

\[ (9) \quad \text{beaucoup de "portable" 'a lot of portables'} \quad (FI 14) \]

2.1.3.1 Language switch and interplay with other lexical strategies: the notion of strategy follow-up

One of the hypotheses investigated in this study is that (i) one strategy will immediately follow another when the student's aim is to prevent further risk for miscommunication or when the student has uncertainties about his/her use of the TL (cf. example 10) and that

\[ \text{This dual strategy usage may be connected with higher levels of TL proficiency. The formal manipulation appears to require a good working knowledge of TL rules and might be a reflection of overall fluency since such a strategy seems less conspicuous than the use of unmodified English words and hence, perhaps less disruptive. It would be interesting to investigate in future studies whether or not similar forms of English code switches obtain in the speech of native French speakers.} \]
(ii) language switch will be the primary means by which this follow-up is accomplished. In other words, when students become aware that the communicative situation involves a bilingual speaker, students may suspect that the use of language switch will be less risky than other strategies and hence, their best chance for successful communication when lexical problems are encountered or when they are uncertain about the correctness of their TL usage. There is also the possibility that students resort to language switch out of habit because this is what they have been doing in their classes with their immersion teachers.

(10) les deux [k] cours de CPO / and puis ahm // le [f] oui physique
     ↑<LS> "physics" </LS>
     'two OAC [k] courses / and then ahm // [f] yes physics ↑ physics' (Fl 15)²⁴

To address the first point of the hypothesis, it may be stated that cases of one strategy being used immediately after another for the purpose of clarification are, in fact, observed in the data and, as will be shown throughout the remainder of the chapter, some strategies fulfill this role more than others. As indicated in Table 4-8, language switch fulfills the task of clarification to prevent miscommunication in 8 cases and is found subsequent to a range of strategies; namely, word coinage approximation, circumlocution, and mime (cf. example 11). It is interesting to note that follow-up with language switch for the purpose of message clarification occurs most often after L2-based strategies.

²⁴ OAC stands for 'Ontario Academic Credit'. Students in Ontario must take six courses at this level, which is the equivalent of grade 13, in order to apply to universities in Canada.
Table 4-8. Distribution of language switch as follow-up strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For clarification of:</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-based strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-based strategies</td>
<td>[&lt;A&gt;_&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;C&gt;_&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;WC&gt;_&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopragmatic strategies</td>
<td>[&lt;M&gt;_&lt;LS&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtotal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following instances of correct TL referencing</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of language switch strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also indicated in Table 4-8 is the finding of 10 cases where language switch follows instances of correct TL usage. Several sociopragmatic functions may be attributed to this usage. First, the usage may serve as an acknowledgement of a student's uncertainty about their previous strategy usage and means to verify the interviewer's level of comprehension of the strategy and invite her feedback; i.e., the follow-up serves to clarify. On the other hand, as is the case of example (11), it may also be that the use of one single strategy was deemed inadequate given the cultural specificity for the concept that the student has in mind. In other words, the student may be aware that a second strategy is required in order to sufficiently bridge the gap between the message conveyed in French and the meaning of the specific English language concept that the student desires to convey. While the technical difficulty of translating terms was not explicitly treated in the study, there are several examples to suggest that strategy usage is affected by the students increased awareness of living in two cultures and thus, reflective of the
fact that they may be more cognizant of the conceptual difficulties in translation. Thus, if
the student intended to convey 'joking around', then *jeux* 'games' is inadequate. The
purpose of the language switch thus supplies a more precise and stylistically marked

term.

(11)  

\[<C>\text{c'est juste dans l'/ quand on parle on / on fait des / c'est juste comme des jeux et puis / des choses comme ça c'est / j'sais pas}\]  

\[</C> / <LS>\text{"joking around"}</LS>\]  

(rire)

'tit's just in the / when we talk we / we make these / it's just like these games and then / things like that it's / I don't know / joking around (laugh)' (FI 17)

The assumption that language switch would not be followed by a second strategy

was based on the interviewer's assumed bilingual status and the idea that students could
easily convey their message in English and, hence, follow-up would be unnecessary. On
the whole, language switch is not often followed by another strategy and therefore one
can presume that students are usually satisfied with conveying their messages in such a
manner. This finding is also explained by the idea that language switch may be a habit
that students have developed during interactions with their immersion teachers. There
are, however, 11 cases of circumlocution strategies following language switch (cf.
example 12) and 36 cases of appeal for assistance following language switch. When
circumlocution follows language switch it is proposed that it serves the purpose of
elaboration or detailing, as opposed to the strict sense of correcting the first strategy with
a second strategy. In the case below, the student switches to English; however, due to
his/her awareness of the term 'Kinesiology' as being very specialized (in either language),
s/he provides the interviewer, whose exact level of bilingualism is unknown, with a basic
definition.
When language switch is followed by appeal for assistance strategies, it is possible that students are treating the interview as a learning experience and wish the interviewer to provide the new vocabulary term so that they can 'learn' it. Alternatively, since the interview is being conducted in French, they may simply feel obligated to play the game in French and hence, compensate for their English by asking for the appropriate TL term (cf. example 13).

(12)  \textit{j'ai pris le cours de/ <LS> "Kinesiology" </LS> \textsuperscript{†}/ <C> c'est / comme / comment / le corps fonctionne des choses comme ça </C>  
'I took a course in / Kinesiology \textsuperscript{†} / it's / like / how / the body functions and things like that' (F1 15)

(13)  \textit{les enfants/ noirs et <LS> "Hispanic" </LS> / <AA> comment tu dis </AA>  
'Black / kids and Hispanic/ how do you say' (F1 35)

In light of these findings, a tentative conclusion regarding the use of two strategies. Four possible reasons are posited to account for why students follow up one strategy usage with another: (i) for the purpose of correcting one strategy with a second strategy (ii) due to awareness of translation difficulties of culturally specific concepts; and (iii) to demonstrate interest in correct TL usage and/or treat the interview session as a learning experience.

2.1.4 Language switch strategies versus unflagged non-TL uses

From a global perspective of the corpus, an interesting finding emerges when the lexical switch strategies are examined in relation to unflagged non-TL usages that resemble strategies, but do not fit the definitive communication strategy criteria followed in the present study. Upon examination of these unflagged cases, what is particularly striking is that nearly three quarters comprise function words, including "like", "well", "but", "ya",
and "so". With this said, the ratio of content words to function words among the unflagged cases is virtually the reverse of what obtained for the flagged cases (cf. Table 4-9). This suggests the possibility that students switch to English unintentionally with their use of function words. It support of this, Table 4-10 shows that almost twice as much self-correction is found among the total English content words as compared to total English function words in the corpus, although, still, overall, there is not a great deal of self-correction associated with content words, either.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-9.</th>
<th>Comparison of the ratio of content to function words among flagged and unflagged lexical switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical switch strategies</strong></td>
<td>N=538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content words</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function words</td>
<td>N= 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Unflagged non TL usage** | N=191 | 16.1% |
| content words | 995 | 83.9% |
| Total | N=1186 | 100 % |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-10.</th>
<th>Self-correction of English content words versus function words in the corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>%=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;SC&gt; and content words</td>
<td>32/729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;SC&gt; and function words</td>
<td>21/1017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.4.1 Unflagged use of English function words: connections to turn yielding and self-correction

In section 2.1.1, the presence of *like* in the environment of a language switch strategy was discussed and the claim was made that *like*, while, itself, unflagged appears in some cases to function as a form of hesitation that signals the use of a language switch strategy. Usage patterns of various other unflagged English function words observed in the
immersion corpus are also worth noting. For example, there are 60 cases of English "so" and 14 cases of "yeah" in sentence final position, which appear to serve the specific function of turn yielding (cf. examples 14 and 15) (for discussion of other uses of "so", cf. discussions in Chapter 2 and Rehner [in progress]).

(14) *probablement/ mais j'ai j'ai pas compris le livre non plus* "so" </TT>
    'probably / but I I didn't understand the book either so' (FI 4)

(15) *j'évalue ahm ahm les statistiques* "yeah" </TT>
    'I evaluate um um the statistics yeah' (FI 13)

Note that these usages are not associated with problematic discourse, since message abandonment (cf. section 2.8) is distinguished from turn yielding; however they are related to maintaining the flow of discourse. Thus, even though turn yielding is not traditionally included in a communication strategy typology, it is strategic in the sense that students can purposely use so or yeah, etc. to indicate when they have nothing further to add about a particular topic and, at the same time, still display an interest in continuing the discourse as a means to encourage the interviewer to proceed with a follow up statement or a new question. Table 4-11 shows that while learners make use of a variety of sentence final markers to indicate turn yielding in the TL (e.g. donc/ alors 'so', mais 'but', etc.), they also make use of L1 markers, though less frequently. Without neglecting the fact that the communicative situation under study is a semi-directed interview designed for the purpose of gathering students' responses to open-ended questions, one matter that would be pertinent for future study is an investigation of whether or not the amount of turn yielding by these students is augmented here as compared to other communicative situations between two participants.
Table 4-11. Distribution of turn yielding cues in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TL-based</th>
<th></th>
<th>L1-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>alors 'so'</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td><strong>&quot;so&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mais 'but'</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>donc 'so' (more formal than alors)</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ouais 'yeah'</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>&quot;yeah&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>352</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the use of English well in the data, three trends are observed: it is found in conjunction with other pauses (cf. example 16), possibly as an evincive marker, as it is typically referred to in the literature (cf. Helt 1997), similar to the use of like (Helt 1997:42); at the start of an utterance (cf. example 17), again, either as an evincive marker, i.e., to display a mild form of disagreement (cf. Burdine 2001) or as a response marker for achieving coherence (Helt 1997:42); and before a self-correction (cf. example 18).

(16) on doit avoir une/ ahm / "well" une certaine hem/ comment dit-on (voix basse) (rire)/ <M> "uh oh" </M>/ ahm on doit maintenir une certaine vitesse quand on/ fait du ski 'we must have a / um / well a certain um /how do you say (low voice) (laugh) uh oh / um we have to maintain a certain speed when we're / skiing' (F1 38)

(17) "Well" le français oui parc' que je je trouve les langues/ tellement intéressants mais l'anglais pas vraiment 'Well French yes because I I find languages / so interesting but not really English' (FI 11)

(18) j'espère que je le donnerais à les personnes qui ont besoin de ça / comme "well" ou me[z] les membres de ma famille je donnerais un peu pour chacun 'I hope that I would give it to people who need it / like well or my the members of my family I would give a little for each' (FI 11)
The French equivalents bien 'well' or ben (informal variant) as discourse markers are used very infrequently (N=3) by immersion speakers. Interestingly enough, however, one case in which the French equivalents are used involves indirect speech where the student is actually talking about the tendency for ben in the speech Parisian French speakers' (cf. example 19), thereby suggesting that even though students may understand how the TL equivalents function in the native speech, they have not adopted them into their own use of the TL.

(19) ma mère est allée hem au Paris quand elle était jeune/ et tout[t] les personnes <V> a <\V/> dit oh ben ben ben [bɛ]/ et c'était elle a pensé que les personnes ont dit de prendre un bain/ alors elle pensait pas que ils ont dit bien/ <TT> alors <\TT/> 'my mother went um to Paris when she was young / and everybody said oh well well well / and it was she thought that the people said to take a bath\(^{25}\) / so she didn't think that they said well / so' (FI 2)

2.1.4.2 Unflagged use of English content words

Turning now to how some of the unflagged English content words are used in the corpus, an interesting pattern observed among these cases is that they will occur subsequent to previously flagged cases for the same lexical item. In other words, in cases where a student uses an English lexical item repeatedly, the first case may be flagged as a communication strategy, but successive cases will occur without any flagging (cf. example 20). It may be that the speaker, not having received any feedback from the interviewer, feels that the item has been accepted and therefore feels confident in using it again. In example (20), both "cottage" and "skidooing" are marked initially by rising

\(^{25}\) The term ben [bɛ] 'well' is homophous with bain 'bath'.
intonation, but subsequent uses of these and related terms further along in the discourse are uttered free of any flagging. Bear in mind that his pattern is not categorical and some lexical switches are simply never flagged\textsuperscript{26}. Wagner and Firth (1997:338) suggest that in such cases where strategies develop non-flagged status, the participants may have viewed the strategies as "playing an insignificant role" in the discourse and "only if they become a key element for the process of meaning creation are they focused upon and 'flagged'" (ibid.).

(20)  line 58:  
\text{\textit{nous} <\textit{V}> \textit{veut} <\textit{V}> l[\textit{e}] \textit{aller au} <\textit{LS}> "cottage" <\textit{LS}> \uparrow / \textit{et nous} <\textit{V}> \textit{veut} <\textit{V}> \textit{faire de} <\textit{LS} "skidoogo" / <\textit{LS}> \uparrow \\
\text{we want to go to a cottage / and we want to go skidooing}\uparrow

line 59:  
\text{\textit{nous[z]} n'avons pas d'une <ULS> "cottage" </ULS> mais ahm/ ma mère/ son ami/ alors elle a elle a un <ULS> "cottage" </ULS> avec le <ULS> "skido" </ULS> \\
\text{we don't have a cottage but um / my mother / her friend / so she has she has a cottage with the skido}' (FI 2)

2.1.5 Language switch strategies and the interviewer

It was previously suggested that given the tendency for the French immersion students to rely so heavily on the use of language switch that English seems to occupy a unique place in the communicative situation at hand. Given students' assumptions that the interlocutor is a French/English bilingual, they may have the impression that they have unspoken consent to use English to overcome these difficulties, perhaps more so here than in other communicative situations or as would be the case with a monolingual native speaker of French. The opportunity for students to receive feedback from the interviewer and, at the

\textsuperscript{26} In the same vein, we also find cases of repeated\textit{flagged} use of the same English lexical switch. In such cases we might surmise that the speaker is still hesitant about the usage and thus continues to seek approval from the interviewer.
same time, verify her comprehension of these L1-based strategies may be additional
incentive to use them so freely. When the interviewer indicates that she has understood
the student's strategy, the message can be conveyed quite economically. Sometimes the
interviewer supplies the correct TL term, in spite of having already understood the
message as it was originally conveyed in English (cf. example 21).

(21) FI 13. ... c'est beau oui et um y a une une une bon <FOR> [vijy] </FOR> une <FOR> [vijy] </FOR> um haut um aux (rire) <SC> dans </SC> les montagnes si tu cours um // <LS> "up (rire) the mountain" </LS> ↑
'tit's beautiful yes and um there is a a a a good ?view a
?view um high um at the (laugh) in the mountains if you
run um // up (laugh) the mountain ↑'

1. Si tu montes oui
'if you go up yes'

FI 13. <II> Si tu montes </II> <SC> si je monte </SC> je peux je peux voir ahm le le rue de Saint le rue de non
<SC> le fleuve de St. Laurent </SC>
'if you go up if I go up I can I can see um the the street
St. the street no the St. Lawrence river'

If, on the other hand, the interviewer does not understand the strategy, the context
of the interview is such that it enables the interviewer to ask students for clarification.
Normally, the students will then provide additional information and, at the same time, can
verify the interviewer's comprehension until their intended message is conveyed and/or
the student and interviewer are both satisfied with the end result. Example (22) illustrates
some of the collaboration evidenced between the two parties in order to establish
appropriate lexical referencing; in this case when a TL term was unavailable to both the
interviewer and student, which leads the interviewer to paraphrase the intended meaning.  

(22) I. est-ce que tu es branché sur l'internet
'are you connected to the internet?'

FI 30. Oui et non / hem / je peux aller sur l'internet mais on n'a pas un / <AA> comment est-ce qu'on dit <LS> "browser"</LS> (rire) </AA>
'yes and no / ahm / I can get on the internet but we don't have a / how do you say browser (laugh)'

I. Euh le browser je ne sais pas (rire)/ non alors tu ne peux pas/ c'est limité disons OK
'Ah browser I don't know (laugh) / no so you can't / it's limited let's say okay'

FI 30. Oui
'yes'

Perhaps the best reassurance for a student that his/her lexical switch strategy was successful is if the interviewer herself reuses the English term in subsequent discourse.

Of the 39 cases of language switch found in the interviewer's speech, 67 percent (N=26) of them were uttered previously in the students' speech. Among other terms, they include: donut shop, cottage, and apprentice. In many instances the interviewer is back-channeling, i.e., simply extracting the terms from the student's response and repeating them while the student is still speaking, but in 8 cases the interviewer reuses the term in subsequent discourse and then follows up with the correct TL usage. For example, one student inserts the English term "witchcraft" at a moment during his/her discourse (j'ai lu un livre de le witchcraft" [FI 40] 'I read a witchcraft book'). In subsequent discourse, the

---

27 One might question whether it is justifiable to claim that a communicative problem really exists here, given that the native speaker cannot retrieve the correct TL term, either.
interviewer refers back to this concept, first by using appropriate TL terms (e.g. les histoires de sorcellerie 'stories of witchcraft'), however, within the same statement, she also defines the TL items by using the student's original English term (e.g. les histoires de sorcellerie la euh "witchcraft" [talking to FI 40]). The interviewer's reuse of students' lexical switches in such a way serves at least two communicative purposes. First, it serves as an explicit reaction to the students' use of the language switch strategy, which indicates that the interviewer understood it in the first place. This makes a connection with the students on a personal level, i.e., it demonstrates that their responses are important and she is paying close attention to them. Furthermore, given that some kind of TL structure tends to accompany the interviewer's reuse of the English terms, she is also providing new input for the students. This increases the possibility for students to treat the interview as a learning experience, whereby the proper TL term(s) could be incorporated into their speech during subsequent discourse.\(^2\)

As mentioned, 67% of the interviewer's use of language switch is influenced by the students' use of language switch; in most cases they are repetition of the English lexical switches the students make. Focusing now on the remaining one third of language switch cases observed in the interviewer's speech, they are, interestingly enough, almost totally comprised of school-related vocabulary: core French, extended French, March break, OAC, kindergarten, etc. In fact only in less than 5 cases does the interviewer

---

\(^2\) Not only does the interviewer maintain an astute awareness of the individual speakers' use of lexical switch, but she also appears to keep track of students' lexical switches, as evidenced by her carrying over some English terms from one interview to the next, often incorporating them into her questions, e.g. *tu fais aussi de la planche à neige* le "snowboard" 'you also do snowboarding / snowboard' (talking to FI 14).
switch to English under circumstances that do not entail her reusing the English words uttered by the students. In example (23), for instance, the interviewer appears to false start in French (i.e., [p] for premier'first') and then switches to English in order to ask the student which *Ace Ventura* movie s/he saw, *one* or *two*. The use of English here is likely related to the fact that the movie is in English and the student utters the title of the movie in English, therefore the interviewer is possibly visualizing the title as *Ace Ventura I* or *Ace Ventura II*. It is a bit unexpected to see that in spite of the interviewer's willingness to refer to the movie in English, the student, nevertheless, answers in French!

(23) I. *quel film*
    'which movie'
    FI 26. *ahm/ *"Ace Ventura"
    'um/ *Ace Ventura*'
    I. *ah oui le [p] quoi "one" "two" euh non*
    'oh yes the [f] what one two euh no'
    FI 26. *ah le deuxième*
    'ah the second'

2.1.6 *Language switch summary*

Based on the examination of the language switch data, one may conclude that language switch strategies are generally appealing to the French immersion students because (i) they are easy for students to retrieve, and thus, particularly economical in the discourse and (ii) once they confirm their assumptions that they are interacting with a bilingual interviewer and that these strategies will be comprehensible to her, students may perceive these strategies as having greater potential for success than other strategies. In other words, a near guaranteed accuracy of conveying the intended message, coupled with an ease of production, appears to make the use of language switch particularly inviting to students and consequently, they may view language switch as their best chance for
increasing the odds of fulfilling the overall communicative goal: speaking, being understood and actively maintaining the flow of dialogue.

In light of the finding of various lexical switches in the speech of the interviewer, it appears that English is an important characteristic of the communicative situation under study for both bilingual participants. Given the potential for communication to take place in both English and the TL during these interviews, one might surmise that while these same strategies would presumably not share the same level of success in other communicative situations, i.e., interactions with a monolingual speaker of French, the potential for an increased level of mutual exchange may be possible in the present situation at hand and students should, arguably, never find themselves in the face of a lexical misunderstanding in the TL that they cannot overcome by switching to English.

2.2 Foreignization

The second type of L1-based strategy identified in the corpus is foreignization. A total of 67 cases of foreignization obtain. A variety of disruption phenomena are observed to flag the foreignization strategies. Table 4-12 provides the distribution of flagging types among foreignization strategies. As can be seen, multiple disruption phenomena are most often observed to cue these strategies. This includes any combination of pauses, repetition and/or metalinguistic commentary prior to strategy use and rising intonation and/or metalinguistic commentary or self-correction following the strategy.
Table 4-12. Distribution of flagging among foreignization strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Flagging</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>%=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple flags:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[(pre-strategy flagging)_ &lt;FOR&gt; (post-strategy flagging)]</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. nous ne ouvrions pas le/ ahm présens[s] sur le jour de Noel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'we don't usually open the / um ?presents on Christmas Day' (FI 7) [cadeaux]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single flag preceding &lt;FOR&gt;:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition/false start_ &lt;FOR&gt;]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pausing_ &lt;FOR&gt;]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&quot;like&quot; _ &lt;FOR&gt;]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. elle a &quot;like&quot; &lt;FOR&gt; smacké &lt;/FOR&gt; le &lt;LS&gt; &quot;concrete&quot; &lt;/LS&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'she like smacked the concrete' (FI 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One finds repetition and false starts associated with foreignization strategies more so than with the language switch strategies (cf. example 24), which may suggest that students are more uncertain about using them.

(24) c'est beau oui et um il y a un un bon <FOR> [vijy] </FOR> un <FOR> [vijy] </FOR>
    'it's beautiful yes and um there is a a a good view a view' (FI 13)

2.2.1 Flagged foreignization strategy versus unflagged non-TL usage

The number of unflagged non-TL cases which resemble foreignization strategies is significantly greater than the number of flagged cases, as indicated in Table 4-13.

Table 4-13. Flagged cases of foreignization versus unflagged non-TL usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flagged</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unflagged</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, there is a large discrepancy between the use of deliberate, strategic foreignization, used for the purpose of overcoming a lexical difficulty, and use of a non-TL term that resembles foreignization. Note that approximately 15 percent (N=35) of the unflagged non-TL cases denote school-related concepts (cf. example 25), whereas the flagged foreignization strategies appear to reference a broader range of concepts. Furthermore, approximately 55 percent of the unflagged cases (N=127) involve the use of false cognates or faux amis (i.e., words which look alike, if not identical in L1 and L2, but which differ semantically), a pitfall in L2 learning that is rapidly brought to the attention of most every English-speaking student of French (and vice versa) (Wise 1997:89) (cf. example 26).

(25)  oui après <UF> la graduation </UF> ça va être comme notre grand cadeau
      'yes after graduation [la remise des diplômes] that's going to be like our big present' (FI 11)

(26)  ah oui il y a certaines / différences comme je pense comme les accents et / juste comme le mode de vie ça change le <UF> langage </UF> un peu
      'ah yes there are certain / differences like I think like accents and / just like the way of that changes language [la langue] a bit' (FI 12)

Two explanations for the divergence between flagged and unflagged cases are proposed. First, it could be that among these students there are particular lexical items that are simply accepted in this domain, hence the widespread use of terms such as classe (N=63) to denote 'course'²⁹. If this is an accurate assumption, then true immersionese, so to speak, appears to be largely characterized by anglicized forms and false friends.
Another possible explanation is that some of the unflagged cases that resemble foreignization are actually ingrained TL errors. Holmes (1977:523-524), referring to "the perennial phenomenon of the false cognate", lists several examples of false cognates that are typical of the spoken and written language of her L2 French students, many of which are duplicated in the French immersion data, including: avertissement (annonce/réclame) 'advertisement' (N=3); and caractère (personnage) 'character in book, play, etc.' (N=2). Further evidence to suggest that one is dealing with some ingrained TL errors among the unflagged cases is the finding of cases where students attempt to self-correct with what turns out to be a faux amis (N=5). In (27) the unsuccessful correction comes in response to a foreignization strategy, while in (28) the unsuccessful is in response to a language switch strategy.

(27)  \[ \text{mais} \text{ <LS> "actually" </LS> <OC> actuellement </OC> je pense que chum est universel} \]
\[ '\text{but actually }{\text{effectivement}}' \\ I \text{think }'\text{chum}'' \text{is universal}' \]
(FI 13)\(^{30}\)

(28)  \[ \text{c'est c'est plus facile à }\text{ <FOR> marquer </FOR> <OC> à correcter </OC> \}
\[ '\text{it's it's easier to / mark to }'\text{correct }[\text{corriger}]'' \]
(FI 40)

One has to assume that the usage in (27) and (28) is distinct from a case such as (29) below, where the student appears to be testing his/her hypothesis about shared cognate vocabulary between L1 and the TL; the rising intonation observed with the use of the

\(^{29}\) In standard French classe refers to a group of students in a course together or a room where a course is taught.

\(^{30}\) chum means 'boyfriend'
foreignized term suggestive that the student may be seeking approval of its use from the interviewer.

(29) FI 41. _je pense qu'ils ne / née ahm // <LS> "expect" <LS> ↑ / ils <<FOR> n'expectent <FOR> pas ↑
'I think that they don't / don't um // expect ↑/ they don't expect ↑' (FI 41)
I. _Ils s'attendent pas à \ce que\ les étudiants sont
'they don't expect \that\ the students are'
FI 41. \_**Oui par ce que les / étudiants // ils vont les ils vont nous entraincr**
'yes because the / students / they're going to train them they're going to train us'

Additional support of the distinction between clear cases of foreignization and cases that appear to be ingrained TL errors is the finding of self-correction (cf. example 30) or, in one case, unsuccessful correction (cf. example 31), as a response to foreignization (N=10). As was previously discussed with regard to language switch, such a reaction serves as a flag for the preceding strategic usage and demonstrates that the student is aware that the usage is problematic and is now in the position to provide what s/he feels is an appropriate TL term in its place.

(30) _Mais c'est très <FOR> expens[i]ve <FOR> / <SC> très cher ‘<\SC> ‘b ut it's very ?expensive (cher) / very expensive' (FI 12)

(31) _je veux aller prendre mo[n] // je veux aller prendre mo[n] um <FOR> license <FOR> ↑ (rire) <OC> Perme[t] de conduire <\OC> mais um / ma mère...
'I want to take my // I want to go take my um license ↑ (laugh) ?driver's permit but um / my mother...' (FI 19)

---

31 In this excerpt, FI 41 is talking about volunteering in a hospital where the staff does not yet expect the students to know all of the procedures.
Thus, unlike in (27) and (28), where students mistakenly use foreignization in an unsuccessful attempt to self-correct, in examples (30) and (31) the students follow up the foreignization with a correct TL usage, thereby acknowledging that the foreignization is, in fact, a problematic usage.

2.2.2 Interplay of foreignization and other lexical strategies

Foreignization is one type of strategy whose usage can be followed by the immediate use of other strategies for the purpose of clarification; however, in and of itself, is never used as a clarification device subsequent to other strategies. Eleven cases are found in which students follow up their use of a foreignization strategy with another strategy; namely, language switch, circumlocution or appeal for assistance, which lends support to the idea that students are aware in the production of speech of the potential risk for miscommunication that foreignization may cause. Table 4-14 shows the distribution of strategies in the contexts following foreignization. L2-based circumlocution follows foreignization most often. This entails students' attempts to provide more detail to ensure comprehension or perhaps to compensate for the foreignization, should it be perceived as a failure (cf. example 32).

(32)  
il <V> n'a </V> / pas beaucoup[p] de / de ah / um / de <FOR> damage </FOR> / sur / sur uh / elle et / <C> il n'avait pas des uh / os uh / battus uh frappés </C> / et seulement[t] uh / il était uh / blessé un peu  
he ?didn't have / a lot of/of ah / um / of ?damage / on / on uh / her and / he didn't have any uh / bones uh / beaten uh hit / and only uh / he was uh / hurt a little' (FI 36)
Table 4-14. Distribution of strategies following cases of foreignization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L1-based strategies</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[FOR_&lt;AA&gt; [&lt;LS&gt;] &lt;AA&gt;^32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L2-based strategies</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[FOR_&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sociopragmatic strategies</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[FOR_&lt;AA&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of foreignization strategies</strong></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociopragmatic strategies are also possible in contexts subsequent to foreignization and entail an appeal for assistance to the interviewer to provide the correct TL term, which the student can then incorporate into his/her own utterance (cf. example 33).

(33) FI 18. *il ahm* \<FOR\> *bless[e] <FOR> / ah non pas bless[e] he um ?blesses / ah no not ?blesses*

I. `bénit`
    `\blesses\`

FI 18. `<II> bénit </II> oui (rire) `blesses yes (laugh)`

2.2.3 Interviewer's reactions to foreignization strategies

Foreignization strategies are flagged in the students' speech, usually with multiple hesitation phenomena. Students then, either, independently overcome the lexical difficulty or, not having received any negative feedback from the interviewer, appear to at least feel confident in continuing with the discourse and do so. In the case of example (33) above, the student and interviewer conjointly overcome the lexical difficulty; the student foreignizes the English verb 'bless', modifying it to fit with French phonology and morphology, however, is unsatisfied with the strategy attempt. The interviewer corrects
the student, likely to prevent further miscommunication, since in the TL this same pronunication actually means 'hurt' (as shown in example [32]). This is the only instance where the interviewer explicitly addresses a foreignization strategy.

In light of this example, and the absence of any others, one might assume that the interviewer reacts to foreignization strategies specifically when the usage could potentially impede communication and is crucial to the intended message. The fact that the interviewer can (i) guess the intended meaning of bless[e] from the context and provide the correct TL term and (ii) does not react to false cognates such as classe or graduier fits with her assumed bilingual status and the idea that some foreignizations, particularly the school-related ones, are perhaps more understandable given the communicative context, which may support the claim that such words are generally accepted in the domain. Also in favor of this latter point is the fact that the interviewer, herself, uses classe(s) to denote 'course(s)' in 20 instances, although this usage is significantly less than her preferred use of standard French cour(s) (N=138).

2.2.4 Foreignization summary

Two explanations were proposed to account for unflagged cases of foreignization: (i) certain anglicized forms, particularly those which denote school-related concepts have gained unspoken acceptance in the domain of French immersion education and hence, are widely used and (ii) the use of certain false friends has become ingrained in French immersion students' speech and fossilization has occurred. These explanations are not

---

32 Cases of appeals for assistance that have embedded language switch strategies are included here in order to distinguish them from appeals for assistance that are completely L2-based.
mutually exclusive and there appears to be evidence to support both. With this said, it is concluded that while foreignization strategies are observed in the speech of the immersion students as a means to deal with lexical difficulty, overall this L1-based strategy is seldom used, particularly in comparison with language switch. In most cases, students and the interviewer appear to be unaffected by their use of anglicized forms, likely because the usage generally does not impede communication, hence the majority are unflagged in the discourse, i.e., an absence of disruption phenomena surrounding the usage indicates that it is not overtly strategic.

2.3 Word coinage

The examination of L2-based strategies begins here with word coinage. It is not only the L2-based strategy used least often, but also it is the most infrequently used lexical communication strategy overall in the immersion data, with a mere 6 occurrences. Table 4-15 shows that all instances of word coinage involve multiple flagging, where filled and unfilled pauses, repetition and metalinguistic commentary in the form of an appeal for assistance may all serve to alert the interlocutor to the ensuing strategy usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Flagging</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>%=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple flags:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[(pre-strategy flagging) _ &lt;WC&gt; (post-strategy flagging)]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| e.g. le vendredi uh// <WC> ! le vendredi bon </WC> <AA>
| je ne sais/ pas comment </AA>
| 'the the Friday uh // th' the ?Good Friday I don't / know how' (FI 36) [le vendredi saint] |    |    |
| Total                                                  | 6  | 100|
It was previously suggested that when the interviewer indicates that she understands the student's strategy, lexical reference can be established quite economically and that sometimes the interviewer may even supply the correct TL term, in spite of having already understood the message as it was originally conveyed (in English). If, on the other hand, the interviewer does not understand the strategy, the interviewer may ask for clarification, in which case students will normally begin to provide additional information and, at the same time, can verify the interviewer's comprehension until their intended message is conveyed and/or the student and interviewer are both satisfied with the end result. This is true of the one case of word coinage where it is the interviewer's search for clarification following the strategy that leads to discussion of the student's usage. In example (34) the student coins the term route de papier for 'paper route' (trajet de livraison in standard Canadian French):

(34) I. est-ce que tu travaille en même temps que tes études
'do you work during your studies'
FI 12. j'ai / <WC> un route de papier </WC>
'I have / a paper route'
I. qu'est-ce que c'est
'what is that'
FI 12. <C> comme je / je donne les <FOR> papiers </FOR> à
tout le monde...
'like I / I give the papers to everybody'
I. \ah d'accord\n'oh okay\'
FI 12. ... comme des / des petits annonces et toutes choses comme
ça <</C>
'like the / flyers and everything like that'
I. OK oui
'okay yes'
While, to the reader, it may appear to be a clear transfer from L1, from the interviewer's perspective it is vague enough to warrant a negotiation of meaning with the student and, accordingly, the interviewer asks for clarification of the term. Perhaps the interviewer is simply caught off guard by the word coinage in the first place, since this strategy is particularly infrequent among the students. Or, perhaps the interviewer does not equate 'paper route' with 'job' and therefore the context for such a usage was not established in her mind. While it is easy to speculate about the interviewer's reactions, *route de papier* is somewhat difficult since it is based on a direct translation from English plus has the added complexity of a foreignization with *papier* 'paper', which appears to derive from a translation of the English clipping of 'newspaper' but, nonetheless, is still completely unrelated to the French term for 'newspaper', *journal*. It is only after the student reuses *papier* in the context of *donner* 'to give' and then provides further detail of the types of things s/he delivers (i.e., *comme des/ des petits annonces*...\(^{33}\)) that the interviewer acknowledges comprehension of the student's intended message.

The concept of word coinage is arguably the most difficult of the three L2-based strategies as it necessitates a particular degree of lexical creativity which may take

\(^{33}\) Note that while the interviewer does not take issue of it, at least to the analyst, the student's use of *des petits annonces* is ambiguous. It is difficult to conclude with any certainty whether the student intended to convey 'classified ads' in an attempt to describe some of the standard components of a newspaper or if s/he is translating literally from English with the intention of conveying 'small ads' or 'flyers'. While the former would suggest that 'paper route' is being used in the traditional sense, the latter is not as clear, though it may be logical to assume that the meaning of 'paper route' has been extended to flyer distribution. The fact that the researcher, but not the interviewer takes issue with the use of *des petits annonces* illustrates an important point regarding the procedures followed in the present study in identifying communication strategies. While, to the analyst, hesitation phenomena seem to mark the onset of *des petits annonces* as a communication strategy, in this case the ambiguity of the usage, tied to the fact that the interviewer does not react to it, suggest otherwise. In other words, on this occasion the hesitation phenomena appear not to be "unambiguously related to a specific lexical item" (Wagner and Firth 1997:329). On the other hand, it is quite possible that the interviewer did not react to it simply because she felt that the student had struggled enough and it was time to proceed.
substantial effort because the output is based on L2-principles, though, obviously, 
influenced by a degree of literal translation from L1, as well. Aside from the idea that its 
usage may be unpopular because of this creative element, it may also be thought of as an 
elementary response to lexical difficulties, i.e., unsuitable for advanced L2 students or, 
quite simply, viewed as an inefficient use of L1 resources.

2.3.1 Word coinage and interplay with other lexical strategies

Two discoveries among the word coinage strategies that differ from observations made 
regarding the other strategies examined thus far include: (i) no instances of unflagged 
usage that resembled word coinage found in the data and (ii) every instance of word 
coinage is followed by another strategy usage, either circumlocution or an appeal for 
assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-16. Distribution of strategies following word coinage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1-based strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2-based strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![WC]_&lt;C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociopragmatic strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![WC]_&lt;AA&gt;³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of word coinage strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-16 illustrates the distribution of strategies following word coinage. The 
reader will recall that up until this point in the analysis, none of the strategy types has

³⁴ This row does not include the one appeal for clarification from the interviewer regarding route de papier.
been categorically followed by another strategy; strategies found subsequent to language switch were identified in approximately 8 percent of all cases, though not necessarily for the strict purpose of clarification (cf. section 2.1.3.1), while strategies following foreignization were found in approximately 15 percent of all cases (cf. Table 4-14). This differentiation implies an emergence of a continuum among lexical communication strategies (cf. Figure 4-2) that suggests the frequency of a strategy is reflective of the level of its potential risk for impeding communication: the greater this potential, the more likely that students will follow up with another (less risky) strategy in order to prevent further miscommunication and, ultimately, convey the intended message. The findings thus far have suggested that at one extreme of the continuum is word coinage, the most infrequently used strategy and perhaps most risky in the communicative context under study, hence the need for follow up to clarify every instance. Use of this strategy also involves a substantial amount of effort, given the potential lexical creativity involved, and this effort is required both by the student and the interviewer. On the other extreme end of the continuum is language switch, the most frequently used strategy, and perhaps the least risky strategy for the context under study, and hence, one finds the least amount of follow-up. The notion of a strategy continuum based on frequency and amount of follow-up will be referred to again further along in the discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word coinage</th>
<th>foreignization</th>
<th>language switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>least frequent</td>
<td>most frequent</td>
<td>least risky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most effort required</td>
<td>least effort required</td>
<td>least risky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most risky</td>
<td>most effort required</td>
<td>less need for follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more need for follow-up</td>
<td>most frequent</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-2.** Emergence of a strategy continuum based on frequency and amount of follow-up

2.3.2 *Interviewer's reactions to word coinage strategies*

There is no explicit reaction from the interviewer concerning word coinage strategies beyond the one case described above in example (34) in which she asks for clarification; thus students are primarily the participants who acknowledge the lexical difficulty addressed via word coinage. Given that students always follow up word coinage with an additional strategy, it is presumed that all of the necessary information required to understand the usage is conveyed in that subsequent discourse, thereby reducing, if not eliminating the interviewer's need to pursue it any further\(^{35}\).

2.4 *Approximation*

There are 42 cases of approximation identified in the immersion data. Table 4-17 outlines the distribution of flagging among these strategies. Following the pattern seen

---

\(^{35}\) Since word coinage strategies involve a degree of literal translation from English and thus appear to overlap somewhat into the realm of L1-based strategies, we could also speculate that in most cases the bilingual interviewer simply understands the usage. On the other hand, since we are dealing with communication in the context of a semi-natural setting, there is always the possibility that the interviewer simply does not react to some strategies; however, if this is the case then, perhaps, it is even more interesting to examine those instances in which she does react, as we have tried to do here.
consistently so far, approximation is most often cued by a variety of disruption phenomena. Note, however, that as far as post-strategy marking is concerned, none of the cases of approximation are followed by metalinguistic commentary, an unprecedented finding among the other strategies examined thus far.

Table 4-17. Distribution of flagging among approximation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Flagging</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>%=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple flags:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[(pre-strategy flagging) &lt;A&gt; (post-strategy flagging)]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>au &quot;cottage&quot; il n'y a pas/ hem/ de &lt;A&gt; chauffeur ↑ /&lt;/A&gt;</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'at the cottage there isn't / um / a ?heater (chauffage) ↑ (FI 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single flag preceding &lt;A&gt;:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pausing_&lt;A&gt;]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition_&lt;A&gt;]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. <em>ma mère déteste l'idée de / d'avoir un chien a la maison parc'que um &lt;A&gt; le déménager &lt;/A&gt; &lt;AB&gt; tous les/ &quot;ya&quot; &lt;/AB&gt;</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'my mother hates the idea of / of having a dog at home because um the ?move all the / ya' (FI 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 42 | 100 |

2.4.1 *Formal approximation versus Semantic approximation*

There are two types of approximation strategies identified in the corpus: formal approximation and semantic approximation. Formal approximation entails students' attempts to approximate the phonological and/or morphological structure of a TL word, while semantic approximation entails students' use of a superordinate form for a subordinate form or one term in place of a semantically-related term. Each of these is described below.
Students' use of phonological approximation (N=19) seems to coincide with the belief that if the speaker is able to provide a portion of the intended TL term (e.g. the first syllable or first word of a compound structure), then there is a decent chance that the listener will be able to guess the correct term from the discursive context (cf. example 35). Thus, in most instances students provide portions of the intended TL word and, based on the context, the interviewer is able to successfully fill in the blanks.

\[(35)\] FI 18. \textit{son ahm/ [mys] / les}
\[\text{'his um / mus' / the}\]
\[\text{I.} \quad \text{les muscles [myskl]}
\[\text{'muscles'}\]

In some cases, there is the impression that students may have had more opportunity to see the word in print, as opposed to hearing it spoken. For example in (36), the student demonstrates some knowledge of the compound structure \textit{coup\textsuperscript{e} de poing /pwE~/}, 'punches', but obviously has a lack of the specifics which leads to a mispronunciation\(^{36}\).

\[(36)\] \textit{tous les <UA> pratiqueurs </UA> de Tai Kwan Do ahm <V> apprend </V> \textit{m\textsuperscript{e}thodes de bloquer les les <LS> "kicks" </LS> ou les les ahm //les "something" de poing [p\textsubscript{In}]
\[\text{'all the ?practitioners of Tai Kwan Do ahm learn methods of blocking the the kicks or the the um // punches'}\] (FI 13)

Morphological approximation (N=20) involves the substitution of one part of speech for another (e.g. verbal form for nominal, adjectival for adverbial, etc.) or the

\(^{36}\) Previously in the utterance the student has difficulty finding the TL word for "kicks" (\textit{coup\textsuperscript{e} de pied}) and therefore resorts to a language switch strategy. Since this compound structure obviously resembles the approximative structure in question, it is uncertain whether the student intends to say 'kicks or punches' or if s/he is confusing \textit{coup\textsuperscript{e} de poing} 'punches' with \textit{coup\textsuperscript{e} de pied} 'kicks' in an attempt to follow up the language switch usage "kicks" with an L2-based strategy.
application of inaccurate derivational TL morphology (e.g. *chauff-eur* for *chauff-age* 'heater'). Table 4-18 shows the distribution of types of morphological approximation strategies observed in the data. It appears that students (i) rely on their knowledge of verb forms to approximate unknown TL structures more than fifty percent of the time and (ii) according to this distribution these unknown TL structures are typically nouns and adjectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitution of part of speech</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V for N</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V for Adj</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj for N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N for Adj</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj for Adv</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inaccurate suffixation</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                          | 19 |

With regards to the few cases of inaccurate suffixation, though the numbers are small, it is interesting to note that in 2 out of the 5 cases students applied the suffix *-eur*. This reflects students' awareness of this suffix as a derivational morpheme used in the formation of nouns. The choice of *-eur* over any other suffix, if not the correct one, is strategic in its own sense; the students knew the root of the intended target form and simply applied the nominal suffix they felt would have the best odds for being correct.

There is very little evidence of semantic approximation in the data and only three instances obtain. In example (37) the student is able to convey the general idea using the TL by referring to *oiseau* 'bird', but then strategically resorts to English as a follow-up by
which to provide more information and specify the kind of bird, in this case, a 'hawk' (un faucon).

(37) ils ont un ois' un oiseau et c'est ah <AA> comment est-ce qu'on dit <LS> "haw" 'they have a bir' a bird and it's ah how do you say hawk' (FI 28)

In example (38), the student, unable to find the TL equivalent for the location of the event 'apple orchard' (un verger), strategically supplies a semantically-related term; in this case for the source of the fruit pommier 'apple tree'.

(38) <C> il' ont allé à un/ place de // pommes ↑ </C>/ <A> un pommier <</A> 'they went to a / place for // apples ↑ / an apple tree' (FI 21)

Finally, in example (39), which is slightly different from the previous, the student resorts to a superordinate term singe 'monkey' after his/her use of the subordinate term orang-outang 'orangutan', suggesting a certain level of comfort associated with knowledge of the basic level term, but uncertainty about higher level terms.

(39) uuh c'était une/ une // orang-outang ↑ / <A> une / singe </A> / qui a / il a ah / mangé quelque chose 'uuh it was an / an // orangutan ↑ / a / monkey / who had / he had uh / eaten something' (FI 36)

2.4.2 Approximation and interplay with other lexical strategies

Table 4-19 shows that in response to an approximation strategy, students will most likely appeal to the interviewer for assistance (cf. example 40). What is not reflected in the table is that in 22 percent of approximation cases the interviewer automatically provides

37 Note that this is the only case in which approximation follows another strategy in an attempt to clarify.
the correct TL usage, without being asked for it. This suggests that approximation strategies are associated, to a certain degree, with sociopragmatic strategies. It was suggested in Chapter 3 that the boundaries between strategy types are often unclear. In the case of approximation, students can remain in the TL to a certain extent, however the interviewer must rely for a large part on the context in order to figure out the students' intended meaning, which requires a certain heightened level of participation on her part, in order to help ensure that the intended message gets conveyed and that communication is not impeded.

(40) FI 10. *le mois de mon fête de mon/anniversaire / <A> le frévi/ frévier[r] / frévia* </A>
'the month of my party of my / birthday / [frev] [frevrier]
[frevria]' I. frévier†
'February †'
FI 10. </II> frévier </II>
'February'

Table 4-19. Distribution of strategies following cases of approximation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L1-based strategies</em></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L2-based strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/A&gt; _ &lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/A&gt; _ &lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sociopragmatic strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/A&gt; _ &lt;AB&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of approximation strategies</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, it is interesting to consider the overall picture of approximation in relation to other strategies, particularly in light of the proposal made in section 2.3.1 about the possible existence of a continuum among the strategies examined thus far which links
frequency, level of perceived risk associated with a strategy and the amount of follow-up found subsequent to that strategy for the purpose of clarification. Adding approximation to this continuum lends further support to this proposed relationship between the strategies examined thus far and, as can be seen in Table 4-20, under these terms its usage falls about midway between word coinage and foreignization. In other words, so far it appears that the L2-based strategies are considered most risky, based on their level of frequency and amount of follow-up found in subsequent contexts.

| Table 4-20. Approximation and the proposed strategy continuum<sup>38</sup> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                 | Strategy type | % of total strategies in corpus | % strategy is followed by another strategy* |
| least frequent                  | <WC>          | 0.5                        | 100                                      |
| most effort req'd               | <A>           | 3.8                        | 19                                       |
| most risky                      |               |                            |                                          |
| more need for follow-up         | <FOR>         | 6.0                        | 13                                       |
| most frequent                   | <LS>          | 55.0                       | 8                                        |
| least effort req'd               |               |                            |                                          |
| least risky                     |               |                            |                                          |
| less need for follow-up         |               |                            |                                          |

*rounded to nearest whole number

<sup>38</sup> The orientation of the scale has changed from the horizontal view in Figure 4-2 to a vertical view to accommodate the number of strategies and the full names of strategies have been replaced by the corpus tagging labels.
2.5 Circumlocution

There are 118 cases of circumlocution identified in the immersion students' speech.

The basis for circumlocution strategies involves the speaker's implicit invitation to the interlocutor to engage him/her in a joint search for the appropriate TL word. In some cases in the immersion data the interviewer's participation in this collaborative search for a TL term is very apparent. For example, in excerpt (41) the interviewer makes several guesses as to the student's intended TL term and eventually the student's continued attempts at description brings the correct word to the interviewer's mind. The interviewer verbalizes the term and it is accepted and subsequently used by the student.

(41) FI 16. un fois je l'ai téléphoné à mon ami et j'avais j'avais dit que que son chat était ahm mon mon um comme / ah 'once I called [*him] my friend and I had said that that his cat was um my my um like / ah'
I. dans le balcon non?
'on the balcony no?'
FI 16. ah non comme
'ah no like'
I. sur ton toit
'on your roof?'
FI 16. ahm non <C> c'était autour de la de la maison ↑ ahm comme pour diviser les um les terres de chaque maison/ les <C>
'um no it was around the the house ↑ um like to divide the um the lands of each house / the'
I. ah d'accord la barrière de la maison
'ah okay the fence of the house'
FI 16. Oui oui et ah j'avais <V> sais <V> <SC> j'avais ahm su <</SC> que / il n'a pas un chat donc il ne sait pas ah ah qui que j'étais il il avait [s] dit il n'a pas un chat et donc je l'ai dit que je n'ai pas un <II> barrière <</II> (rire)
'yes yes and ah I had know I had um known that / he doesn't have a cat so he doesn't know ah ah who [*that] I was he he had said he doesn't have a cat and so I told him that I don't have a a fence (laugh)'
In contrast, the use of circumlocution, and the long-windedness that it can often entail, may also appear much less interactive and the excerpt below in (42) is one example of this kind of usage. What is particularly noticeable in this case is how the interviewer is able to summarize the student's rambling message (regarding pranks played on teachers) in one short paraphrase:

(42) FI 33. *Non/ je ne fais pas/ aux professeurs/ je pense que c'est stupide/ si il/ il est confortable/ je l'/je le fais [m] / mais pas/ comme je je// je n'aime pas alors je fais ça à lui
   'no / I don't do [that] / to teachers / I think that it's stupid / if he / he is comfortable / I / I do it b' / but not / like I I / don't like (him) so I do that to him'

I. pas pour être méchante juste pour s'amuser
   'not to be mean just for fun'

Thus, while, perhaps, we cannot be certain that the student is experiencing a lexical problem, i.e., we do not know if s/he is searching for the term 'mean' or 'unkind', the example does suggest that students may lack some paraphrasing skills.

2.5.1 *Circumlocution and interplay with other lexical strategies*

Table 4-21 indicates that circumlocution is used 27 times in response to a previous strategy usage:
Table 4-21. Distribution of circumlocution as follow up strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L1-based strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/LS&gt;_&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/FOR&gt;_&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L2-based strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/WC&gt;_&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/A&gt;_&lt;C&gt;]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sociopragmatic strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of circumlocution strategies</strong></td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the most interesting cases are those in which circumlocution is found in close proximity to language switch, and vice versa (cf. examples 43 and 44; cf. also example 11).

(43) *<LS> "Boxing Day" </LS> / <C> le jour après le Noël </C>*
    'Boxing Day ↑ / the day after Christmas' (FI39)

(44) *notre équipe fait le <LS> "fundraising" </LS> / <C> pour l'argent </C>*
    'our team does fundraising / for money' (FI 1)

While there is not a great deal of cases like these (N=21), they are interesting for several reasons. It was suggested earlier that students may be sensitive to the fact that they are living in two cultures and, consequently, are gaining awareness of the conceptual difficulties involved in translating from English to French. The concepts of 'Boxing Day' and 'fundraising', for example, may be so decidedly 'English', that students feel that they need to use French to point out the cultural specificity. In other words, if a term is well-conventionalized in L1, it is understandable for students to simply switch to L1 to express its meaning, rather than coin a new word, for example. The question really becomes whether or not students' use of "Boxing Day" or "fundraising" should really be seen as
problematic, since they are conceptual problems for society and how the students are
dealing with the issue is not different from how native TL speakers would likely deal
with the it. It is thus suspected that the use of circumlocution as a follow up strategy is
not intended for the purpose of clarification, but rather as a means by which students can
compensate for the conceptual difficulties of translation.

It is interesting to find that circumlocution (N=13) is used more often than
language switch (N=8) as a general follow-up strategy (i.e., for the purpose of clarifying
or correcting a previous strategy). Although the difference is marginal, this finding was
unanticipated and does shed some light on the issues alluded to in section 2.1.2. Recall
that the hypothesis statement that language switch would be the strategy used most often
as a follow up to previous strategies was initially called into question, in light of the
unexpectedly small number of language switch strategies found subsequent to other
strategies. Bearing in mind that the amount of follow-up we are finding in the data, in
general, is not all that frequent, it would still appear that the hypothesis has now been
disconfirmed, since, when a strategy goes awry and clarification is attempted, students
are more apt to describe or exemplify what is meant by their intended message via
circumlocution strategies, rather than resort to language switch strategies.

Circumlocution, itself, may be followed by another strategy; however, it is
uncommon. In two cases language switch is observed to follow circumlocution. As can
be seen in example (45), the usage appears to be due either to students' uncertainty about
their TL usage or for clarification purposes. In two separate cases, message abandonment
follows circumlocution. In example (46) the speaker is having trouble finding the TL
words for 'mechanic' (méchanicien) and consequently resorts to circumlocution, however
she cannot complete her description (she appears to be missing the TL term for 'garage'), hence she abandons the sentence and waits for the interviewer to resume the dialogue (cf. section 2.8 for more details about message abandonment strategies).

(45)  &lt;C&gt; c'est un peu comme les les émissions que tu regardes au milieu de jour &lt;/C&gt;/ les &lt;LS&gt; "soap operas" &lt;/LS&gt; (rire)
     'it's a little like the the shows that you watch in the middle of the day / soap operas (laugh)' (FI 11)

(46)  &lt;C&gt; il ahm travaille avec les autos &lt;AB&gt; il a son propre // &lt;/AB&gt; &lt;/C&gt;
     'he um works with cars / he has his own // (FI 18)

It should be emphasized that circumlocution and language switch are the only two strategy types examined thus far that can both precede and succeed other strategies. The difference between the patterning of language switch and circumlocution in these roles is that unlike circumlocution, which may be clarified by a follow up strategy, language switch is never followed by another strategy for the purpose of clarification. Bearing this in mind, we see that the addition of circumlocution to the proposed continuum still allows for consistency in terms of maintaining the link between total frequency, level of perceived risk and amount of follow up for clarification purposes: the more frequent the strategy, the lower the perceived risk, hence the lesser the need for follow up for the purpose of clarification (cf. Table 4-22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>% of total strategies in corpus</th>
<th>% strategy is followed by another usage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest whole number

Notice in Table 4-23 that an increase or decrease in the amount of follow up that a strategy provides (i.e., the percentage a strategy follows another usage) fits with the expectation that word coinage would not be used as follow-up for another strategy, since it is the most risky. While it was originally surmised that language switch would provide the most follow up, at this point in the analysis we see that, in fact, circumlocution provides more follow up than language switch, albeit for different reasons. What was unpredicted was that the immersion students would use such a strategy almost twice as often as language switch in response to previous strategy usage.
Table 4-23.  Circumlocution and strategies providing follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>% strategy is follows another usage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest whole number

2.5.1.1 Circumlocution and embeddedness

Given that circumlocution strategies usually entail lengthy stretches of language it is possible that other strategies may be embedded within them, but in actuality, this is an infrequent phenomenon and only a small proportion of circumlocution strategies are affected. Table 4-24 indicates that language switch is most typically embedded within a circumlocution strategy, but message abandonment, approximation, ambiguous strategy use and mime are also found within the context of a circumlocution strategy.
Table 4-24. Strategies embedded within circumlocution strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Proportion of circumlocution strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AB&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AMB&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;M&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatively, circumlocution strategies may be embedded in another strategy however, the only context in which this occurs is within an appeal for assistance strategy. There are 6 cases of circumlocution embedded within an appeal for assistance found in the corpus. As shown in the example below, the student is searching for the appropriate term for 'bachelor's degree':

(47)  <AA> qu'est-ce que c'est/ <C> le/ le quatre années avant l'école de médecin </C> </AA>
'what is the / the four years before medical school' (FI 39)

2.5.2 Circumlocution in the interviewer's speech

We depart for a moment from L2 communication strategies to some informal observations made of the interviewer's speech and see that she resorts to circumlocution several times, specifically as a means to rephrase a question because the student has indicated that s/he did not understand a particular lexical item stated in it. In other words, with the exception of example (22) in section 2.1.5, where the interviewer could not provide the student with the TL term for 'browser' and resorted to describing the circumstances (e.g. c'est limité, disons 'it's limited, let's say'), the interviewer is not normally observed to use circumlocution as a means to overcome her own lexical retrieval problems in the way that has been shown for the L2 speakers, but rather, as a
paraphrasing tool to facilitate the students' L2 understanding (N=9). Consider the following three examples, where, in each, the student questions a lexical item in the interviewer's speech, to which the interviewer responds with a paraphrase of its definition in the TL:

(48) I.  *est-ce que tu vas te considérer comme bilingue quand tu vas sortir de secondaire?*
    'are you going to consider yourself as bilingual when you leave high school?'
F1 23.  *ahm une bilingue?*
    'um a bilingual?'
I.  *tu vas être bilingue tu vas bien avoir les deux langues*
    'you're going to be bilingual you're going to really have two languages'

(49) I.  *tu es bon en informatique des choses comme ça?*
    'you're good in computers things like that?'
F1 26.  *en quoi?*
    'in what?'
I.  *en informatique la science d'ordinateurs ça va bien?*
    'in computers computer science that goes well?

(50) I.  *si tu avais la possibilité est-ce que tu aimerais voyager à l'étranger?*
    'if you had the possibility would you travel abroad?'
F1 34.  *ahm// voyager où?*
    'um // travel where?'
I.  *à l'étranger ailleurs dans un autre pays*
    'abroad elsewhere in another country'

In light of these examples, it would appear that, similar to the students, the interviewer also appears to have both English-based strategies and French-based strategies at her disposal. It will be recalled that in earlier discussion (cf. section 2.1.5), examples were provided in which the interviewer used English lexical items in her questions or reused the various English lexical items that students had uttered in previous discourse. In
contrast, we see here that she is committed to using the TL to convey her intended message to the students.

2.6 Ambiguous strategies

There are a total of 7 strategies in the corpus assigned to this category; not because they ambiguous for the students, but rather, for the analyst, in terms of their linguistic origin. On one hand, the 7 usages could be characterized as evidence of transfer from a third language and, therefore, reflective of the linguistic diversity of the students under study and the fact that approximately half come from homes where neither English nor French is spoken, but a third language. On the other hand, in some cases, it is difficult to rule out the influence of English and/or French, and, perhaps, some instances could even be justifiably assigned to one of the L1 or L2-based strategy categories. Use of an 'ambiguous' category in this study, however, underscores the fact that the business of characterizing the source of a strategy or the processes involved in the implementation of a strategy is not always a straightforward affair and the core categories found in most strategy typologies may be inadequate for certain speaker groups. Given the possibility of L3 influence in the speech of these students and the fact that previous studies performed on this immersion corpus have found that the linguistic behavior of speakers of a third language at home is reportedly quite different from that of their English-only at home counterparts (cf. section 11 in Chapter 2), it was felt important that an independent category be included in the typology to account for this. The examples below illustrate the kinds of ambiguity at issue:
(51) C'est une / une // <AMB> une mal// for[tS]om / une malfortion um / une mal / fortu </AMB>
    'it's a / a // a ?mis/ fortune / a ?misfortune um / a ?mis/ fortune [une malchance]' (FI 36)

(52) ma sœur va // hem // <AMB> laborer ↦ </AMB>
    'my sister is going // um // to ?work ↦[travailler]' (FI 22)

(53) je ne peux pas compren[d] des /<AMB> la gramma[ti[k] ↦-aux-ale].</AMB>
    I can't understand the / the ?grammar [la grammaire]' (FI 32)

In (51) the student's use of the prefix mal- is correct in the TL, however the root fortion, and variants of this, could be interpreted as foreignization. On the other hand, it could also be a case of influence from a Romance language, i.e., Italian ('misfortuna') or Spanish ('desafortunado'). In example (52), it is uncertain whether the strategies are influenced by L1-transfer or transfer from L2 or L3. If L1-based, it could be a foreignization of English 'to labor' in place of travailler 'to work', albeit a rather formal one. If L2-based, it could be that the student knows the adjective laborieux (-euse) 'laborious', so laborer is his/her attempt to derivatize a verb. Alternatively, the usage could be L3-based, transferred from Spanish or Italian laborer 'to work'. Finally, in (53), it may be that the student is attempting an approximation strategy, based on the adjective grammatica[k] -aux-ale. Or, it is possible that the form is based on principles from a Slavic language, i.e., 'grammatika'.

To briefly conclude this section, such examples lead one to suspect that L3-based strategies are an option to many of the 41 speakers, but, in actuality, this option is exercised only very rarely. The low usage makes sense given the high level of risk for
miscommunication that would be associated with an L3-based strategy (cf. Chapter 5 for more discussion).

2.7 Appeal for assistance

We turn now to a discussion of the sociopragmatic strategies identified in the corpus, beginning with appeal for assistance strategies. There are a total of 143 appeals for assistance in the corpus that are related to lexical problems alone. These strategies are generally flagged in a traditional way, i.e., they are preceded by disruption phenomena such as pausing and repetition; however, the fact that an appeal for assistance strategy requires that students directly (or indirectly) address the interviewer means that they are inherently interactive and therefore do not actually need to be forcibly cued or publicized in the discourse, as is the case with other strategies that have been examined thus far.

Four interrogative structures are distinguished among the appeal for assistance strategies. Table 4-25 illustrates the various forms of the strategy and how often they occur in the corpus. In terms of the level of explicitness attached to a student's appeal for assistance, the frequent *comment est-ce qu'on dit X* 'how do you say X?' structure, and variants of it which also involve straightforward questioning (e.g. *comment se dit X* 'how is X said?'), are considered direct appeals for assistance, whereas other forms, as we will see, are expressed less explicitly. Essentially, however, the purpose for all appeals for assistance is to ask the interviewer to provide the appropriate TL term, presumably because the item is not yet part of the IL or is momentarily forgotten. The four types of appeal for assistance strategies are described below.
Table 4-25. Linguistic structure of appeal for assistance strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Basic structure:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct appeal</td>
<td><em>comment est-ce qu'on dit X?</em> (where X = &lt;LS&gt; 62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'how do you say X?' (where X = &lt;C&gt; 6)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic commentary</td>
<td><em>X je sais pas comment le dire en français</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'X, I don't know how to say it in French'</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect appeal</td>
<td>i.e., implicit appeal, implied by rising intonation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock appeal</td>
<td>i.e., speaker does not expect a response from the interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As briefly discussed in section 2.1.3, a large proportion of students’ direct appeals for assistance embed a language switch (N=62), while only a few embed an L2-strategy; namely, circumlocution (N=6). In either case, the TL word is unavailable or unknown to the student therefore s/he relies on one strategy or the other to express the intended message in the form of a question. Once the interviewer provides the French term, which the student incorporates into his/her next utterance (cf. example 54) thereby possibly treating the interview as a learning experience or conforming to the assumed expectation that one ought to speak French during the interview. In a few instances, the students’ appeals for assistance are vague and therefore the interviewer must infer the intended meaning from the context in order to provide the appropriate TL term. The student can either accept the suggested term (cf. example 55) or reject it and continue to provide more information until an appropriate one is found.
In addition to directly asking the interviewer to supply an appropriate TL term, students may also utilize an appeal for assistance strategy as a means to solicit feedback regarding a previous or upcoming strategy usage. The most frequent implicit form of appeal entails metalinguistic commentary of the 'I don't know how to say it in French' type in the context of a language switch (cf. example 56). Similar commentary is also found in the contexts of other strategies (cf. example 57) or as a means to address uncertainties about a correct TL usage (cf. example 58).

(54) FI 33.  elle fait le / comme elle donne/ de le <LS> "blessing" </LS> ↑/ <AA> comment tu dis </AA> 'she does the / like she gives / of the blessing ↑/ how do you say'
I. la bénéédiction
'the blessing'
FI 33. <II> La bénéédiction </II> / elle fait le bénéédiction et...
'the blessing / she does the blessing and...'

(55) I. quand tu as de temps libre qu'est-ce que tu fais
'when you have free time what do you do'
FI 23. ahm/je/j'ai/ah euh comment est-ce qu'on dit "spend"?
'um / I / I've / ah euh how do you say spend'
I. Je/ mais ça dépend/ tu tu passes du temps
'I // but that depends // you you spend time'
FI 23. Oui je passe temps avec mes amis
'yes I spend time with my friends'

(56) mon père est très/ hem/ <AA> je ne sais pas le mot/ très <LS> "shy" </LS> ↑
'my dad is / um / I don't know the word / very shy ↑' (FI 4)
(57) FI. 39  je pense que je/ j'vais ahm/ faire <FOR> des
avertissemens </FOR> / <AA> c'est correct/ pour
les </AA>
'I think that I / I'm going um / to make ?advertisements / it's
right / for the'
I. la publicité
'advertising'
FI 39. <II> oui la publicité </II> pour/ hem/ les gens qui/
cherchent / un un professeur/
yes advertising for / um / people who / are looking for a a
teacher'

(58) FI 10. quelques semaines avant / ahm non avant/ avant
<LS> "is that before" ↑
'a few weeks before / um not before / 'avant' is that before↑'
I. hmmm
'hmmm'
FI 10. nous lions / le Fantôme de l'Opéra
'we read / the Phantom of the Opera'

The third type of appeal for assistance observed in the students' discourse
involves a more implicit appeal for assistance, such as a lexical strategy that is marked by
rising intonation. It has been maintained throughout this study that when a change in
intonation accompanies a strategy, students may be acknowledging their uncertainty
about a strategy usage and looking for feedback from the interviewer to indicate that she
has comprehended the usage and/or to provide a TL equivalent. There are 16 cases
identified in the data where the interviewer infers that an appeal for assistance is
embedded in the student's lexical strategy, given that her response in each instance is to
supply the appropriate TL term (cf. example 59).

(59) FI. 23. j'aime faire des ahm // <AA> <LS> "drawings"
</LS> ↑</AA> /
'I like to do um // drawings ↑ /'
I. les dessins
'drawings'
FI 23. <II> les dessins </II> / de ah / les vêtements
'drawings / of ah / clothing'
It must be emphasized, however, that in several instances where rising intonation accompanies a lexical strategy, the interviewer does respond to them as if they were typical appeals for assistance, i.e., by supplying the TL equivalent outright, although she may offer other feedback to suggest that she understood the strategy, i.e., by paraphrasing and/or asking additional questions (cf. example 60). This type of usage was excluded from the appeal for assistance strategy tokens on account of the fact that it is impossible to determine whether or not in these cases students fully expected to have the appropriate TL term provided, but the interviewer chose not to supply a single lexical equivalent (e.g. *boutique de fleuriste* 'flower shop') or that the change in intonation at these points in the discourse are actually evidence to suggest that speakers have simply not yet mastered the standard intonational patterns of the TL.

(60) I.  

*Qu'est-ce que tu fais comme travail*

'What do you do for work?'

F1 14.  

_Ahm je travaille chez "Loblaws" ⇑ / je suis dans la la <LS> "flower department" <LS> ⇑*

'Um I work at Loblaws ⇑ / I'm in the the flower department ⇑'

I.  

_Ah c'est bien/ qu'est-ce que tu/ tu vends des fleurs tu les emballes*

'Ah that's good / what do you / you sell flowers you wrap them'

Finally, the last type of appeal for assistance structure identified in the corpus is dubbed a mock appeal. In over 30 contexts following a language switch strategy, students interrupt the discourse in order to ask the interviewer for the correct TL term, the item is supplied and the students then exercise the option of reincorporating the TL term into their subsequent utterances. It was suggested earlier in the chapter that students do not follow up their use of a language switch strategy with an appeal for assistance.
strategy as a means to clarify their message, since students may have the impression that the interviewer is bilingual and, thus, has understood the language switch; but rather, (i) students may be treating the interview situation as a learning experience, based on the expectation that the interviewer will provide the TL equivalent or (ii) students may be simply behaving in a manner that they feel is expected of them, i.e., compensating for English use by asking for the correct term in French, since the interview is being conducted in French.

This latter point seems reasonable given the cases where, similar to example (60), where the interviewer does not always explicitly provide a TL equivalent, but, in fact, it appears that students may not have actually paused sufficiently long enough for her to supply the term and may have no expectation for the item to be supplied. In the example below, the student produces a statement that embeds the appeal for assistance strategy in the lexical switch strategy and not vice versa:

(61) I.  pourquoi tu dis ça
     'why do you say that'
     FI 25. juste le / comment c' qu'on dit "way" c'est /
             maintenant
             'just the / how do you say way it is / now'
     I.  c'est pas bien maintenant
          'it's not well now'
     FI 25. Non c'est pas bien /...
            'no it's not well / ...'

In other words, in order to avoid disruption to the flow of discourse potentially caused by waiting for the interviewer to provide the appropriate TL term, the student uses a mock appeal for assistance that effectively maintains the momentum of the discourse and appears to imply to the interviewer that a response is not expected, nor is one offered.
The difference here, thus, is that the intonation is not consistent with that of other appeals for assistance. It is surmised that students might use a similar tactic of 'mock appeal' to maintain the flow of their responses during classroom talk, but this assumption would have to be empirically confirmed.

2.7.1 *Appeal for assistance and interplay with other lexical strategies*

Table 4-26 summarizes the use of appeal for assistance in the contexts following other strategies. As indicated, almost 34 percent of the total number of appeal for assistance strategies in the corpus occurs after another strategy, which suggests that students are fairly comfortable interacting with the interviewer as a means to address potentially problematic usage and that the strategy is considered low risk and effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For clarification of:</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L1-based strategies</em></td>
<td>[&lt;LS&gt;_OA&gt;][&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;FOR&gt;_OA&gt;][&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;FOR&gt;_OA&gt;[&lt;LS&gt;][OA&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L2-based strategies</em></td>
<td>[&lt;AA&gt;][&lt;LS&gt;][OA]&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;AA&gt;][OA]&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;WC&gt;][&lt;AA&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ambiguous</em></td>
<td>[&lt;AMB&gt;][OA]&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sociopragmatic strategies</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Subtotal 46)

**Following instances of correct TL referencing:**

Total 49

Percentage of appeal for assistance strategies 34.3%
Table 4-27. Appeal for assistance and the proposed strategy continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>% of total strategies in corpus</th>
<th>% strategy is followed by another usage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AA&gt;</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest whole number

Table 4-28. Appeal for assistance and strategies providing follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>% strategy is follows another usage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AA&gt;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest whole number

2.8 Message abandonment strategies

There are 96 cases of message abandonment identified in the immersion corpus.

Message abandonment strategies entail students ending a message with an incomplete utterance or stopping mid-sentence and not saying anything further until the interviewer takes over. They are found in the context of various pauses and false starts, but in and of
themselves are a form of disruption phenomena as they effectively stop the dialogue.

Notice that in example (62), the student completely stops talking once s/he reaches a
difficult moment in the discourse and even sighs, perhaps out of frustration.

(62) I. 

{\textit{mais tu trouves ça ennuyeux qu'il y ait des 
changements technologiques 
'but you find it boring that there will be technological changes?'}}

FI 36. \textit{Oui [yn] peu parce que uh / la communication avec 
/ vous-mêmes / va / changer / avec le/ avec 
l'ordinateur/ \textless AB\textgreater tu peux // (soupire) \textless /AB\textgreater
'Yes a bit because uh / communication with / yourselves / is going / to change / with the / with the 
computer / you can // (sigh)'}

I. \textit{Tu aimes ça toi/ la technologie informatique/ les ordinateurs
'you like that you/ computer technology / computers'}

This is an implicit appeal for assistance. The interaction of the interviewer with the
student thus comes in the form of a rescue, as the onus is then placed on the interviewer
to restart the dialogue\textsuperscript{39}. There are different options available to the interviewer to
achieve this; in this particular case, she ignores the student's abandoned message and asks
a new question, though it is still related to the same general topic. Alternatively, the
interviewer may attempt to guess the term that is currently unavailable/unknown to the
student, and fill in the blank accordingly, as shown in example (63) or may try to extract
more information from the student with the use of follow up questions, which also
involves somewhat of a guessing game on the part of the interviewer (cf. example 64).

\textsuperscript{39} Message abandonment here patterns quite differently from Tarone's (1977) data, where the speaker gives
up on a difficult topic and independently initiates a new one for discussion. This reflects the fact that
Tarone's (1977) data were elicited from students' descriptions of drawings and were therefore non-
interactional, unlike the present data set.
(63) FI 22. _je vois les nouvelles et c'est très/ <AB> je ne sais pas </AB>_  
'I see the news and it's very / I don't know

I. _déprimant?_  
'depressing?'

FI 22. _hem hem oui_  
'uh huh yes'

(64) FI 36. _il était [yn] criminel / il [a:] // il <V> fait </V>_  
_t[u] choses / des / des / activités criminelles et / les_  
_uh / le police le <V> chasse </V> / uuh / <AB>_  
_parce qu'il [a:] / aah // il [a:] // uuh // <AB>_  
'he was a criminal / he h[a:]d / he ?did everything / some / some / criminal activities and / the uh / the police ?were chasing him / uuh because he h[a:]d / uuh // he h[a:]d // uuh /'

I. _Il a fait quelque chose de mal avant?_  
'He did something bad before?'

FI 36. _Oui il [a:] / ahh // avec l'argent[i] / il [a:] /_  
'Yes he h[a:]d / uhh // with the money / he h[a:]d /

I. _Il l'a volé?_  
'he stole it?'

FI 36. _oui..._  
'yes...'

2.8.1 Message abandonment and interplay with other strategies

Message abandonment is observed as a follow-up response to other strategies (cf. Table 4-29), once following approximation and twice following circumlocution. The low occurrence of message abandonment following other strategies suggests that in most cases students feel the need to substantiate their strategic usage and can make the most of the resources they have, whether L1-based, L2-based, or sociopragmatic, to do so.

Consequently, complete message abandonment is not usually required, but does remain an option.
Table 4-29. Distribution of message abandonment as follow-up strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For clarification of:</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1-based strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2-based strategies</strong></td>
<td>[&lt;C&gt;_&lt;AB&gt;]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;A&gt;_&lt;AB&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociopragmatic strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of message abandonment strategies</strong></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.2 **Interviewer’s reactions to message abandonment strategies**

No strategy per se can follow message abandonment, or else it would not be an instance of abandonment; however, in most cases the strategies are followed by instances of feedback from the interviewer in which she provides the missing TL term or asks additional questions. For this reason, it seems acceptable to claim that message abandonment strategies are not unchecked in the dialogue, but how they are dealt with is primarily at the discretion of the interlocutor rather than the speaker. In other words, given that the strategies are strongly associated with excessive pausing, particularly lengthy pauses (/(/), presumably the interviewer feels prompted to help the student to move past the problematic discourse instead of prolonging the silence. Thus, any follow-up necessarily comes from the interviewer, which also fits with the communicative setting under study, where timing is a factor and the discourse is partially guided by interviewer. The decision between whether to accept the students' message abandonment (and, thereby, ignore whatever meaning the student intended to convey but could not) or
renew the message with follow-up questions is left up to the interviewer. It is possible that if given unlimited time and no possible help from another speaker (e.g., in a non-interactional setting), students may feel pressured to recompose a problematic message and eventually find a satisfactory way to deal with the encoding problem so that message abandonment would result less often, if at all. In the communicative situation under study, however, students may feel that message abandonment is a useful option to them since the general role of the interviewer is to keep the discourse flowing under any circumstance.

Table 4-30 shows the multiplicity of purpose among follow-up strategies, with appeal for assistance having the widest range of application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-30. Message abandonment and strategies providing follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AB&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AA&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> for purpose of correction  
<sup>2</sup> due to awareness of translation difficulties  
<sup>3</sup> due to uncertainties about TL usage  
<sup>4</sup> to treat interview as learning experience  

*rounded to nearest whole number
2.9 Mimetic strategies

In the present study 22 cases of mimetic strategies obtained in the data. Fourteen of these cases involve gesturing/pointing toward a physical object or performing an action, which commonly entail use of deictic (comme) ça '(like) this' or ici 'here' (cf. example 65), and 8 cases involve the use of an interjection (cf. example 67).

(65) FI 33. elle était fait mal/ au travail...
'she [the speaker's mother] was hurt / at work...'
I. quelle genre de travail elle fait
'what type of work does she do'
FI 33. elle travaillait au/ <LS> "donut shop" </LS> ↑
'she used to work at the /donut shop ↑'
I. et elle s'est fait mal en
'and she was hurt while'
FI 33. oui elle ahm / quand elle/ ah nettoyait <M> elle <V>
ét[e] </V> fait comme ça (bruit) </M> elle/
'yes she um / when she / ah was cleaning she
had gone like this she /'
I. elle a glissé
'she slipped'
FI 33. oui ...
'yes...'

(66) parce que je le uh / <M> le <LS> "volume" </LS> est/ "like"
<M> "ooohhh </M> je ne (rire)/ tout le maison peut <V> écoute
</V> (rire)/ pas seulement moi
'because I the uh / the volume is / like ooohhh I don't (laugh) /
the entire house can listen (laugh) / not just me' (FI 18)

While the present study is focused on the use of mime identified as a replacement
for the appropriate TL vocabulary, there are also 10 occasions where students use
gesturing or onomatopoeia to complement their TL usage (cf. example 67). However,
in general, neither strategic and non-strategic usage of miming techniques are very frequent in the corpus. We will explore possible explanations for the infrequency further along.

(67) quelques jours juste si elle ne <V> peut pas </V> trouver le film en français nous avons le vu en anglais et (rire) c'était comme/ bon bon c'était (rire) "woohoo" c'était en anglais et toute la classe était très heureuse (rire)
'some days just if she couldn't find the movie in French we watched it in English and (laugh) it was like / good good it was (laugh) "woohoo" it was in English and the whole class was really happy (laugh)' (FI 4)

2.9.1 Mime and interplay with other lexical strategies

There are several points to be made regarding the interaction of mime with other lexical strategies. First, mimetic strategies are never used as follow-up strategies. This is perhaps unsurprising if one considers the limited physical environment of the meeting rooms where the interviews took place. In other words, even if students felt compelled to follow up a language switch strategy, for example, by gesturing towards the said object, the feasibility of this would be next to none since most, if not all, of the items that students referred to in English were not physically represented in a meeting room. If one takes into account, for example, some of the nominal lexical switches that students used, then the point is fairly clear: accountant, beach club, cranberry sauce, and chickens. In the same vein, the usefulness of performing an action in place of using a TL reference is also limited due to the fact that many of the verbs for which students substitute English
words cannot be physically demonstrated (e.g. rent, research, plan, counsel, incorporate), though many others certainly could have been, but were not (e.g. scream, sneeze, break, whistle, lock, sew)\textsuperscript{40}.

Secondly, in spite of the fact that mime is used very infrequently overall in the corpus, this strategy is virtually never followed-up by another strategy. Only one case is found where language switch follows a student's physical gesturing and the mimetic strategy itself is actually embedded in a circumlocution strategy. In this case, the student, not knowing the term for breast cancer points to the body part, then follows up with the English term:

\begin{center}
(68) \textit{ma tante elle} <C> avait le / cancer <M> ici </M>/ dans le <LS> "breast" </LS> </C>
\'my aunt she had / cancer here / in the breast †' (FI 33)
\end{center}

Certainly, as illustrated before, such a follow-up technique may or may not be intended for the purpose of clarification and, arguably, in this case, it is used for emphatic reasons. Nevertheless, it remains that mimetic strategies do not receive sufficient follow-up to fit with the strategy continuum that has been consistently affirmed by the data up to this point in the analysis, whereby the most infrequent strategies require the most amount of follow-up. One possible explanation for this is simply that there is a disassociation between frequency and risk in this strategy type. Bear in mind, also, that due to data collection procedures, i.e., the interviews were not video recorded, the true frequency of

\textsuperscript{40} It must be emphasized that data collection involved identifying places in the discourse where mimetic strategies were used in place of appropriate TL usage. Since the interviews were not video taped, we have no way of knowing whether mimetic strategies accompanied a language switch, for example, i.e., the student could utter "sew" and simultaneously mime the action of sewing with a thread and needle. Presumably students would use such techniques; however, this is outside the scope of the present study.
mime in the corpus is, in fact, not known. In other words, only a proportion of the actual
instances of mime could be transcribed.

Nonetheless, the apparent infrequency of mime in the data, in spite of its potential
for success, should be addressed. One simple explanation is that students view mimetic
strategies as banal or even inappropriate. Harley (1992:168; 180) found that the younger
L2 students she included in her study of verb usage were more likely than the older
students to rely on sound symbolism to extend their limited verb vocabulary. Harley
(1992:168) surmised that the older students may have viewed this tactic as a childish
form of expression to fill in lexical gaps and, in addition, may have regarded the
interview situation "as a relatively formal occasion that required more serious linguistic
effort". Following this line of thought, it is possible that the group of immersion students
presently under study have a similar impression that mimetic strategies are both
inappropriate for their age and/or advanced educational stage or for the communication
situation at hand.

2.9.2 Mime and the interviewer's speech

The use of mime in the interviewer's speech to aid in linguistic production is rarely
observed. On one occasion, a miming gesture is identified in the interviewer's speech (cf.
example 69), however, it appears not to be used as a substitution for linguistic output, but
rather as a meaningful gesture to accompany her linguistic output, as was similarly found
in 9 cases in the learners' speech.

(69)  I.  *est-ce que tu sors de là avec les oreilles comme ça/ 
a tête grosse? (rire)
'do you leave there (a rock concert) with ears like 
this / a swollen head? (laugh)' (talking to FI 22)
3. Quasi-strategy usage: Interviewer's influence on students' speech

As part of the investigation of the hypothesis that some students would treat the interview session as a learning experience, data were collected regarding the number of times that students adopted the interviewer's wording into their own speech, since it is conceivable that, in some instances, students might use the interviewer's wording in an attempt to maximize their use of French and/or to avoid TL errors during the interview\(^1\). In fact, there are 273 cases where students are observed to incorporate the interviewer's wording into their own; however, not all appear to occur as a product of an L2 learning situation (cf. Table 4-31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students adopt interviewer's wording:</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as a form of interaction with interviewer</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-correction following strategy usage</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-correction following other non-TL usage</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 85 instances counted where students adopt a lexical item provided by the interviewer in response to a strategy. Table 4-32 offers a breakdown to show the types of strategies that may be involved, which include all strategies, with the exception of mime\(^2\).

---

\(^1\) Whether the TL item becomes permanently part of the IL or is immediately forgotten is irrelevant for our purposes.

\(^2\) The figures are provided to give the reader an idea of the contexts where a student incorporated the interviewer's language. The totals themselves are inconclusive given the fact that data were not collected on the number of times that the interviewer provided feedback to a strategy and students did not incorporate the interviewer's language, nor on how often the interviewer could have provided feedback, but did not.
Table 4-32. Students' repetition of interviewer's wording following lexical strategy usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/AA&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/LS&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/AB&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/A&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/AMB&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/FOR&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/C&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[&lt;/WC&gt; _ &lt;II&gt;]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Occurrences are counted in response to an original strategy, not to a secondary or follow-up strategy. If strategies are embedded, it is the encompassing strategy that is counted.

Additionally, there are 67 cases where students use the interviewer's speech as a form of self-correction (cf. example 70). In most cases the interviewer does not appear to be actively trying to correct the student, but rather, in her back-channeling, she will repeat students' answers in the correct TL form.

(70)  
I. *et comment tu viens à l'école*  
    'and how do you come to school?'  
FI 13. *par auto*  
    '?by car'  
I. *en auto*  
    'by car'  
FI 13. *<SC> en auto </SC> </II> "sorry"*  
    'by car sorry'

While in both cases described above, i.e., repetition following a strategy and repetition following other non-TL usage, it could be that students are interested in learning the correct TL term and repetition of the term represents some kind of validation that is part of the process. It is also plausible that students simply feel the need to compensate for their non-TL usage by repeating the correct TL term and/or feel that
because the interview is being conducted in French, they are, in a sense, obligated to show the effort.

Finally, there are 108 cases where students appear to repeat the interviewer's language as a means to increase their level of interaction/participation in the discourse (cf. example 71). In other words, students repeat the interviewer's words, phrases, etc. in the same way that one might assume native TL speakers do while interacting in casual conversation with their peers, i.e. to show agreement, for emphasis, etc. Clearly, some comparative analysis between the French immersion learners and native speakers of French is in order to verify this claim (cf. Chapter 6 for remarks on potential future analyses).

(71)  I.  

\textit{toute ta famille vient là/ c'est une tradition à la canadienne}

'your whole family comes there / it's a tradition Canadian style'

FI 30. \textit{oui <II> à la canadienne </II> (rire)}

'yes Canadian style (laugh)'

Undoubtedly, the presence of the interviewer has influenced not only the types of strategies seen in the data, but as was shown in this brief section, her presence affects the overall language used by the learner and can therefore be seen as having an important effect on speaker performance (Yule and Tarone 1997:26).
4. Discussion

This latest chapter presented and analyzed the findings pertaining to overall strategy usage in the French immersion students' speech. The goal of the chapter was to provide details on the range and frequency of strategies observed in the corpus and to describe the general usage patterns observed for each. A preliminary analysis of the results confirmed the initial hypothesis that students do utilize a range of strategies, both linguistic and sociopragmatic, and that there is a tendency to rely heavily on L1-based strategies; specifically, language switch. Generally speaking, this finding fits well with Canada's bilingual situation; students may assume that the interviewer is a French/English bilingual and can confirm this assumption early on in the interviews by resorting to English, in order to overcome lexical difficulties, and noting the interviewer's reaction to the strategy. Since the interviewer often provides feedback to suggest that she does understand the strategy, the students discover that they can easily and repeatedly return to such a strategy in the discourse. In other words, the use of English appears to be perceived as fairly low-risk in terms of its chances for interrupting the flow of discourse or creating additional communicative problems, as compared to what might be the case if the interlocutor was a French monolingual, for instance. Chancier strategies include the use of L2-based approximation and word coinage, for example. Rather than run the risk of being inaccurate in the TL, students seem to prefer to assume that the interviewer will understand and hit their mark by simply switching to English. Again, however, it is quite possible that the use of language switch strategy is habitual during students' interactions with their immersion teachers and that they are applying the same principles in the interview context.
The fact that the student interviews were conducted face-to-face also helped to facilitate the use of sociopragmatic strategies and these strategies were used second most frequently overall in the corpus. Through students' interaction with the speaker, whether via an appeal for assistance strategy or message abandonment, the physical presence of the interviewer became an essential part of the way that students dealt with lexical difficulties. The interviews could also be seen as valuable from a pedagogical standpoint, as there is the possibility that, in some cases, students were treating the communicative situation as a learning experience.

The second hypothesis investigated in this chapter was that the less frequently a strategy occurs, the more risky it may be perceived to be, and therefore the more follow-up it will require for the purpose of clarification or correction. This idea found support with the emergence of a strategy continuum. Based on proximity of strategy, the continuum revealed a relation between strategy frequency and amount of follow-up. Word coinage, the most infrequently used strategy always co-occurred with a second strategy that served to clarify the students' intended meaning. In contrast, language switch strategies did not require a second strategy for the purpose of correction; again, possibly based on the students' assumption that the bilingual interviewer will understand them, and therefore there is no need to second-guess the usage or it was used out of sheer habit. Only when there appeared to be difficulties specific to translation problems between L1 and L2 was language switch followed by a second strategy.

The addition of mimetic strategies to the proposed continuum proved incompatible. The explanation proposed was that because few messages can, in actuality, be acted out, mimetic strategies behave differently than the others examined in the
present study and is not associated with frequency. It is possible that with the use of alternative methods for data collection, i.e., video taped interviews, that additional use of mime, including those in response to previous strategies, would be identified.

With the exception of mime (and ambiguous strategies), Table 4-33 compares the remaining strategies investigated in the present study. In the right-most column there is a ballooning effect among the strategies used most frequently, with circumlocution and appeal for assistance strategies carrying the bulk of the weight, indicating that they are most likely to follow another strategy. Appeal for assistance strategies fulfill the broadest range of purposes for follow-up. In an attempt to understand why circumlocution strategies and appeal for assistance strategies have emerged in the way they have, one might consider that both are interactional; circumlocution implicitly engages the interviewer in a joint search for the appropriate TL term, while appeal for assistance involves students directly and indirectly asking the interviewer to supply the appropriate TL term. One general assertion, then, is that the more interactional a strategy is, the more often it will occur.
Table 4-33. Comparison of French immersion strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>% of total strategies in corpus</th>
<th>% strategy is followed by another usage*</th>
<th>% strategy follows another usage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;WC&gt;</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FOR&gt;</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AB&gt;</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;1,3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;C&gt;</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;2,3,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;1,2,3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;AA&gt;</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33&lt;sup&gt;1,2,3,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;LS&gt;</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;1,2,3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded to nearest whole number

<sup>1</sup> for purpose of correction  
<sup>2</sup> due to awareness of translation difficulties  
<sup>3</sup> due to uncertainties about TL usage  
<sup>4</sup> to treat interview as learning experience

4.1 Comparison of results to previous communication strategy research in French immersion

At this point, it is important to return to some of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 to assess how the general results of the previous study compare with those of precedent studies. Marrie and Netten (1991) reported that the strategies used most often by their students were approximation and circumlocution. This finding is in obvious contrast to the results of the present study, where L1-based strategies were used substantially more often than L2-based strategies. It may be that Marrie and Netten's (1991) results are a product of their methodology, since their data are collected from situations where each student was required to tell a story based on a picture, as opposed to from informal, interactional discourse between two speakers and thus, their results may not be directly
comparable with the results of the present study. It may be predictable that students
would rely most heavily L2-based strategies in a story telling task because the options of
testing a strategy for comprehension by the listener, such as a language switch, or
appealing for assistance from the listener, would not be available.

The second difference between the results of the present research and those of
Marrie and Netten's (1991) work is that in the latter, no occurrences of foreignization are
reported. The authors suggest that the lack of foreignization strategy may be what
distinguishes immersion students from regular core French students. Further discussion
of this point is reserved for Chapter 5; however, for the moment, it may be stated that
foreignization is, in fact, a strategy available to immersion students, but it may be
constrained by extralinguistic factors that were not explored in Marrie and Netten's study
and this may account for the absence of the strategy in their data.

The results of the present research appear to be most compatible with those
reported by McGrath (1999). Similar to the present study, the majority of strategies
identified in her interviews are L1-based (over 63 percent), the second most frequently
used strategies are sociopragmatic (over 27 percent), while L2-based strategies are used
least often (less than 10 percent). Bear in mind that the labels used in the present study
have been superimposed on McGrath's categories for the purpose of discussion;
nevertheless, in spite of the minor differences, i.e., she included topic avoidance, literal
translation, and self-repair as individual strategies unlike the present study, the general
trends pertaining to type of strategy usage and frequency of usage basically parallel those
found in the present study. Since McGrath (1999) obtained comparable results within a
similar communicative situation, it would be interesting to discover whether a more
complete functional analysis of the strategies identified in her French immersion students' speech, i.e., examining context of usage, amount of follow-up, etc. would further corroborate the frequency data to the same extent as was found in the present study and therefore lend credence to the strategy continuum developed in the present study.

5. General results: concluding remarks

This chapter provided a functional analysis of the types and subtypes of communication strategies found in the speech of immersion students in an interactional setting. To my knowledge, this is the first investigation of French immersion students' communication strategy usage to analyze, in addition to frequency, (i) the linguistic context of strategy usage, (ii) the interplay between strategies, and (iii) the interaction between the speaker and interlocutor related to strategy usage, all as a means to support claims about frequency. Moreover, the strategy continuum presented in this chapter has provided support for the notion that some strategies are riskier than others by demonstrating that frequency of usage is directly related to the amount of follow-up a strategy type requires and hence, a perceived level of risk associated with that strategy.

From previous studies we have gained knowledge about which kinds of strategies immersion students tend to use and about how often. Now we have a more complete understanding of how students actually use them and how a native speaker of French might react to this usage. In conclusion, several points can be made to summarize the general findings presented in this chapter. The first point is that how communication strategy data are collected does affect the results and there is importance for using natural data in communication strategy research. The use of interactional strategies, both highly
interactional strategies and less interactional strategies, play a large role in the communicative context under study. Without the presence of the interviewer during data collection the group of immersion students would not have demonstrated such a full range of strategies. Another important finding is the multiplicity of factors involved in communicative strategy usage and evidence that students, in fact, use strategies in a very strategic way. Whether strategies are used to overcome communication difficulties or to enhance communication, each may be used in a different way to fulfill different communicative purposes vis à vis the interlocutor and the linguistic context.

Furthermore, some strategies, i.e., language switch, appeal for assistance, and circumlocution, displayed a higher functionality of use to the communication situation under study than did others strategies and this is reflected in their high frequency/low level of risk.
Chapter 5

Factors Affecting Communication Strategy Usage: Statistical Analysis and Examination of Individual Scores

Récemment j’ai décidé que je vais/je ne veux pas oublier mon français
'Recently I decided that I’m going/ I don’t want to forget my French' (FI 41)

Le problème c’est/dans la classe de français/ quand le professeur ne ne parle pas// les autres dans la classe parlent en anglais/pas en français/ alors je n’peux pas pratiquer et je n’aime pas ça (rire)
'The problem is/ in French class/ when the teacher isn’t isn’t talking// the others in the class are speaking in English/ not in French/ so I can’t practice and I don’t like that (laugh)' (FI 30)

1. Introduction

One of the main aims of the present study is to discover how students’ communication strategy usage might be constrained by certain linguistic and extralinguistic factors and whether a significant relation exists between them. The linguistic factors examined include problematic verb usage and the use of self-correction, unsuccessful correction, and unnecessary correction. The extralinguistic factors investigated include (cf. Table 3-3 in Chapter 3):

- students' sex, age/grade;
- socioeconomic status;
- amount of French medium schooling;
- time spent in a Francophone environment;
- time spent staying with a Francophone family; and
- home language.
In addition, the number of times that students incorporated the interviewer's wording into their own TL utterances following a strategy was also considered as a potential external factor bearing on overall strategy usage.

2. Statistical Analysis

2.1 Procedure

The application of likelihood ratio and deviance tests showed that a Generalized Linear Model (Negative Binomial and Logistic) was the appropriate statistical model to apply to the French immersion data. For parameter estimation, the Maximum Likelihood Estimation model was used. _SAS_ (v. 8) software was used to perform the analysis. The error rate is estimated at 0.10, which reflects the fact that the data set is small (N=41).

2.2 Presentation of Results: Influence of linguistic factors

Data concerning students' problematic verb usage were collected as a means to provide a measure of students' levels of proficiency in French, i.e., the less verb errors identified as a proportion of students' individual interviews, the higher the degree of proficiency could be assumed. It was surmised that higher proficiency might be tied to a certain type of strategy usage; namely, L2-based strategies; however, no statistical correlation was, in fact, found between verb errors and strategy usage. Perhaps a correlation would be found with more highly advanced students.

It was also hypothesized that problematic verb usage would correlate with a variety of social factors, including; amount of schooling in French; length of time spent in a Francophone environment and/or with a Francophone family; and level of exposure to French language media. Interestingly enough, only one extralinguistic factor was
identified as having a statistically significant bearing on verb accuracy; namely, length of stay with a Francophone family, whereby the longer the stay with a Francophone family, the less possibility that students will display difficulty with their use of verbs in spoken French. This finding lends some support to the hypothesis that the greater the extracurricular time spent interacting in French, the stronger students' proficiency in the use of French will be.

With regard to students' use of various forms of self-correction, it was suspected that higher amounts of self-correction would be linked, on the one hand, to L2-based strategies and, on the other hand, to the factors sex and/or socioeconomic status. Nevertheless, no correlations were found in either regard. Furthermore, neither students' use of unnecessary correction nor use of unsuccessful correction was found to correlate with strategy type or any social factors.

2.3 Presentation of Results: Influence of extralinguistic factors
Six of the nine communication strategies identified in the corpus are affected by some of the social factors examined in the study. The strategies include L1-based strategies (i.e., language switch and foreignization), sociopragmatic strategies (i.e., appeal for assistance, message abandonment and mime), and ambiguous strategies (i.e., potential L3-based strategies). L2-based strategies (i.e., approximation, circumlocution, word coinage) did not display statistical correlations with any of the social factors. The results of the statistical analysis are presented in Table 5-34 and summarized in point form below. Discussion of the results follows in the next section.
Table 5-34. Summary of Statistics for Strategies (Variable Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range (Min-Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language switch</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>0.00-52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeal for asst.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.00-16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumlocution</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.00-8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abandonment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.00-9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreignization</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.00-20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.00-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mime</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.00-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.00-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word coinage</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00-1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The amount of time spent in a Francophone environment has a significant effect on the use of language switch strategies. As the amount of time spent decreases, the possibility of using language switch increases.

- The greater the amount of schooling, the higher the possibility for students to use foreignization. Exposure to French language media also correlates with foreignization strategies. The more exposure to French language TV and radio, the higher the likelihood that students will resort to foreignization strategies.

- The amount of schooling in French exhibits a significant effect on the use of message abandonment strategies. As the amount of schooling in French decreases, the possibility increases for students to abandon their messages in the TL.

- The amount of schooling in French shows a statistical correlation with students' use of the interviewer's language as a follow-up strategy; as students' amount of schooling in French decreases, the possibility that they will incorporate the interviewer's language increases.
• Students' socioeconomic status correlates with the use of appeal for assistance strategies. The likelihood of appeal for assistance by students from upper working class families is higher than for students from middle class families. The amount of schooling in French also has a significant effect on students' use of appeal for assistance. The less students have been schooled in French, the greater the possibility that they will appeal for assistance from their interlocutor to overcome communicative difficulties in the TL.

• Students' age/grade has a significant effect on use of mime. It is more likely for miming strategies to be used by students in grade 9 than by students in grade 12.

• Students' home language has a significant effect on the use of ambiguous/L3-based strategies. It is more likely for students who speak a language other than English (and not French) at home to use these strategies.

• Students' sex is not a statistically significant factor for communication strategy usage.

2.4 Discussion

Several generalizations can be based on the results. First, increased extracurricular exposure to the French language affects the quality of students' French, albeit in different ways. While students with more extracurricular exposure to French display more native-like use of the TL, i.e., with their use of more correct verb structuring and less reliance on language switch in place of TL items, foreignization in their discourse is still likely. This may be an indication that the more exposure students have to French outside of the classroom, the more comfortable they become with their use of the language as far as
taking risks in the TL, which would also include the possibility for them to exercise a
degree of lexical creativity. The fact that less language switch is found in these students' speech shows that they have presumably developed other appropriate means for linguistic compensation when speaking with a monolingual speaker of French in extracurricular communicative contexts.

The discovery of a link between amount of schooling in French and use of foreignization fits with the ideas discussed earlier in Chapter 4 where it was suggested that some foreignized structures are used so frequently in the domain of French immersion that they may have fossilized in the students' II. (cf. section 2.2.3). The results of Dean's (1996) study are similar to those found in the present study; her grade 10 students had less of a tendency to use foreignization than the students in grades eleven or twelve, although her results were not formally quantified. Further support of the idea that amount of schooling in French is tied to a greater likelihood for students to use foreignized terms is found in Marrie and Netten's (1991) study which reported that early French immersion students never used foreignization strategies. The authors (1991:454) suggested that the absence of foreignization may be indicative of "a difference between core French and immersion second language learners". While no conclusions can be drawn in the present study about core French students' usage (and the specific differences between French immersion students and the core French students' usage were not outlined by Marrie and Netten [1991]), the findings of the present study, suggest that use of foreignization is a strategy well-used among immersion students, though it may be constrained by overall exposure to French, both in and outside the classroom. A longitudinal study would be necessary to reveal when foreignization
strategies may begin to emerge in the speech of early immersion students as they progress through the programme.

The amount of schooling in French is also correlated with the two major sociopragmatic strategies identified in the corpus: appeal for assistance and message abandonment. The finding that students with weaker skills in French tend to use strategies that rely directly on the interlocutor for help is reasonable, since a lack of experience in the TL would presumably inhibit their range of independent communicative problem-solving skills.

The finding that a greater use of appeal for assistance correlates with students from upper-working class families is difficult to interpret. This is particularly true in light of the fact that (i) the average length of schooling in the French medium for these students is slightly longer than that of students from middle class families and (ii) as amount of schooling in French decreases, the possibility for using appeal for assistance is shown to increase. In other words, since it cannot be argued that it is due to less experience with the French language that these students rely more often on the interlocutor by appealing for assistance, we must seek alternative plausible explanations. It could be that, due to behavioral norms of this group, these students may feel more of a need than others to conform to the expectation that one speak French during the interview and, moreover, that one speak the language as correctly as possible, which would support the need to rely on an appeal for assistance, i.e., in order to be informed of the appropriate TL term. The fact that the upper-working class students are also the most likely to incorporate the correct term provided to them by the interviewer further supports
the possibility of this claim; however, further analysis is certainly in order before any firm conclusions can be made to this effect.

The correlation found between mime and students' age/grade fits with Harley's (1992) findings, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 4. Younger students may simply feel less inhibited about using mimetic strategies than do the older students and/or perhaps the older students tend to treat the interview as a more formal communicative situation, where such strategies would not be viewed as appropriate. It should be emphasized that a higher grade does not necessarily mean longer amount of schooling in French, i.e., since some students may have enrolled in the French immersion programme later in their education than others. Bearing this in mind, in addition to the fact that proficiency in French was neither tied to any particular strategy type nor to any social factor, with the exception of the amount of time spent with a Francophone family, we cannot conclude that it is necessarily students with less experience interacting in the TL that use mime. Consequently, age really does appear to have the greatest effect on who uses mime and who does not.

Finally, the statistical analysis has potentially put to rest the debate concerning the ambiguous strategies. Recall that these strategies were ambiguous to the analyst in terms of their ideal classification within the strategy typology since their source language was questionable; however, it was hypothesized that strategies whose source language was ambiguous might be specific to students who speak a language other than English (and not French) at home. Given the finding that home language is correlated with these strategies, i.e., the likelihood of using ambiguous strategies increases if a student's home
language is not English, we now have some evidence for the idea that L3-transfer plays a role in students' strategy usage.

The one social factor that was excluded by the analysis is students' sex. It was hypothesized that the female students may have a desire to maintain a level of correctness in their speech, based on previous research undertaken on the same group of students (cf. Rehner et al. 2002) and that this might translate into their preferred use of L2-based strategies, as opposed to L1-based strategies. Since the analysis showed that students' sex is not a significant factor in determining which strategy types are used by which types of students, this hypothesis could not be validated.

3. Individual scores

In the present study it has been confirmed that French immersion students, as a group, use a range of communication strategies and each of the nine strategies investigated occurred a minimum of six times and a maximum of 611 times in the corpus. We can turn now to a discussion of some of the interindividual differences found among students and their strategy usage. Although the differences are marginal and some have not been shown to be statistically significant by the analysis, they, nonetheless, may be insightful for future research performed on larger data sets, where correlations may be stronger.

3.1 Frequent and infrequent users of communication strategies

In the French immersion data, every student uses communication strategies in their speech; however, not every student uses every strategy (cf. Appendix I). On average, students use 27 communication strategies each, which means that the average proportion of strategies per interview (based on average number of words in the interviews) is 0.6
percent. There are four students (FI 13, 14, 22, 25) who use proportionately more strategies in their interviews than other students; the proportion of communication strategies in these students' interviews totals 1.1 percent or higher and the total number of strategies per student ranges between 34 and 79. Each of these students has spent some time in a Francophone environment, but none has spent time with a Francophone family (cf. Appendix II). Since spending time in a Francophone environment may not always require that students use their French, i.e., some students may take the opportunity to practice their French, but others might be embarrassed, afraid, or discouraged to do so and therefore will rely on relatives and friends to get by in the target culture, it is possible that spending time with a family is the factor having the most impact on students' use of accurate French. In other words, the intimacy of being with a French family may actually set up an ideal situation to force students to practice their French and, in general, attain a higher level of fluency so that less reliance on communication strategies in place of the TL is required. Incidentally, these same four students are also part of the group that relies on language switch the most frequently and two of the students demonstrate above average use of problematic verbs.

We turn now to the four students who use the least number of communication strategies in the course of their interviews, i.e., the proportion of strategies in their interviews equals 0.2 percent or less. We see that this group averages the same amount of schooling in French as the frequent strategy users do, but these students have spent more time in a French environment than the previous group and half has also stayed with a Francophone family. With more time spent in a Francophone environment and with a Francophone family in this group's favor, one might expect that a stronger mastery of TL
verbs would be in order, as well, and yet, we find that students in this group actually
demonstrate a higher proportion of verb errors than the latter group (1.3 percent). In fact,
one of the students in this group has the highest proportion of verb errors in the entire
corpus (2.9 percent). This suggests that the number of strategies that a student uses may
not be reflective of his/her overall competency in the language, and that some
communication strategies are used in cases where a TL item may be known, but it is
temporarily unavailable.

3.2 Some interindividual differences concerning strategy types
The clearest finding in the data is that language switch is the only strategy used by 100
percent of the students. Circumlocution is used by all but 6 students (used by 85
percent), while appeal for assistance is used by 78 percent of the students, and message
abandonment is used by slightly fewer: 73 percent. Foreigization and approximation
strategies are used by 54 percent and 49 percent, respectively, while both mime and word
coinage are both used by 15 percent of students and ambiguous strategies are only used
by 10 percent of students. These scores, presented in Table 5-35 below, are reminiscent
of the strategy continuum proposed in the previous chapter, where frequency was
associated with degree of risk that the strategy poses for additional communication
difficulties; the lower the strategy frequency, the higher the perceived risk that the
strategy may impede communication and possibly require a follow-up strategy. In light
of the interindividual differences in strategy usage, it would also appear that the more
widespread and frequent the usage is among speakers, the more acceptable it may be
overall as a less risky strategy for overcoming communicative difficulties. The fact that
the positioning of appeal for assistance and circumlocution is reversed here supports the
idea that both are interactional, but to varying degrees, and that more students may prefer an implicit appeal for assistance to the interviewer than an explicit appeal, although the difference is fairly marginal. It is also interesting to see that the interindividual use of mime fits well according to this scheme. The reader may recall that since mimetic strategies behave differently, they were difficult to identify along the strategy continuum. One plausible explanation that was proposed is simply that there is a disassociation between frequency and risk in this strategy type. Finally, the fact that the ambiguous strategies, i.e., the potential L3-based strategies, are used by so few students is, as previously discussed, suggestive of the fact that while influence from a language other than English or French on strategy usage is possible, it may not be very common due to the potential for miscommunication that these strategies entail.

### Table 5-35. Summary of interindividual communication strategy usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>N of individual student users</th>
<th>% of total students</th>
<th>N of cases in corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language switch</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal for assistance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message abandonment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreignization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word coinage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 L1-based strategies

The average number of times a student uses a language switch strategy is 15 and, as a proportion of the students' individual interviews, usage ranges between 0 and 0.9 percent. Of the 41 students, the four (FI 8, 16, 30, and 36) who make use of language switch the
least frequently (i.e., less than 0.09 percent of their interviews) have all spent time in a
Francophone environment and/or with a Francophone family. All, but one, speak a
language other than English at home.

Focusing specifically on the twelve students (FI 2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 22, 24,
25, 28, and 34) whose total use of language switch is 0.5 percent and higher for each
interview (token counts are between 12 and 52), the majority of the students in this group
are grade nine, middle class, and female. Furthermore, most have between 30 and 39
percent of their schooling in French, do not listen to French language radio or TV, and
have spent time in a French environment. In contrast to the former group, these students
have not stayed with a French family and they speak only English at home. Interestingly
enough, the majority of these students are also part of the group of students that uses
foreignization strategies during their interviews. Furthermore, they are the students who
are observed to use “like” the most frequently before an ensuing strategy usage, averaging
10 occurrences or 0.2 percent of individual interviews. Although it was not proven
statistically, for the particular speaker group under study L1 transfer appears to play an
especially important role in the processes that these students use to overcome
communicative difficulties in the TL.

3.2.2 L2-based strategies

Since most students do not use word coinage, it seems fitting to examine those who do.
There are six occurrences of word coinage in the corpus and a different speaker (FI 12,
13, 16, 18, 36, 37) uses each one. Five out of the 6 speakers are in grade 12 and are
occasionally exposed to French language media. Furthermore, these same students also
make up the majority of speakers who use approximation strategies (e.g. average is 3
times). It would seem, then, that comparable to the relation established between
foreignization and exposure to French language media, these L2-based strategies may
also be linked to students who, through exposure to informal varieties of French via the
media, where lexical innovations and play on words tend to abound, find themselves able
to exert a similar creativity in their own lexical usage.

With regards to circumlocution strategy usage, since it did not correlate with any
particular social factor, it is difficult to confirm any assumptions made in the previous
chapter about the individual students who use circumlocution, particularly as follow-up to
previous strategies. It was surmised that more proficient students might make use of
circumlocution in such a way and while this was not confirmed statistically, it seems
noteworthy that the student (FI 9) who evidenced the most problematic verb usage never
uses circumlocution; however, this is hardly conclusive and more study is required.

3.2.3 Sociopragmatic strategies
Mime is an interesting strategy to consider in light of the interindividual results and the
fact that the majority of occurrences of mime (N=12) are found in the speech of one
speaker (FI 33). Seven of the occurrences involve demonstrating an action or pointing to
a body part, while the remaining involve onomatopoeia. In this particular student's case,
it would be interesting to discover if an equal amount of mime is found in her L1 and
therefore an idiosyncrasy of the student's oral expression, in general, or if miming in L2
is simply a preferred strategy for dealing with lexical difficulties. Since the concentration
of the speaker's strategies is found among the most interactional types; namely,
circumlocution, appeal for assistance, message abandonment, and mime, perhaps the
latter assumption is most reasonable.
If we examine the four students (F1 22, 23, 25, 28, 31) who use the most appeal for assistance strategies (i.e., 0.3 or higher), we see that none of the students has stayed with a Francophone family. This is interpretable under the assumption that to a greater extent than others, students who have spent time with a Francophone family, particularly one where minimal to no English is spoken, will have developed a greater reliance on strategies other than those which may be typically used in the classroom setting, i.e., language switch and appeal for assistance. On the other hand, if we examine the 8 students who never use appeal for assistance strategies, the majority of these students have, likewise, never stayed with a Francophone family. The explanation for students' non-use of appeals for assistance may be tied to the fact that most of these students are infrequent users of communication strategies in general and/or the concentration of their strategic usage is not found among sociopragmatic strategies.

Finally, with regard to message abandonment strategies, while no statistical correlation was found with grade or length of schooling in French, it is interesting to find that of the six students (F1 6, 9, 21, 33, 34, 36) who use message abandonment strategies the most frequently (i.e., 0.1 percent or higher), all are in grade 9 and have an average amount of schooling in French (i.e., a maximum amount of approximately 39 percent).

3.2.4 Ambiguous/Potential L3-based strategies

In support of the claim that L3-transfer may influence students' strategy is the finding that all of the individual students who use an ambiguous strategy speak a language other than

---

43 While not all of these students are from an upper working class family, the correlation discovered between appeal for assistance and socioeconomic status is potentially more interpretable at this point if we can assume that the upper working class students may have had less opportunity to participate in student exchanges than have other students.
English (and not French) at home. While the number of ambiguous/potentially L3-based strategies is very low considering that about half of the students speak a third language, it remains suggestive that L3 can play a role in students' L2 communication strategies and, for this reason, warrants a specific category within the strategy typology. One possible explanation for the low number of occurrences in this category is the potential for miscommunication that such a strategy would entail. In other words, use of an L3-based strategy places the student neither in the TL speaker group, nor in the bilingual French/English speaker group, but rather in a group that potentially alienates the interlocutor. For this reason, they may not be seen as an effective use of linguistic resources for the communicative situation in which they find themselves and hence, tend to be avoided.

3.2.5 Problematic verb usage

Verb errors were examined primarily to find correlations with proficiency and strategy usage. As previously discussed, no correlations were found; however, when verb errors were measured against social factors, it was found that length of time spent with a Francophone family has a significant effect on verb usage. Of the six students (FI 3, 7, 9, 10, 18, 33) who demonstrated the highest rate of problematic verb usage (e.g. proportion of over 2 percent of total interview), besides having spent no time with a Francophone family, all of these students speak a language at home other than English. Furthermore, five out of six students are in grade 9. While no statistical correlations were found between grade or home language and problematic verb usage, the data are suggestive that L3 transfer may play a role in the speech of these students and this may affect students' correct use of verbs in French and that the longer amount of time spent in French
immersion courses at the advanced level, the more accurate students' verb usage may become.

4. Concluding remarks

To conclude, it is useful to relate the main findings outlined in the present chapter to those reported in past research on the use of communication strategies by French immersion students and, more generally, by L2 learners. First, with regard to L2 learner proficiency, it was found that proficiency in French does not have a statistically significant effect on students' use of a particular strategy type. This finding contrasts with Bialystok (1983) who found that students with advanced proficiency in French as a TL relied much more on L2-based strategies than did students with lower proficiency in French and, furthermore, that the lower proficiency students relied more on L1-based strategies. Although the amount of time that students have been enrolled in French immersion programmes does not correlate directly with proficiency in the present study, the longer that students are enrolled in the programme, the more likely they are to use the L1-based strategy, foreignization. Marrie and Netten (1991) and McGrath (1999) both found that the students in their samples who were more proficient in L2 demonstrated a higher use of achievement strategies than did the less proficient students.

Second, with regard to the possible influence of home language on students' communication strategy usage, a significant effect was found to suggest a link between home language and type of strategy used. Tarone (1977), in contrast, reported that students' home language did not influence their patterns of strategy usage; however, since
Tarone's findings are not the result of a statistical analysis, further research is necessary in order to draw any firm conclusions.

With regard to the social value of L2 learner status, it was found that students' use of some strategies; language switch and circumlocution, in particular, were not always easily explained as a compensation for linguistic deficiencies; but rather, in some cases, appeared to serve as a versatile use of a communication strategy to foster a relationship with the interviewer⁴⁴. This finding is comparable to those reported in Rampton's (1995) study of a group Anglo and Afro-Carribean adolescents who were observed to use language switch strategies when speaking with their Punjabi friends as a means to identify themselves as part of a joint interethnic group. It is possible that some of the strategies in the French immersion corpus, as opposed to being compensatory in nature, serve the sociopragmatic function of reflecting (i) the student's status as a participant in the discourse as an L2 learner versus a native TL speaker and/or (ii) the student's cultural identity, as a bilingual speaker of English and French in Canada.

⁴⁴ It was also noted that the interviewer's use of language switch, for example, appeared to serve a similar sociopragmatic purpose vis-à-vis the students.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

1. Summary of study

This study investigated the use of communication strategies in the speech of advanced French immersion students as a means to overcome lexical difficulties in the TL that are encountered while interacting with a native speaker of French in the context of an informal interview situation. It was proposed that frequency and strategy follow-up is tied to level of perceived risk; the higher the risk for a strategy to impede communication, the less frequent it is used overall (and by fewer speakers) and the greater the chance that it will require a second strategy to either clarify or correct the message that it conveyed.

Language switch is the most frequent strategy and is used by all 41 students. Consequently, it was assumed to pose the lowest risk for causing further communicative difficulties in the TL discourse. In contrast, word coinage and ambiguous/potentially L3-based strategies, used most infrequently and by the lowest number of students, are considered most high risk.

The interactional nature of the data offered a clearer understanding for the reasons the French immersion students have a tendency to use some strategies more regularly than others. It was suggested that students may have developed the habit of resorting to language switch at school with their immersion teachers and are relying on the same strategy in the context of the interviews. It was also surmised that students' preference for language switch may be due to the fact that students are interacting with an assumed
French/English bilingual speaker and that once students have ascertained that their use of English will be understood by their interlocutor, they return to it often. Ease of production, coupled with the fact that the interviewer is likely to understand the strategy, makes it an appealing option for the immersion students.

In keeping with the idea that students may rely on interaction with the interviewer to overcome lexical difficulties in the communicative context under study, it was also found that most of the sociopragmatic strategies, i.e., appeal for assistance and message abandonment, in addition to those strategies that entail some implicit interaction with the interviewer, i.e., circumlocution, were also fairly widespread in the corpus. It was proposed that multiple reasons may account for students' reliance on such strategies: (i) to treat the interviewer as a translator/source of information about the TL; (ii) to form a common bond with the interviewer; (iii) to minimize communication problems by allowing the interviewer to take charge; (iv) to treat the interview as a learning experience and/or to conform to expectations regarding the amount of French that students think they should be using in the communicative situation.

A Generalized Linear Model analysis was performed to determine whether or not students' communication strategy usage is correlated with certain linguistic and/or extralinguistic factors. The results indicated that (i) amount of schooling in French and (ii) amount of extracurricular time spent interacting in the French language, whether through extended stays with a Francophone family, visits to a French-speaking environment or exposure through French language media, are the factors most likely to affect the frequency and type of strategies that students use. In addition, age/grade, socioeconomic status and home language were other social factors found to have an
effect on strategy usage. L2-based strategies were not found to correlate with any social factors and students' sex was the one social factor found not to have any significant impact on students' patterns of strategy usage. It was proposed that some strategy usage: language switch and circumlocution, in particular, could not always be viewed as problematic, i.e., a compensation for linguistic deficiencies, but appeared to serve as students' versatile use of language to establish a bond with the interviewer and/or establish their cultural identity as an English/French bilingual.

2. Recommendations for future research

One general expectation in communication strategy research may be for "all second-language learners to behave in roughly the same way and that [their selection of communication strategies] would be distinct from the patterns of selection that might be observed from native speakers" (Bialystok 1990:53). On the other hand, it could also be that learners have particular idiosyncrasies when it comes to strategic language use and this translates into patterns of usage that are specific to L2 learners alone. In other words, it is possible that simply being a second language learner is the relevant factor in strategy selection (ibid.). One of the criticisms of communication strategy research performed to date has been the lack of comparative study that would allow for the investigation of such hypotheses; specifically, studies that compare L2 strategy use with native speaker use in the TL and/or those that specify which strategies in L2 speech are identical with or similar to those in L1 speech, and which are L2 specific (Færch and Kasper 1983d:218). As Færch and Kasper (ibid.) explain, overlooking the value of such a comparative aspect in a communication strategy study makes little sense because "precisely to what extent
the presence of such features in L1 speech is considered acceptable would be necessary
information for establishing a criterion for 'fluency' in IL performance".

The scarcity of comparative data is partly due to the fact that methodological
differences between the two major approaches to communication strategy research
surface in the choice of participants desired for study. Those interested in psychological
processing would tend to compare learners' use of L2 with the use of the learners' L1 by
eliciting responses for the same task in both languages, which fits with the general
interest in describing cognitive processes, whether in L1 or L2. In contrast, for
interactional studies "the relevant L1... is not that of the learner, but that of the target
language (TL) speakers" (Yule and Tarone 1997:22), which fits with the approach's
overall interest in "[investigating] how language is used interactively to accomplish
interpersonal goals" (Firth 1990:69). As emphasized by Yule and Tarone (1997:22)

The point of eliciting L1 data from native speakers, as well as learners, within the [interactional approach], is to have some clear (and not idealized) illustrations of the target behaviour of L2 learners and to note the ways in which native speakers organize and manipulate certain types of general vocabulary when specific referring expressions are not available.

For the purposes of the present study, the most ideal group for comparison would
consist of adolescents from a strong majority Francophone community in Ontario
because these speakers would be the most highly differentiated from the French
immersion students in terms of exposure to and frequency of use of French in
communicative situations outside the school setting. The city of Hawkesbury, located in
the Southeast region of Ontario, near the Quebec provincial border, has a Francophone
population of 85% and represents such a majority Francophone community. Mougeon
and Beniak (1991) compiled a corpus of Ontario French from four different localities, including Hawkesbury and the twenty speakers interviewed here would, thus, be an ideal benchmark for the comparative aspect of future research on French immersion students' use of communication strategies. The Hawkesbury corpus is based on students interviewed were enrolled in the ninth or twelfth grade (same grades as French immersion students) at a French-medium secondary school where subjects are taught entirely in French. Before attending French-medium secondary schools these students attended French-medium elementary schools. The data were obtained much in the same manner as the French immersion data, i.e., from face-to-face, tape recorded, informal interviews conducted by French Canadian native speakers on school premises. Again, the interviews range in length from 30 to 45 minutes and many of the questions that were asked were the same or quite similar to those asked in the French immersion interviews, covering topics including leisure activities, school and home life, personal experiences, and future aspirations.

The group of Hawkesbury speakers differs from the other native Ontario French speaker groups in two major ways. First, all of the Hawkesbury speakers are from homes where both parents are Francophone, which may have an effect on the maintenance of Ontario French language and culture in the home that would not otherwise exist if the adolescents came from linguistically-mixed marriages. Secondly, in self-reports completed by all of the native Ontario French speaker groups regarding patterns of language use, the Hawkesbury group reported (i) the most frequent use of French in a variety of settings (home, community, school) and with a variety of interlocutors (parents, siblings, friends) and (ii) the least frequent amount of exposure to English in the
same diverse interpersonal settings. In other words, these speakers communicate in French in most situations and with a variety of interlocutors. Considering the fact that Hawkesbury is a Francophone-majority city, these students are, presumably, also fairly weak bilinguals in English, but again, this makes them appealing as the benchmark for the comparative element of future research since the intent would be to differentiate them as fully as possible from the French immersion students\textsuperscript{45}.

The two major advantages to pursuing a comparative study of the native Ontario French and French immersion data, thus, include the fact that first, since it is possible to control for overall language dominance (French or English), the researcher is in a position to investigate the possible influence of patterns of language dominance on speech output. Secondly, while a knowledge of English is the common bond between the French immersion and Hawkesbury students there is still variation within the Franco-Ontarian and French immersion samples in the extent to which individuals communicate in English, in French, and in the case of some French immersion students, in a third language.

For the purpose of a communication strategy study, it would be interesting to investigate (i) which of the communication strategies that have been identified in the French immersion corpus, if any, also occur in the speech of native speakers of Ontario French and (ii) at what point along the scale of level of restriction in French (i.e., French-dominant versus English-dominant) these common strategies are found. Generally, it would be expected that the range of communication strategies would be smaller for

\textsuperscript{45}Studies devoted to the speech of Ontario French adolescents have shown that, comparatively speaking, the Hawkesbury students are unique in many ways: they are the least affected by standardization, simplification, and English transfer (cf. Mougeon and Beniak 1991).
native speakers, but more varied than for the immersion students. Specifically, native speakers would be expected to demonstrate differences from the immersion students in relation to communication strategies that are on the border with discourse marking, e.g. turn yielding, approval seeking, etc., and that are not necessarily symptomatic of communication difficulties. Secondly, it would be expected that the nature of some hesitation phenomena associated with strategy usage would be different in L1 and L2 performance and that learners will not have mastered the language-specific use of phenomena such as filled pauses, as observed in L1 performance. Language switch, appeal for assistance, and message abandonment strategies that were quite frequent in the French immersion corpus would be expected to be only exceptionally activated by the native Ontario French speakers, while the total absence of strategies, such as word coinage, would be equally expected by the native French speakers.

A second line of enquiry for future communication strategy research in French immersion would be to investigate the nature of classroom input that students are exposed to in the speech of their teachers and the possible influences for this on students' communication strategy usage. Classroom input is an especially important realm in the case of the French immersion speakers under study, since they have learned French primarily within an immersion classroom setting and receive most of their exposure to French in the classroom setting. To date, however, the effect of L2 teachers' speech on students' communication strategy usage has not been pursued. To gain insight into how teachers work with students to help them overcome any communicative difficulties communication strategies, the corpus of in-class French immersion teachers' speech compiled by Allen, Cummins, Harley, and Swain's (1987) could be used to compile data.
The corpus contains approximately 50,000 words from transcripts recorded in 19 French immersion classes randomly selected from two school boards in the Greater Toronto Area and one school board from the Ottawa/Carleton area. There is a discrepancy between the grade levels taught by the immersion teachers (grades three and six) and the grade levels of the French immersion adolescents investigated in the present study (grades nine and twelve). In many ways the Allen et al. (1987) teacher corpus is therefore not ideal for comparison purposes, but in spite of its limitations (i) it has proven quite revealing in other studies performed on the French immersion student corpus (cf. Rehner et al. 2002; Rehner [in progress]) and (ii) it is still the only extensive corpus on French immersion teacher speech available in Canada.

3. Final remarks

Swain and Lapkin (1995:375, citing Gary and Gary [1981:3]) point out that

"[c]omprehension...allows many linguistic signals to...very often be ignored without seriously distorting the message being comprehended". If we apply this principle to L2 speakers and their TL interactions with native TL speakers, then the implication is that students' non native-like use of the TL is only problematic if the form of their intended message actually impedes the interaction and that, in many ways, a structurally distorted message can still be comprehensible (i.e., meaningful) for the interlocutor. This speaks to the status of L2 learners vis-à-vis the native speakers with whom they interact and the pressure that is placed on them to conform to conventional lexical choices of the TL in spite of the fact that the goal of communication, i.e., to speak and be understood, is still being achieved.
In most SLA research, the L2 learner has been painted "as a deficient communicator struggling to overcome an underdeveloped L2 competence" (Firth and Wagner 1996:22). Consequently, L2 learning and interaction in the TL "is inherently problematic" (ibid.). It has not been the intention of the present study to suggest that learners need not or should not strive for accuracy in the TL; however, as students progress towards this linguistic goal it seems appropriate in language pedagogy to notice the strategic abilities that students demonstrate in their TL interactions to extend and manipulate their IL resources which enables them to succeed in communicating in the TL. In the words of Firth and Wagner (1996:23) "it is the explication of the 'successful' deployment of communicative resources - as indicators of second/foreign language acquisition - that should, in our opinion, be added to SLA's research agenda".
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## Appendices

### Appendix I. Distribution of individual communication strategy scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36/0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20/0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22/0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38/1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14/0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41/1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18/0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17/0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77/1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66/1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27/0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19/0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70/0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30/0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46/0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20/0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34/1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35/0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25/1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34/1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43/0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23/0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43/0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17/1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22/0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28/0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23/0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>611</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II. Distribution of social characteristics among the French immersion students

Key:
- code 1 = grade 9 (9) vs. grade 12 (2)
- code 2 = female (f) vs. male (m)
- code 3 = middle class (m) vs. upper-working class (w)
- code 4 = French medium schooling (1 = low, 2, 3, 4 = high)
- code 5 = no use of French language media (n) vs. occasional use of French language media (o)
- code 6 = time spent in a Francophone environment (0 = no time, 1, 2, 3 = greatest amount of time)
- code 7 = time spent staying with a Francophone family (0 = no time, 1, 2, 3 = greatest amount of time)
- code 8 = speaks only English at home (e) vs. speaks a Romance language at home (r) vs. speaks a non-Romance language other than English at home (o)
- (/) = information not supplied by the student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student I.D.</th>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9mm2n00e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9fw2n03e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>9mm2n00o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>9fm2n10e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>9fm2n20e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>9fm2n00e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>9fw2o00o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9fm2o120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9fm1o20o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>9fw2o00r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2fm1n00e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2mw2o20e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2fm1o20e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2fm1o20e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2fm2n23e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2mm2o33e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2fm2n23e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2fm2n20o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2fm1n10r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2fm2o13r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>9mw3n00o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>9f/4n20r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>9fw2n00e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>9mw4n02e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>9mm1n10e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>9mm2o20o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2mm/n30o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. 2fw1n00r
29. 2fw2o33o
30. 2fw2n33r
31. 2fm2o20o
32. 9fw3n32o
33. 9f/2n10r
34. 9mm2n12e
35. 9fw3n22e
36. 9mw2n10r
37. 2fm2o12e
38. 2fm1o23e
39. 2fm2o10e
40. 2fw2o00e
41. 2fw2n20o