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Introduction

Natural languages are constantly in change. Language change is a universal and diachronic phenomenon that covers the variation of a language in its lexical, morphosyntactic, phonological, semantic and pragmatic inventory. Language internal change includes processes such as lexicalization and grammaticalization, which have been discussed extensively in research in the last decades. Over a certain period of time, internal language change can lead to language variation. This language variation becomes especially apparent when one language underlies different processes of language change in different geographic areas. But languages may also change due to external factors, such as cultural and political influences, attempts of language standardization and language contact. In a very simple definition, language contact implies the use of different languages at once in the same geographical area (Thomason 2001). Here, language contact does not always necessarily go along with multilingualism. In some geographical areas, languages may coexist without multilingualism. This is the case for speakers in countries where the languages are restricted to a specific region, such as Switzerland and Belgium. This type of multilingualism is also referred to as territorial multilingualism. But language contact may not only arise in countries with different official languages. It may also occur in regions with linguistic minority groups, such as the different regional languages in France or Spain, or in situations of large-scale immigration of a certain linguistic group. It is important to distinguish between language contact in a certain society, generally termed as language contact, and language contact in a certain speaker, generally termed as bilingualism or multilingualism. Here, several factors influence the degree of bilingualism or multilingualism of a speaker. These factors include, amongst others, the age of language acquisition, the modalities of language acquisition, the sociolinguistic environment and the degree of language proficiency.

In the last decades, bilingualism and multilingualism have been extensively studied from a psycholinguistic perspective. Research questions include the exact nature of the bilingual mental lexicon, the storage and processing of more than one language in the bilingual brain and the interaction and influence of the languages in the bilingual brain.

In contrast, language change and language contact have not been in the focus of psycholinguistic investigations. Language change has mainly been investigated from a historical perspective. In early research on language contact, it has been questioned if language contact played an important role in the development of languages at all. This perspective has changed in recent years and it has been pointed out that languages can indeed transfer parts of their structure to another language in situations of intensive long-term language contact (Heine & Kuteva 2005).

The present work aims to investigate cross-linguistic influences in language contact situations by means of the linguistic expressions pragmatic markers. Pragmatic markers are linguistic ex-
pressions that are still not clearly defined, classified and limited. In the present work, I refer to pragmatic markers as a class of words, but this terminology and classification is by no means an uncontroversial issue (see chapter 4). They generally emerge through processes of grammaticalization or pragmatization from already existent lexical items. Pragmatic markers are known to be very suited for language change in contact, because they are syntactically very detachable and often do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance.

The aim of the present work is to analyze, by means of own corpus data, how pragmatic markers develop in a language contact situation and, by means of experimental investigations, which implications this change has on bilingual language processing. A variety of Canadian French, the Franco-Manitoban, spoken in the Canadian province of Manitoba, serves as basis for an own corpus of spoken and informal speech data. This variety of Canadian French has experienced a long period of intensive language contact with English and is highly influenced by the English language.

Therefore, Franco-Manitoban is very suited for an analysis of pragmatic markers in language contact. The underlying speech data was collected with highly fluent and early bilingual Franco-Manitoban speakers and therefore, the corpus data contains English and French to unequal parts. After a detailed analysis of the corpus data, the processes found in the corpus analysis will be investigated experimentally. The combination of a corpus-based approach and a psycholinguistic approach aims to give a broad view over pragmatic markers in language contact and the impact on bilingual language processing.

The choice to investigate pragmatic markers in language contact situation has different motivations. First, a cross-linguistic analysis of pragmatic markers can give important insights into their role in language change. Second, these insights may help to point out the specific characteristics and the functioning of pragmatic markers in general. Third, only very few psycholinguistic studies have focused on pragmatic markers and very little is known about their role in language processing. Psycholinguistic research is mainly based on prototypical word classes, such as nouns and verbs. Research on non-prototypical word classes, such as pragmatic markers, may give important insights into language processing and the models of the mental lexicon. Forth, the impacts of language contact on language processing have not been investigated at all from a psycholinguistic perspective. Therefore, experimental investigations on language contact phenomena, based on natural speech data, may help to clarify if these changes are also anchored in language processing.

The first chapter of the present work gives a brief overview about pragmatic markers and language change. Pragmatic markers are a very heterogeneous class of words, which is not clearly defined, classified and delimitated. Therefore it is crucial to clarify the present understanding of pragmatic markers and to give an overview about past research on pragmatic markers in lan-
guage contact. Furthermore, the first chapter introduces different processes of language internal and contact-induced language change.

The second chapter of this work focuses on bilingual language processing from a psycholinguistic perspective. In the first parts, current models of bilingual language representation and processing will be introduced and (dis)advantages of the respective models will be highlighted. The third part of the second chapter focuses on semantic, conceptual and pragmatic representations in the bilingual brain, delimiting these different notions and introducing past research on this topic.

The third chapter aims to introduce the underlying contact variety of the present work, the Franco-Manitoban. First, the sociolinguistic and historic background will be highlighted, with special focus on linguistic peculiarities of this variety and past linguistic research.

Chapter four provides a detailed corpus analysis of three French partial equivalent pragmatic markers, *comme/genre, alors/ donc* and *bon/ben* as well as their respective English translation equivalents *like, so* and *well*. Each analysis is preceded by a detailed overview about current research on the respective markers, their emergence and their functioning in monolingual contexts. The actual corpus analysis then contrasts the monolingual use of the respective markers, based on monolingual corpus data, with the use of these markers in the corpus data of the contact variety Franco-Manitoban. The main focus lies on the question how the markers developed in the specific language contact situation and how their use differs from their purely monolingual use. Regarding the results, it will be questioned if the markers underwent processes of contact-induced language change and how these changes manifest themselves.

Chapter five aims to consider the results of the corpus analysis from a psycholinguistic perspective. Here, the focus will be on the impacts of the different processes of language change on bilingual language processing and how they can be explained by means of different models of bilingual lexical access and language representation.

Chapter six presents the experimental investigation on pragmatic markers in language contact. Two experiments were conducted to investigate the influence of different processes of language change in a contact variety on language processing. Experiment 1 focuses on monolingual French pragmatic markers in sentence processing, whereas Experiment 2 focuses on bilingual pragmatic markers in word processing. In both experiments, Franco-Manitoban-speaking early bilinguals serve as experimental group and European French speaking late bilinguals serve as the control group. The main results of the experiments will be discussed and related to the results from the corpus analysis and to current models of bilingual language processing.
Pragmatic markers and language change

Pragmatic markers have been in the focus of linguistic research since more than 40 years. While first approaches to pragmatic markers come from text linguistics and conversation analysis, pragmatic markers now constitute one of the major research focuses of pragmatics. Despite the extensive research on pragmatic markers, there is still no mutual agreement on fundamental questions of this field. Therefore, the first part of this chapter aims to provide an outline of crucial questions in research on pragmatic markers, that is, their definition and classification as well as their meaning patterns and their functions. Different theoretic approaches will be discussed with regard to the focus of the present work.

As the aim of the present work is a cross-linguistic analysis of pragmatic markers in language contact, it is crucial to consider current approaches and theoretical considerations to processes of language change and outcomes of language contact. The second subchapter provides an overview of processes of language change with a special focus to the emergence and evolution of pragmatic markers. On the one hand, the focus lies on monolingual processes such as grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. On the other hand, processes of language change in language contact situations, such as replication and borrowing, will be considered.

The conclusive part of this chapter provides a preliminary introduction to the peculiarities of pragmatic markers in language contact situations.

1.1 Pragmatic markers – State of the Art

Providing an overview of pragmatic markers is still linked to a wide range of problems and questions. In the last decades a large number of studies tried to approach the field of pragmatic markers from different perspectives (among the most influential works can be cited e.g. Gülich 1970; Schourup 1985; Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1990; Brinton 1996; Mosegaard-Hansen 1998; Jucker & Ziv 1998; Schourup 1999; Fischer 2000; Rossari 2000; Andersen 2001; Aijmer 2002; Blakemore 2002; Dostie 2004). This class of words, here grouped under the name of pragmatic markers, is still not clearly classified, delimited and defined. In English studies, it is possible to find denominations such as discourse connectives (Blakemore 1987), discourse particles (Schourup 1985), pragmatic markers (Fraser 1990, Schiffrin 1987), pragmatic particles (Östman 1995) or pragmatic expressions (see Fraser 1999: 932). In French studies, the same lexemes are called mar-
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queurs discursifs/du discours, marqueurs pragmatiques, connecteurs, particules discursives, particules énonciatives or mots du discours (Dostie & Pusch 2007: 3).

However, it is not only complicated that the respective class of words has several different names in different studies, it is far more problematic that, depending on the respective denomination, the class of words may include or exclude very differing types of words. The term connectives often includes lexemes such as therefore, and, because or but. Furthermore, the term connective, or French connecteur, is commonly distinguished from the term pragmatic marker/discourse marker, as in Beeching (2011:100):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Connectives’</th>
<th>Other types of discourse particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items integrated into host utterances</td>
<td>Items constituting independent utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting function</td>
<td>Functions regarding conversation management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken and written text</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of utterances</td>
<td>Topic, activities, sequential structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Differentiation between connectives and other discourse particles

The term pragmatic expressions regularly includes expressions such as you know, I mean and t’sais (Jucker & Ziv 1998: 2). In contrast, the term particle or French particule generally puts the focus on monosyllabic lexemes such as so, well and ben. According to Fischer (2006), the term discourse particle “suggests a focus on small, uninflected words that are only loosely integrated into the sentence structure” and “is used in contrast to clitics, full words, and bound morphemes” (Fischer 2006: 4). Still, it can be stated that English discourse markers and pragmatic markers, as well as French marqueurs discursifs/du discours seem to be the most common denominations. Here, the different termini focus on two different functionings of this class of words. While marqueurs discursifs/du discours and discourse markers focus more on the discourse-structuring function of the markers, the term pragmatic markers highlights the pragmatic function of the markers. In this respect, the term pragmatic marker is chosen in the present work, because the focus lies on pragmatic and semantic functions and meanings of the respective markers. Here, the present work follows e.g. Fraser (2006), who explains his choice by stating that pragmatic markers are “free morphemes, are discourse-segment initial, signal a specific message, and are classified not syntactically but in terms of their semantic/pragmatic functions” (Fraser 2006: 189).

While it is relatively unproblematic to choose a suitable denomination, it is much more problematic to classify and to delimitate the class of pragmatic markers.

For example, Blakemore (1987) classifies as pragmatic markers lexemes such as after all and moreover and Schiffrin (1987) includes lexemes like because, and, then in her classification. These cases are definitely problematic, because they can for instance easily be defined as adverbs or con-
junctons. Other authors, such as Schourup (1985) do not include the above-named lexemes, but imply different kinds of interjections, such as hey and aba (Jucker, Ziv 1998: 2).

The delimitation of the class is indeed one of the main problems in research on pragmatic markers. Does this word class include interjections, modal particles, hedges, hesitation signals etc.? In order to find a possible answer to this question, it is crucial to take a look at different definitions of pragmatic markers and at their functioning.

Some researchers have tried to define a general function of the overall class of pragmatic markers. Here, the focus lies mainly on the relation or relevance of parts of an utterance or the specific contextual information.

Schiffrin (1987) assumes that pragmatic markers have an indexical function in that they point to special contextual features. Blakemore (1987) argues that the main function of pragmatic markers is to indicate how discourse elements depend on each other. Fraser (1988) states that pragmatic markers mainly signal sequential discourse relationships. Östman (1995) proposes that pragmatic markers function as implicit anchors. Aijmer et al. (2006) define pragmatic markers as fulfilling a metalinguistic or metapragmatic role in sentence processing.

While these approaches try to assign one major feature to the class of pragmatic markers, other approaches try to establish a whole list of features of pragmatic markers, such as Brinton (1996: 30ff.). She differentiates between phonological features such as the phonological reduction, syntactic features, such as the sentence-peripheral position, semantic features, such as the lack of propositional meaning, and functional features, such as the restriction to oral rather than written discourse (see Brinton 1996 for a more detailed discussion). When trying to define the class of pragmatic markers, it is crucial to consider two major problems that are the delimitation and the classification of the class of words. When saying that pragmatic markers are mainly short items (e.g. Östman 1982), this excludes multiword expressions such as you know, I mean and items such as because and anyway. When saying that pragmatic markers do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance (e.g. Brinton 1996, Schiffrin 1987), this excludes automatically different kinds of hedging functions, such as rounders and approximators. When stating that pragmatic markers occur mainly in sentence-peripheral, especially in sentence-initial, position, this excludes a wide range of items such as connectives, modal particles, hedges, etc.

The present work relies on the following characteristics of pragmatic markers. Pragmatic markers

a) are syntactically flexible
b) are polyfunctional
c) occur mostly in sentence-peripheral positions
d) contain a high number of polysemic senses
e) do not contribute to the propositional content
f) fulfil discourse-pragmatic functions
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g) do not stand in a grammatical relationship to other elements of the utterance
h) are not inflectable

It has to be pointed out that c) and e) are not always applicable, especially not for hedging functions of pragmatic markers. In the present account, hedges are included in the group of pragmatic markers to a certain extent. This is because some pragmatic markers may fulfill discourse-pragmatic function on the one hand and hedging functions on the other (see chapter 4). Still, it is clearly differentiated between hedges and pragmatic markers, because both may vary importantly in their respective characteristics. It has to be pointed out that the present account does not include interjections, connectives, hesitation and monitoring signals as pragmatic markers.

The above-named characteristics will be explained in detail in the following. To do so, it is useful to take a separate look at the semantic meanings of pragmatic markers, their pragmatic functions and their discourse-related properties. In the present understanding, the semantic meaning patterns of a pragmatic marker are defined as its contributions to the propositional content (see e.g. Fischer 2000: 16). The pragmatic functions of a pragmatic marker are contextually determined and may have metacommunicative reasons. The discourse-structuring functions serve pure discourse-structuring and monitoring reasons. It is not always possible to distinguish unequivocally between pragmatic and discourse-structuring functions (see chapter 4).

Semantic meaning patterns

There is by far no agreement on the semantic meaning patterns of pragmatic markers and especially on their interrelation and their nature. Here, the main questions concern two very different aspects of the meaning of pragmatic markers. The first problem is to define the interrelation of semantic meaning patterns, that is to decide if pragmatic markers are polysemous or monosemous items. It is generally accepted that most pragmatic markers emerged from other word types through processes such as grammaticalization or pragmatization. This leads to the fact that pragmatic markers commonly have more than one meaning.

When taking a polysemy perspective on pragmatic markers (e.g. in the work of Mosegaard Hansen, Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, Waltereit, Pons Bordería, etc.), lexical items with various interrelated senses are defined as being polysemous. The polysemy approach claims that:

“most linguistic word forms have more than one meaning, not only at the level of parole but also at the level of langue, and that these meanings are related to one another in ways that can at least be motivated, if not fully predicted” (Mosegaard Hansen 2008: 35)

In contrast, the monosemy approach (e.g. in the work of Fischer, Weydt, Fraser, Rossari, Schiffrin) claims that:
“Each phonological/orthographic form is associated with a single invariant meaning. This invariant meaning may describe the common core of the occurrences of the item under consideration, its prototype, or an instruction. Individual interpretations arise from general pragmatic processes and are not attributed to the item itself.” (Fischer 2005: 13)

Therefore, in particular monosemy-oriented studies try to establish a core meaning of different pragmatic markers. But also scholars following the polysemy approach may assume that pragmatic markers have a core meaning (from a polysemic perspective), in that they have one meaning that is more dominant than others (see e.g. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003). Still, in a polysemy approach it is not a prerequisite to assume a core meaning, it is also possible to accept different interrelated meanings without one clear dominant sense (e.g. Waltereit 2006).

Especially in the monosemy approach, determining a core meaning is not without problems. The core meaning is often too broad and cannot really distinguish a certain pragmatic marker from others. This is mainly due to the fact that a core meaning does not only try to account for the different semantic meaning patterns of a pragmatic marker but also for its pragmatic and intertextual functioning (Aijmer 2002: 23). This gets particularly complicated in studies that focus on cross-linguistic comparisons of discourse-pragmatic features and meaning patterns of pragmatic markers. Waltereit (2006) points out that there is no satisfactory way of comparing partial equivalent pragmatic markers from different languages from a monosemy perspective, because it cannot explain functional differences in the different languages (Waltereit 2006: 8).

On the contrary, the polysemy approach can account for cross-language differences and semantic change without problems. This is because, from a diachronic perspective, non-systematic polysemy itself is the result of language change (Waltereit 2007: 9). Furthermore, the polysemy approach allows that pragmatic markers from different languages may overlap in some of their meanings and functions and not in others. This assumption is a very important prerequisite for research on diachronic language change, contact-induced language change and cross-linguistic variation. Therefore, the present account adopts a polysemy approach to pragmatic markers, which “is compatible with the diachronic model of grammaticalization (‘pragmaticalization’) in which pragmatic meanings are derived from a propositional meaning via certain paths and on the basis of pragmatic principles” (Aijmer 2002: 23).

A second problem in research on pragmatic markers is the question whether they contribute to the truth-conditional meaning of an utterance or not and whether they encode conceptual meaning or not. The distinction between truth-conditional and non-truth-conditional meaning commonly describes the distinction between semantics (truth-conditional) and pragmatics (non-truth-conditional). Most studies assume that pragmatic markers generally do not affect the truth conditions of a sentence. That is to say that they rather indicate how to interpret an utterance than to contribute to its content. This approach is not without controversy; Blakemore
(2002) argues that the view semantics = truth-conditions and pragmatics = meaning minus truth-conditions, is not adequate for an analysis of pragmatic markers. She defends a relevance-theoretic approach to pragmatic markers, based on Sperber and Wilson (1986) (see also Andersen 2001). This view is based on the differentiation between conceptual and procedural meaning, that is:

“A linguistic expression or structure may encode a constituent of the conceptual representations that enter into pragmatic, while on the other, a linguistic expression may encode a constraint on pragmatic inferences” (Blakemore 2002: 4).

In this view, pragmatic markers are not directly mapped onto a conceptual representation but function as items that modify the interpretation of an utterance and help the hearer to decode the message. According to Wilson (2011) the differentiation between conceptual and procedural meaning differs from the semantics-pragmatics distinction in that “it carries definite cognitive commitments” (Wilson 2011: 9). Furthermore, “the claim that a certain expression encodes conceptual or procedural meaning has implications for the nature of the cognitive mechanisms involved” (ibd.). That is lexemes encoding conceptual meaning are linked to concepts, while lexemes encoding procedural meaning are linked to states of language users, e.g. procedures (Wilson 2011: 10).

The strict distinction between words encoding procedural and conceptual meaning has been criticized in current research (e.g. Pons Bordería 2008, Fraser 2006). Fraser (2006) claims that lexical items can encode procedural meaning and a conceptual component of meaning at the same time. This view has even been adopted by Wilson (2011), who claims that “conceptual and procedural meaning should not be treated as mutually exclusive” (Wilson 2011:14). Although the distinction between conceptual and procedural meaning aims to be particularly suited for a cognitive approach to meaning, it is not clear from a psycholinguistic perspective how this distinction is related to theories of language processing and recent models of the monolingual or bilingual mental lexicon (see chapter 2.3). This issue is addressed in the present work, which takes a psycholinguistic perspective on conceptual and semantic representations in language processing (see chapter 2).

Pragmatic functions

As already mentioned, pragmatic markers are characterized by their spectrum of pragmatic functions. This polyfunctionality is commonly accepted and also goes back to the evolution paths of pragmatic markers. Most markers emerged from already existing lexical items such as adverbs (e.g. well, bon, bien, alors, donc) and conjunctions (e.g. so, like), which often already were multifunctional in their grammatical functions. Still, all of these lexical items developed pragmatic functions over time (see 1.2 and 4 for a more detailed discussion). In most cases, grammatical
and pragmatic functions coexist, but they are generally clearly distinguishable (e.g. the adverb *well* and the pragmatic marker *well*). Furthermore, most pragmatic markers are also polyfunctional at the pragmatic level. While there is general agreement on the fact that pragmatic markers are polyfunctional items, there is discussion on an explanation. From a monosemy approach, every marker has a core meaning that varies according to the respective contextually determined meanings and functions. From a polysemy approach, the different functions are simply a result of the polysemy that is of the emergence of new functions over time.

It is self-evident that different pragmatic markers differ importantly in their pragmatic functions. But it is still possible to point out some functions, which occur on a more frequent basis. When researchers aim to point out more frequent functions of pragmatic markers, they generally mention functions as face-threat mitigators, as emphasizers or intensifiers, attenuation or mitigation purposes or to express the speakers’ attitude. Another function of pragmatic markers may be to establish coherence in discourse interpretation. Aijmer (2002) points out that “when discourse particles are absent or if they are used wrongly, listeners may have difficulty in establishing a coherent interpretation of discourse” (Aijmer 2002: 15). She refers to this phenomenon as indexicality, that is pragmatic markers create an indexical relation to the context and therefore serve in utterance interpretation.

According to Aijmer, it is not possible to determine the concrete number of functions of a pragmatic marker. In contrast to this opinion, a wide range of studies has tried to establish the semantic meaning patterns and functions of specific pragmatic markers (see chapter 4). In light of this it is considered problematic establishing universally valid pragmatic features for pragmatic markers. Here, it seems more plausible to determine the functions of a given pragmatic marker on the basis of corpus data. The pragmatic functions of the specific markers will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.

**Discourse-structuring functions**

Gülich (1970) provided one of the early analyses of pragmatic markers, which she called *Gliederungssignale*. She regards *discourse markers* in the more narrow understanding, in that they aim to have mainly discourse-structuring and -segmentation functions. In a broader understanding, pragmatic markers also include mainly semantic and pragmatic functions as mentioned above. As Gülich regarded pragmatic markers from a discourse analytic perspective, she focused on the discourse functions of pragmatic markers. According to her, pragmatic markers have segmentation functions, for example as opening or closing signals. Furthermore, they function as turn-taking signals and help the interlocutors to deal with repairs and hesitations (Gülich 1970: 89 ff.). The functions established by Gülich are still commonly accepted. Especially in spoken discourse, pragmatic markers can fulfill important functions in discourse structuring to help the
hearer with the utterance interpretation. According to Blakemore (1987), pragmatic markers are therefore meta-pragmatic instructions for the processing of an utterance. As well as Fraser (1988) and Schiffrin (1987), she points out that pragmatic markers function to segment and link utterances. Here, pragmatic markers may mark utterance boundaries or even bracket certain utterances. Examples for marking utterance boundaries are pragmatic markers introducing reported speech, a result or a conclusion. Still, pragmatic markers may not only help the hearer with utterance interpretation, but also the speaker with utterance performance. As filler in pauses or hesitations, the speaker can signal that he has not yet finished his utterance. As a turn-opener, a pragmatic marker may signal that a conversation partner claims the right to speak. As a closing signal the speaker may advise the conversation partners that he has finished his utterance.

It already has been suggested that the syntactic position of pragmatic markers plays an important role in their functioning. This becomes very clear when regarding their discourse-structuring functions. Especially as segmentation and boundary markers, pragmatic markers generally stand in utterance-peripheral positions. Furthermore, pragmatic markers are generally syntactically detachable from the rest of the utterance without modifying the propositional content.

The precise discourse-structuring functions of the underlying pragmatic markers of the present work will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.

**Hedges**

Classic hedges include lexical items such as *sort of, kind of, I think, I mean, I guess*. The term *hedge* goes back to Lakoff (1972), who defines them as “words whose job it is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy” (Lakoff 1972: 195). In the present understanding, the term *hedge* only refers to words which “make things fuzzier” and not “less fuzzy”.

In current research, the definition has been revised and hedging can be defined as “a rhetorical strategy that attenuates either the full semantic value of a particular expression (…) or the full force of a speech act (…)” (Fraser 2010: 15). This definition still lacks some important functions of hedges that do not necessarily attenuate the semantic value.

Hedges have been analyzed extensively in the last decades and have been associated with research on politeness as well as with research on pragmatic markers. Brown and Levinson (1987) argued that hedges are a device to avoid disagreement and a strategy of negative politeness. Other possibilities to define hedges concern their propositional content or their illocutionary force (for an overview about the different classifications see Kaltenböck et al. 2010: 6).

The present understanding of hedges is based on Prince et al. (1982). They proposed a detailed classification of the subclasses of hedges:
In their classification, Prince et al. distinguish between two types of hedges, namely approximators and shields. Approximators are defined as lexical items that modify the truth-conditions of an expression while shields do not affect the truth-conditions of an utterance. Adaptors trigger a loose reading of a lexical unit or expression and operate on the semantic level of an utterance; whereas rounders modify a numeral value in that they indicate a vague interpretation. In contrast, shields do not modify the semantics of an utterance but rather soften a statement and alter the illocutionary force (see Mihatsch 2010: 93 ff.).

While other scholars extended this classification recently (e.g. Caffi 2001, 2007), the present work will however rely on the classification of Prince et al. (1982).

As desirable as it may be to establish a classification and a definition for hedges, it is still unclear how they differ from the class of pragmatic markers. Hedges do not have any discourse-structuring functions and they generally do not stand in sentence-peripheral positions. This may only be the case for the shield function, which is syntactically very flexible and can have a very large scope. Furthermore, approximators (in Prince et al.’s sense) operate on the semantic level of an utterance and therefore do not fulfill a pragmatic function. This is not the case for shields, which do not operate on the propositional content but on the illocutionary force of an utterance.

In contrast, pragmatic markers, as defined in this chapter, fulfill pragmatic and discourse-structuring functions, do not modify the propositional content of an utterance and mostly occur in utterance-peripheral positions.

As mentioned above, some lexical items may as well function as both a pragmatic marker and a hedging device (e.g. English like or Canadian French comme; see chapter 4). For this reason, the function hedging may be a function of pragmatic markers. Still, hedging functions are clearly distinguishable from pragmatic functions and discourse-structuring functions of pragmatic markers, because they act on the utterance level.
The next subchapter aims to provide an overview of processes of language change with special respect to the emergence of pragmatic markers, before analyzing in detail the peculiarities of pragmatic markers in language contact.

1.2 Processes of language change

As mentioned in the previous subchapter, pragmatic markers generally emerge from already existing lexical items, e.g. adverbs, connectives or prepositions. But there is no mutual agreement on how to correctly describe and classify these processes of emergence of pragmatic markers. Therefore, the first part of this subchapter aims to introduce the notions of grammaticalization and pragmatisationalization as possible underlying processes of language change of pragmatic markers.

The second subchapter then puts the focus on contact-induced language change and related processes of pragmatic markers due to language contact. The emphasis here lies on the processes of grammatical replication and borrowing.

1.2.1 Grammaticalization and pragmatisationalization

Grammaticalization is a highly complex process of language change, which has caused much discussion in linguistic research. One of the most influential definitions of grammaticalization comes from Lehmann:

Grammaticalization is a process leading from lexemes to grammatical formative. A number of semantic, syntactic and phonological processes interact in the grammaticalization of morphemes and of whole constructions. (Lehmann 1995 [1982]: V)

This definition implies that grammaticalization consists of different underlying processes, which in the end result in a grammaticalized form. The term grammaticalization was most likely introduced by Antoine Meillet, who defines it as “l’attribution du caractère grammatical à un mot jadis autonome” (Meillet 1912: 131). Since then, research on grammaticalization has focused on constraints, delimitation and examples of this phenomenon in synchronic and diachronic approaches (for an extensive historical overview see Hopper & Traugott 2003).

Haspelmath includes specific characteristics and features of grammaticalization in his definition:
Grammaticalization is the gradual drift in all parts of the grammar towards tighter structures, towards less freedom in the use of linguistic structures at all levels. (Haspelmath 1998)

According to his definition, grammaticalization is a gradual process, which implies different processes and modifies the underlying lexeme in a way that changes its characteristics. This definition may indeed have to be regarded with caution, because it does not become clear in which way grammaticalization is a gradual process. As mentioned later in this chapter, the individual stages of grammaticalization do not appear gradually but rather abrupt. Traugott emphasizes in her definition that not only lexemes may become grammatical forms but also grammatical forms may become more grammatical:

Grammaticalization […] is that subset of linguistic changes whereby lexical material in highly constrained pragmatic and morphosyntactic contexts becomes grammatical, and grammatical material becomes more grammatical. Traugott (1996: 183)

As this citation shows, Traugott speaks of grammaticalization as a subset of changes. But which mechanisms exactly are underlying the concept of grammaticalization?

Prévost (2006) cites as a first process reanalysis, which modifies the underlying structure of a lexeme and may trigger a reparenthesis. Hopper and Traugott also see reanalysis as the most important process in grammaticalization, because “it is a prerequisite for the implementation of the change through analogy” (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 39). According to Prévost, reanalysis comprises different processes such as recategorization (change from a major to a minor category), decategorialization (loss of category markers and other privileges of major categories), loss of syntactic freedom, and fixation of the position (Prévost 2006: 123). Further underlying mechanisms are of semantic and phonological nature. From a semantic perspective, the semantic bleaching of a lexeme is a very important feature in grammaticalization. Furthermore, grammaticalization often goes along with phonological reduction, such as the English future marker going to reduced to gonna. Traugott resumes the mechanisms and features of grammaticalization as follows:

(i) structural decategorialization; (ii) shift from membership in a relatively open set to membership in a relatively closed one (i.e., from lexical category to syntactic operator category) in the context of a specific construction; (iii) bonding (erasure of morphological boundaries) within a construction; (iv) semantic and pragmatic shift from more to less referential meaning via invited inferencing (…), phonological attrition, which may result in the development of paradigmatic zero. (Traugott 2003: 644)

Another possibility is to approach grammaticalization and reanalysis from two different perspectives. According to Detges and Waltereit (2002) grammaticalization describes the speaker-based
part of this language change phenomenon, whereas reanalysis is a mainly hearer-based procedure. That is to say that the listeners ratify grammaticalization by reanalysis.

Apart from these characteristics, respectively the underlying processes, of grammaticalization mentioned above, Lehmann established parameters, which help to determine the degree of grammaticalization of a given lexeme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>paradigmatic</th>
<th>syntagmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesion</td>
<td>paradigmaticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variability</td>
<td>paradigmatic variability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>syntagmatic variability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Parameters of grammaticalization (adapted from Lehmann 2002: 110)

According to this approach, the parameters are correlated and their correlation can be measured for every individual construction. Still, the parameters of Lehmann also have been regarded from a critical perspective (e.g. Auer, Günthner 2005).

Heine and Kuteva (2002) established an approach that assumes that “grammaticalization is based on the interaction of pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic, and phonetic factors” (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 34). According to them, grammaticalization arises when a lexeme is used in a new context and, in extension, loses parts of its initial meaning patterns. Here, they differentiate between four stages of grammaticalization, that is an initial stage, a bridging context, a switch context and the conventionalization (Heine 2002: 84). In the initial stage, the lexeme is used in its initial context. In the bridging context, the lexeme is used in a new, innovative context, in which its meaning differs from the initial stage. According to Heine (2002), bridging contexts have the following underlying properties:

a. They trigger an inferential mechanism to the effect that, rather than the source meaning, there is another meaning, the target meaning, that offers a more plausible interpretation of the utterance concerned.

b. While the target meaning is the most likely to be inferred, it is still cancellable (see Grice 1967), that is, an interpretation in terms of the source meaning cannot be ruled out.

c. A given linguistic form may be associated with a number of different bridging contexts.

d. Bridging contexts may, but need not, give rise to conventional grammatical meanings. (Heine 2002: 84-85)

The concept of bridging contexts is of particular importance when regarding the emergence of new semantic meaning patterns and pragmatic functions in chapter 4. In the third stage, the switch context, the lexeme is mainly used in its new meanings; the initial meaning is blocked and almost lost. In the conventionalization stage, the new meanings are conventionalized (Heine
& Kuteva 2002). These stages from a minor to a major use pattern have been visualized by Heine and Kuteva, excluding the initial stage, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low frequency</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Weakly grammaticalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Increase in frequency</td>
<td>Extension to new contexts</td>
<td>An additional, more grammatical meaning may emerge in new contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>High frequency</td>
<td>Context generalization</td>
<td>Generalization of new grammatical meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. From minor to major use pattern (adapted from Heine & Kuteva, 2010: 86)

On the basis of this context-induced approach to grammaticalization, Heine and Kuteva established parameters of grammaticalization, which rely on earlier works on this topic:

a. extension, i.e. the rise of novel grammatical meanings when linguistic expressions are extended to new contexts (context-induced reinterpretation),
b. desemanticization (or “semantic bleaching”), i.e. loss (or generalization) in meaning content,
c. decategorialization, i.e. loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms,
d. erosion (or “phonetic reduction”), i.e. loss in phonetic substance. (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 80)

These parameters differ from the above-mentioned criteria and parameters in that Heine and Kuteva focus on context-induced reinterpretation and possible bridging contexts. The approach of Heine and Kuteva will be explained in more detail in the upcoming subchapter, with regard to contact-induced language change (see also chapter 4).

A third approach to grammaticalization was introduced by Traugott (e.g. 1988, 1995). She focuses particularly on the semantic and pragmatic mechanisms to grammaticalization in order to explain the emergence processes of pragmatic markers. According to her, the most important element in grammaticalization is subjectivity. In her earlier works, she states that grammaticalization follows from propositional to textual and then to expressive stages (Traugott 1982). In more recent studies, she distinguishes between subjectivity and intersubjectivity:

These expressions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity are expressions of the prime semantic or pragmatic meaning of which is to index speaker’s attitude or viewpoint (subjectivity) and speaker’s attention to addressee self-image (intersubjectivity). (Traugott 2010: 29)

Still, it is not completely clear to what degree lexemes must undergo specification in grammaticalization.
It is not possible in the scope of this work to introduce and compare all possible approaches to grammaticalization extensively (for a detailed overview of the different approaches see, e.g. Mroczynski 2012).

For the present work, two main issues have been identified as extremely relevant. The first concerns the directionality of language change and the second concerns the question whether pragmatic markers underlie grammaticalization processes or not. The directionality of language change and especially of grammaticalization has been subject to much discussion in the past decades (for a discussion see e.g. Haspelmath 2004; Hopper & Traugott 2003; Heine 2003; Traugott 2001). The directionality hypothesis states that grammaticalization, as a diachronic phenomenon is generally a unidirectional process. That is to say that a lexical item can become a more grammatical item over time, but that this process is not reversible. In the debate on the directionality hypothesis, several authors take very differing positions. The strongest position on unidirectionality is that every grammaticalization process implies a shift from lexical to more grammatical meaning and that this process is always irreversible (e.g. Haspelmath 1999, 2004; Lehmann 1995). Still, this very strong statement has to cope with some counterevidence. Some languages show indeed examples for cases were grammaticalization is not a unidirectional process (for examples, see Hopper & Traugott 2003). This has lead some scholars to the assumption that unidirectionality cannot be an important characteristic of grammaticalization, because counterexamples exist (e.g. Janda 1995).

Here, it seems more plausible to follow the position of Hopper and Traugott in assuming that in most cases, grammaticalization implies the evolution from lexical items to grammatical items and that “counterexamples are sporadic and only rarely cross-linguistically attested” (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 139).

A second crucial issue for the present work concerns the question if the emergence and evolution of pragmatic markers is a case of grammaticalization. As mentioned above, some scholars see the emergence of pragmatic markers as a clear case of grammaticalization (e.g. Traugott, Brinton). But other scholars, who assume that pragmatic markers do not underlie the process of grammaticalization because they do not emerge to grammatical items, challenge this view (e.g. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, Waltereit, Dostie). The term pragmatization has been introduced by Erman and Kotsinas (1993) and describes the process of a formerly lexical item turning into a pragmatic item. According to Aijmer (1997) it is important to differentiate clearly between grammaticalization, that is “the derivation of grammatical forms and constructions (mood, aspect, tense, etc.) from words and lexical structure”, and pragmatization, including “speaker’s attitude to the hearer” (Aijmer 1997: 2).

The main problem in this discussion is the definition of grammar and pragmatics. If one adopts a broader perspective on the notion of grammar, it is possible to argue that pragmatic markers
underlie grammaticalization processes (e.g. Brinton 1996). But when regarding the processes of grammaticalization and its definition more closely, it becomes apparent why some scholars refute the notion of grammaticalization for pragmatic markers. Pragmatic markers do not develop grammatical functions and also do not follow grammaticalization parameters (Dostie 2004: 25). They especially contradict the notions of loss of syntactic freedom and fixation of the position, which are important elements in reanalysis.

The discussion on grammaticalization and pragmationalization still rests unsolved and it depends on the approach of the respective author which term is chosen (for a detailed discussion see e.g. Diewald 2011). For some authors, the two terms are not mutually exclusive and may be combined in a larger concept. Dostie (2004) states that the term grammaticalization as such is a polysemous term. Therefore, it is possible to regard grammaticalization in a strict sense and in a broad sense, but these two meanings have to be differentiated clearly (Dostie 2004: 26).

In the present understanding, pragmationalization is seen as a distinct type of language change, which overlaps with grammaticalization in certain functions. That is to say, grammaticalization and pragmationalization start as very similar processes, but result in a different final outcome. It has to be differentiated explicitly whether a lexical item develops grammatical or pragmatic functions, whereby it is possible that an item may develop both at the same time (see Traugott 1995). Furthermore, the present work relies on the grammaticalization approach of Heine and Kuteva, which will be presented in more detail and with focus on contact-induced language change in the upcoming subchapter.

1.2.2 Contact-induced language change

After having presented the notions of grammaticalization and pragmationalization in the previous subchapter, the present part aims to introduce two main types of contact-induced language change. These are borrowing or copying on the one hand and interference, transfer or replication on the other hand (Winford 2010: 170).

According to Heine and Kuteva, “contact-induced influence manifests itself in the transfer of linguistic material from one language to another” (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 2). When talking about cross-linguistic change, Heine and Kuteva assume a model language (also source language), providing the pattern for transfer, and a replica language (also target or borrowing language), receiving the pattern. To underline this very broad definition, they classified different kinds of linguistic transfer as follows:

a. Form, that is, sounds or combinations of sounds
b. Meanings (including grammatical meanings or functions) or combinations of meanings
c. Form–meaning units or combinations of form–meaning units

d. Syntactic relations, that is, the order of meaningful elements

e. Any combination of (a) through (d) (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 2)

In the present work, the focus will lie on the transfer processes b. and c., which will be named, following Heine and Kuteva, grammatical replication and borrowing. Other scholars employ different terms, such as Johanson (2002), who relies on the concept of code copying and differs between selective and global copying. In contrast, Sakel and Matras (2007) refer to PAT borrowing, related to patterns, and MAT borrowing, related to matter (see Kriegel 2012). This amount of different denominations may be especially confusing in some cases. Matras (2009) uses the term replication as a synonym for the term borrowing and with reference to Johanson’s generic term copying. In contrast, Heine and Kuteva (2005, 2006, 2010) use the term replication as opposed to the term borrowing. In the present work, the term contact-induced language change will be employed as an umbrella term for different kinds of cross-linguistic influence and transfer. I follow Heine and Kuteva in the terminology of naming the main types of contact-induced language transfer, which can be visualized in the figure below:

![Figure 4. Main types of contact-induced language transfer (Heine & Kuteva 2010: 87)](image)

As a first phenomenon, the concept of grammatical replication will be introduced.

Grammatical replication describes the gradual transfer of meanings or meaning patterns (including grammatical meaning) from a model language to a replica language. By definition, grammatical replication may “in the same way affect morphological, syntactic and pragmatic structures, the noun phrase and the verb phrase in the same way as the organization of clauses and clause combining.” (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 261). Furthermore, Heine and Kuteva state “that gram-
matical replication as a linguistic process is grounded in discourse pragmatics and semantics rather than in syntax” (Heine & Kuteva 2010: 89). This statement appears very curious at the first view, but it accords with their context-induced approach on internal grammaticalization. Grammatical replication contrasts with borrowing in that it does not include the transfer of phonetic material, which is a crucial point in borrowing. Furthermore, it is important to differentiate grammatical replication from polysemy copying, also called calquing or loan translations, in which a meaning is only copied. According to Heine, “polysemy copying can be described as an abrupt rather than a gradual change, and it tends to be associated with lexical rather than grammatical replication” (Heine 2012: 126).

As a further delimitation, contact-induced grammaticalization is a subtype of grammatical replication, which “is a grammaticalization process that is due to the influence of one language on another” (Heine & Kuteva 2010: 88). Hence, in grammatical replication in general as well as in contact-induced grammaticalization in particular, the pattern in question follows gradual grammaticalization paths, which are comparable to inner-language grammaticalization (see ). That is to say that in these replication processes, bridging contexts can be identified in diachronic and sometimes even in synchronic studies. Here, it has to be highlighted again that Heine and Kuteva follow a broader view on grammaticalization, which also may include semantic or pragmatic transfers.

But the concept of contact-induced grammatical change is still not without controversy. Researchers argued for a long time that change only occurs language internally and that there is no reason to believe that grammatical change may be affected by another language (e.g. Lass 1997). Sankoff (2002) stated that it is very questionable that grammar and syntax can be borrowed. On the other hand, the concept of Sprachbunds, which has been known and accepted for a long time, challenges this view.

Recently, different examples for grammatical replication have been found in different languages (for detailed examples see e.g. Heine & Kuteva 2005). But it is still difficult to identify different processes of contact-induced language change and to delimitate them unequivocally from other internal processes. Therefore, it is important to establish criteria on how to detect contact-induced language change and how to differentiate it from other processes (see Poplack & Levey 2010, Heine & Kuteva 2007 and chapter 4.1.7). Poplack and Levey (2010) criticize that many studies pretend to find instances of contact-induced grammatical change, but cannot explain and prove the instances of change adequately. They state that not every change occurring in a contact situation is necessarily due to the contact situation and that variability does not equal change. Therefore, they determine certain criteria to identify contact-induced language change:

1. Situate the proposed change with respect to its host linguistic system
2. Identify a presumed source of the change
3. Locate structural features shared by the source and recipient languages
4. Prove that the proposed interference features were not present in the precontact variety
5. Prove that the proposed interference features were present in the source variety prior to contact
6. Rule out (or situate) internal motivation (Poplack & Levey 2010:410)

Still, it is not exactly clear to which degree it is possible to fulfill point 6. In some cases, it is nearly impossible to rule out internal motivations unequivocally. These criteria, as well as Heine’s delimitation of grammatical replication, will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.1.7.

It can be concluded here that there is strong evidence that contact-induced grammatical change and grammatical replication exist as processes of contact-induced language transfer. Still, these processes have to be regarded with much caution, because their delimitation from language-internal change and other processes is not always evident. This problem will be discussed in detail in the chapters 4.1 and 5.1.

As previously mentioned, there is no mutual agreement on how borrowing is defined. For Heine and Kuteva, borrowing includes the transfer of form-meaning units and “phonetic substance of some kind or another” (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 6). Other scholars follow a broader view on borrowing, such as Thomason and Kaufman for whom borrowing is “the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language” (Thomason, Kaufman 1988: 37). The present account follows the definition of Heine and Kuteva, in that borrowing always includes the transfer of form-meaning units, whereas polysemy copying only includes the transfer of meaning-units to a new form. An important factor in borrowing is that borrowed lexemes generally become integrated morphologically and phonologically into the recipient language.

Two main questions arise when referring to borrowing. First, it may be questioned if there are general motivations to borrow a certain item from a certain language. Second, it has to be asked if certain items are more suited for borrowing than others. As far as the first question is concerned, it is indeed possible to assume certain motivations for borrowing. Matras (2009) states two main motivations, which are “gaps in the structural inventory of the recipient language” and “the prestige enjoyed by the donor language” (Matras 2009: 149).

The first motivation seems to be very widespread and different examples can be found in different languages. When borrowing due to a gap in the structural inventory, this is commonly due to “cultural loans” (Matras 2009:150). Cultural loans refer to all kinds of borrowings for cultural reasons, such as agricultural and botanic products like coffee, cocoa or mango in English or new technological innovations such as Internet and Computer in German. These gap-fillers introduce a new concept, which has not been named yet in the recipient language. The second motivation for borrowing refers to borrowing for prestige reasons of the donor language. Well-known
examples for this kind of borrowing include Latin and Greek loanwords in different European languages as well as French loanwords in Russian, German and English.

These two kinds of borrowings do not necessarily presume a direct geographical language contact situation or bilingualism of the respective speakers. For example, words for agricultural products have often followed different paths of borrowing, such as English *mango* via Portuguese *manga* from Malay *manga*, borrowed from Tamil *mankay* (Matras 2009: 151).

A third motivation for borrowing may be cognitive reasons. This motivation arises generally in bilingual communities or in situations of direct language contact and is not specific to borrowing but may account for different types of language change. In this case, borrowings may first occur as innovations, which are uttered by one speaker. These innovations may arise accidentally or for special purposes. The first possibility includes that a speaker may use a word from another language in lack of the adequate lexeme in the language currently spoken. According to Lipski (2005), this is a kind of metalinguistic bracketing, while Matras (2000) argues in favor of a cognitive trigger that leads to unintentional language choices (see chapters 4.3.1.3 and 5.2). The second possibility refers to linguistic innovations for discourse-pragmatic purposes. That is to say that a speaker may employ a word from another language for discourse-strategic reasons, such as emphasis or accentuation or to detach it from the rest of the discourse. When a word first entered a language through innovation, it may become a borrowing over time through habitualisation (Hlavac 2006).

All these motivations for borrowing will be discussed in detail and with regard to the specific pragmatic marker *so* in chapter 4.2 and 5.2.

The second main question in borrowing concerns the borrowability of specific lexical items. Are some lexical items more suited for borrowing than other items? It has been subject of discussion that lexical borrowing is far more common than grammatical borrowing, especially of inflected forms. This discussion suggests that there may indeed be a certain hierarchy in borrowability. Several authors tried to establish borrowability scales. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) established a hierarchy for possible borrowings:

- **Casual contact**
  - Category 1: content words
  - Category 2: function words, minor phonological features, lexical semantic features
  - Category 3: adpositions, derivational suffixes, phonemes
  - Category 4: word order, distinctive features in phonology, inflectional morphology

- **Intense contact**
  - Category 5: significant typological disruption, phonetic changes

(Thomason, Kaufman 1988 in Matras 2009: 156)
This scale is clearly not the only way of representing borrowing and it becomes evident that Thomason and Kaufman held a very broad position on the term borrowing. Muysken (2010) proposes a different borrowability hierarchy, in which specific word classes are classified according to their suitability for borrowing (Muysken 2010: 271). In this hierarchy, Muysken visualizes that pragmatic markers are far more suited for borrowing than syntactic elements (ibid.).

There are indeed broad possibilities to visualize hierarchies of borrowing and it is very difficult to determine one unequivocally valid scale. This is because it is nearly impossible to collect and classify all possible occurrences of borrowing worldwide and to rule out possible borrowings, which may take place in the future. Still, there is consent on some general rules on borrowing. As already mentioned, it is generally recognized that borrowing of content words is more frequent than structural borrowing or borrowing of grammatical material, especially of inflectional morphology. Furthermore, it is assumed that elements that are syntactically peripheral, such as pragmatic markers, are borrowed more frequently than syntactically integrated items.

To conclude, the present subchapter aimed to introduce two main notions of contact-induced language change that are replication and borrowing. These two processes are still matters of discussion and it is not always clear how to exactly define and delimitate them. The present account relies on the differentiation and terminology of Heine and Kuteva (2005, 2006, 2010).

It has been stated that pragmatic markers show some peculiarities in language contact. It was assumed that pragmatic markers are especially suited for contact-induced language transfer, due to their syntactic flexibility and their peripheral positions. This hypothesis will be explained in detail in the upcoming subchapter. Furthermore it will be discussed in what way a cross-linguistic analysis of pragmatic markers can be of interest with respect to a general account on pragmatic markers.

### 1.3 Pragmatic markers in language contact

Pragmatic markers have been in the focus of scientific discussion for more than three decades and there is still no consent on their exact classification, delimitation and definition (see ). In the course of the main debate on pragmatic markers, the focus was clearly on their monolingual characteristics and functions. Still, some more recent studies tried to focus on two cross-linguistic issues of pragmatic markers. The first issue concerns the role of pragmatic markers in situations of language contact. Important questions here are for instance what happens to pragmatic markers in language contact and why (e.g. Mougeon & Beniak 1991; Maschler 2000; Matras 2000; Hlavac 2006; Torres & Potowskiński 2008). The second important issue concerns the cross-linguistic comparison of pragmatic markers. Here, the focus lies on cross-linguistic com-
comparisons as a method to deal with the general problems of pragmatic markers (e.g. Fleischman & Yaguello 2004; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003, 2004; Mosegaard Hansen 2008; Simon-Vandenbergen, Willems 2011). The present subchapter aims to introduce these two main issues on bilingual pragmatic markers and their cross-linguistic comparison.

As pointed out in the previous subchapter, pragmatic markers are considered very susceptible to borrowing and other cross-linguistic influences because of their syntactic detachability. Still, this is not the only reason as to the interest of researchers in bilingual pragmatic markers. It has been considered extensively that pragmatic markers are generally difficult to translate and that they may have more than one translation equivalent. Furthermore, their semantic value is often difficult to determine and it is not even clear if they encode conceptual or procedural meaning (see ). Another interesting factor comes from diachronic analysis of pragmatic markers, in that the moment of the emergence of their discourse-pragmatic functions is generally difficult to determine. This is because most pragmatic markers emerged through processes of grammaticalization or pragmatization from already existing lexical items. But it is also due to the fact that pragmatic markers generally occur in spoken language and often only in very informal speech. Therefore it is hard to retrace their diachronic evolution by means of written corpus data (see chapter 4). All these peculiarities make of pragmatic markers a very interesting field of research, especially from a cross-linguistic perspective.

While it is clear that pragmatic markers have specific characteristics in comparison to other lexical items, it is still not clear what happens to them in situations of strong language contact. Clyne (1972) spotted the transfer of German pragmatic markers into English discourse of German-speaking immigrants in Australia. Mougeon and Beniak (1991) examined the core borrowing of pragmatic markers in Canadian French discourse. There is a wide range of examples that account for similar findings, which is the influence of the pragmatic markers from one language on the other language in situations of intense and/or long-term language contact. Torres and Potowski (2008) tried to classify the possible outcomes of pragmatic markers in contact, which they describe as follows:

1. The two sets of discourse markers will coexist
2. Similar markers from each language will acquire differentiated meanings
3. The markers from one language may replace those of the other language

(Torres & Potowski 2008:264)

To support this classification, they cite different examples of studies on pragmatic markers in language contact. As an example for the first case, they mention Hill and Hill (1986) and Brody (1987) who analyzed Spanish in contact with indigenous languages (Torres & Potowski 2008: 264). As an example for the second possibility, they cite Solomon (1995) and her work on Spanish in contact with Yucatec (Torres & Potowski 2008: 265). The third outcome of pragmatic markers in contact has been examined by Goss and Salmons (2000) in their work on Texas
German. In this case, the whole German set of markers was replaced by English markers (ibid.). Still, it is unclear if these three outcomes are mutually exclusive or if long-term and intense language contact always results in outcome number three, that is the complete replacement of one set of pragmatic markers. The opposite option would be that sets of pragmatic markers from two languages might co-occur over a long period of time without too strong of an influence on each other. This question will be discussed in more detail and with regard to a special language contact situation in chapter 4.

Another related problem concerns the question why pragmatic markers show these important peculiarities in language contact situations. Mougeon and Beniak (1991) assume that all markers first occur in the respective other language as code-switches and then gradually become borrowings. It can be stated here that most researchers regard the transfer of form-meaning units of pragmatic markers as a case of borrowing (e.g. Mougeon & Beniak 1991; Silva-Corvalán 1995; Torres 2002; Torres & Potowski 2008). The borrowing of pragmatic markers will be regarded in detail in chapter 4.2.4 with special focus on the pragmatic marker *so*.

To conclude, it can be stated that pragmatic markers are very susceptible to language contact and that sets of pragmatic markers may behave differently in different language contact situations. The peculiarities of pragmatic markers in language contact are mostly due to their general characteristics. But the use of pragmatic markers from one language in the other may have additional reasons (see 4.2.4).

The analysis of pragmatic markers in language contact can indeed offer important new insights into the functioning and structure of pragmatic markers. But also a cross-linguistic comparison of monolingual pragmatic markers may offer important research opportunities.

As stated by Simon-Vandenbergen and Willems, “it is through comparison of partially parallel processes that the complex issues of actuation of a change and motivation for change become more transparent.” (Simon-Vandenbergen & Willems 2011: 333). That is to say that cross-linguistic comparison can not only help to identify common paths in the emergence and evolution of pragmatic markers; it can also help to clarify the motivations for change as well as functioning of pragmatic markers. Consequently, cross-linguistic comparison can help to gain insights from a synchronic and from a diachronic perspective. To underline the usefulness of cross-linguistic comparison, two methods will be presented. The first one concerns the comparison of functions of pragmatic markers by means of separate corpus data. The second method concerns the translation of pragmatic markers and the creation of semantic fields.

The first method appears to be the more common one, in that it resembles very much the monolingual procedure to analyze the functioning of pragmatic markers. Fleischman and Yaguello (2004) compared English *like* and French *genre*, to identify if languages may develop independently pragmatic markers with similar functions. Thanks to the broad literature on English
like, they are able to explore if French genre developed the same functions in French. In their positive conclusion, they try to establish pragmatic universals:

![Functional evolution of like and genre](adapted from Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 141)

With a similar method, Mihatsch (2009) compared French comme, Italian come, Portuguese como and Spanish como. Mihatsch compared these pragmatic markers not for the aim of establishing pragmatic universals, but to explore their grammaticalization paths and possible bridging contexts from a diachronic perspective. Still, this diachronic comparison also helps to identify current possible grammaticalization processes, such as the emergence of new meanings and functions in Canadian French comme (see 4.1).

The comparison of possibly equivalent markers in corpus material from different languages is not only an important method to retrace the diachronic and synchronic evolution of pragmatic markers. It also provides evidence for the polyfunctionality and the polysemy of pragmatic markers. Several authors proved extensively that pragmatic markers in different languages may share certain meanings and functions but may vary in others (e.g. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003, 2004; Waltereit 2006; Mihatsch 2009;; Beeching 2011; see also chapter 4).

Another possibility to explore cross-linguistic differences of pragmatic markers is the translation method by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003, 2004, 2006):

The translation method contributes to specifying how markers function intra-linguistically, how they relate to other, semantically and pragmatically similar items in the same language, and how semantic fields in different languages relate to one another. (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2004: 1782)

Using this method, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen constructed semantic fields, which include different translation equivalents of pragmatic markers. This is motivated by the fact that “pragmatic markers are semantically underspecified and will generally have a large number of different translations representing different senses and implicatures” (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2004: 1786). This method does not only aim to determine different translation equivalents of a specific pragmatic marker:

By going back and forth between languages we can determine not only the strength of the equivalents (interesting from a cross-linguistic point of view) but
also the closeness of items in one language (interesting from the point of view of setting up semantic fields). (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2004: 1786)

In recent studies, this method has offered even more advantages. Mosegaard-Hansen and Strudsholm (2008) showed with French déjà and Italian già that these partial translation equivalents have undergone partly identical and partly different changes. Furthermore, this method helps to provide even more evidence for the polysemous hypothesis of pragmatic markers.

A more recent possibility to present the results from diachronic corpus analysis on pragmatic markers is proposed by Haspelmath’s (2004) semantic map approach. A semantic map tries to capture not only the diachronic evolution of a respective pair of pragmatic markers; it also represents the synchronic comparison of cross-linguistic or partial equivalent marker pairs. Here, a semantic map is particularly suited to highlight differing degrees of polysemy between different markers and to point out their degree of equivalency (see Beeching 2011). Furthermore, a semantic map can visualize the relatedness of functions of pragmatic markers in a very suitable way. An example of a semantic map of the markers bon, enfin, well and I mean, taken from Beeching (2011: 102) is presented and analyzed in detail in chapter 4.3.

As a conclusion, it can be stated that cross-linguistic comparison and the analysis of pragmatic markers in language contact constitute an important tool for linguistic analysis. The present corpus analysis (chapter 4) follows Fleischman and Yaguello (2004) as well as Mihatsch (2009) in its methodology. It only differs in that almost all examples from both languages will be taken from the same set of bilingual corpus data, presented in chapter 3.2.

Before introducing and analyzing the underlying corpus data in detail, the upcoming chapter aims to introduce current problems, models and approaches on bilingual language processing. Therefore, the next chapter puts the focus on a psycholinguistic perspective, which will be crucial for the analysis in chapter 5 and 6.
The present chapter aims to provide an outline of current issues in bilingual language representation and processing and to clarify the view of the present study. The research on bilingual language processing is extremely complex and therefore it is even more important to provide a clear theoretical basis for the upcoming chapters.

On the one hand, the modeling of the bilingual mental lexicon includes the same problems as of the monolingual lexicon, for instance questions about the overall structure of language storage and lexical retrieval. Here, the focus of research lies on the questions of how phonological, orthographical, morphological, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic information of a given lexical item is stored in the mental lexicon, how this information is linked and how it can be accessed and integrated into speech comprehension and production. On the other hand, the modeling of the bilingual mental lexicon raises new issues. The most controversial discussions concern the issue of independence or interdependence of both languages and of selectivity or nonselectivity in lexical access. These questions, treated in this introductory part, are crucial for an understanding of the different models of bilingual language representation in chapter 2.

The second subchapter, 2.2, aims to provide a detailed overview of bilingual models of lexical access in speech production and in speech perception. Thus, chapters 2 and 2.2 provide a very broad perspective on models of language representation and processing to point out the strongly discussed problems and critics in this field of research. On this basis, it is possible to formulate the present understanding and perspective of bilingual lexical access. This is crucial to clearly define the role of pragmatic, semantic and conceptual representations in bilingual lexical access. Building on this, part 2.3 gives a first overview of the field of experimental pragmatics and addresses the question how pragmatic information and especially pragmatic markers are treated in bilingual language processing.

All current models of bilingual language representation agree on the fact that the mental lexicon is divided into different levels that are, at least, a conceptual and a lexical level. The lexical level contains all language specific word information; the conceptual level represents non-language specific abstract information. In current research the conceptual level has often been confused with a semantic representation level and the terms ‘conceptual’ and ‘semantic’ have even been used as synonyms (see Pavlenko 1999, Altarriba 2000). This ambiguity in the terminology may be confusing, especially in crosslinguistic research. While some words in different languages may have interrelated semantic meanings and still represent the exact same concept, other words may
only share some underlying conceptual representations and differ in semantic meanings (Altarriba, Basnight-Brown 2009: 80). Therefore it is crucial for the present work to strictly differentiate between conceptual and semantic representations. The present study relies on the differentiation of Pavlenko (1999), who distinguishes the following three components of words: lexical (word form), semantic (linguistic information about the word form that sets it in context to other word forms) and conceptual (extralinguistic knowledge, based on general world knowledge). Depending on the focus of the respective lexicon model, it may also contain a phonological representation level (for models focusing on spoken language) or/and an orthographic representation level (for models focusing on written language). The models, discussed in the present part and in part 2.2 vary in the inclusion of different representation levels. They put the emphasis on a specific level of language processing and neglect other levels. This issue will be discussed in detail in the upcoming parts of this chapter.

If it is assumed that bilingual language representation may be visualized by means of different levels, the question arises how two or more languages are stored in the multilingual mental lexicon. At first, it seems plausible to suggest that both languages are stored and accessed separately in different memory stores. This hypothesis is known as the separate or independent hypothesis (e.g. Scarborough 1984; Soares & Grosjean 1984). In contrast, the shared or interdependent hypothesis claims that both languages are stored in one memory store and that words are tagged as belonging to one language in word retrieval (e.g. Caramazza & Brones 1980; for an overview of the experimental evidence for both hypotheses see e.g. Heredia 2008).

At first sight, it seems unclear why there is experimental evidence for both hypotheses, but there may be an explanation for these results. It may be the case that the results depend largely on the respective experimental tasks and designs. While tasks, relying on semantic and conceptual processes often give evidence for the shared memory hypothesis, tasks relying on lexical processes point more often towards the separate memory hypothesis (Heredia 2008: 48 f.).

These findings lead to the assumption that both languages may share a conceptual and semantic level but have a separate lexical level. This idea will be explained in more detail on the basis of the respective lexicon models in the upcoming part of this chapter (2.1). This chapter focuses on models of bilingual language representation, which do not differentiate particularly between speech comprehension and production. If both languages are indeed interconnected to some degree, another question arises: Is lexical access and retrieval selective or non-selective? This is to say, do speakers only access one language at a time or are both languages always activated in the lexical retrieval process? And if language processing is non-selective, how is the right language selected and the other one suppressed? These questions will be addressed in part 2.2, where models of bilingual lexical access in speech production and comprehension will be described in detail.
2.1 Models of bilingual language representation

The current subchapter aims to resume three important models of bilingual language representation that are the revised hierarchical model (RHM), the distributed conceptual feature model (DCFM) and the Sense Model.

The revised hierarchical model by Kroll and Stewart (1994) (Figure 7) is based on the hierarchical models by Potter et al. (1984). Potter et al. developed the word association and the concept mediation model (see Figure 6), which both assume that the languages of bilingual speakers share a conceptual level but have separate lexical levels. According to Potter et al., the word association hypothesis states, “as long as the second language remains weaker than the first language, this association is used in understanding and speaking the second language” (Potter et al. 1984: 23). In contrast, the concept mediation hypothesis states “second-language words are not directly associated with first-language words, but instead are associated with the nonlinguistic concept in common to the two words” (ibd.). Potter et al. performed two experiments in which highly fluent Chinese-English bilinguals and nonfluent English-French bilinguals read, translated and categorized words and named and categorized pictures. According to the word association model, translating from the L1 into the L2 should take slower than picture naming in the L2. The concept mediation model predicts that there should be no difference between picture naming in the L2 and translating. They found out that both groups of bilinguals responded faster to pictures than to words, regardless of language proficiency. This result is consistent with the concept mediation model, but not with the word association model (Potter et al. 1984: 34). They conclude that languages may not have associations between lexical pairs from both languages (Potter et al. 1984: 37).

In contrast, Kroll and Stewart (1994) chose another approach to the two hierarchical models and, in consequence, their own evolution of these models. They suggest that the word association model displays the bilingual language representations of nonfluent and late bilinguals,
whereas the concept mediation model describes the bilingual mental storage of highly fluent and early bilinguals. To provide evidence for this model, they performed three picture naming and bilingual translation tasks with fluent Dutch-English bilinguals. In these tasks, they manipulated the semantic context of the translations (randomized or categorized). In Experiment 1 and 3 response latencies were slower in the categorized than in the randomized conditions. Furthermore, category interference in Experiment 3 only occurred when translating from the L1 into L2 and not vice versa. Kroll and Stewart concluded from these findings that a conceptual representation is used to retrieve a lexical entry. When multiple lexical entries are activated by a conceptual representation, this creates interference. Furthermore, they conclude that translating from L1 to L2 passes via the conceptual level whereas translating from L2 to L1 can be completed on the lexical level. That is to say, L1-L2 translation is conceptually mediated whereas L2-L1 translation is lexically mediated. To visualize these findings, Kroll and Steward proposed the revised hierarchical model (RHM), which still is one of the most influential of the bilingual lexicon models. In the RHM, Kroll and Steward consider the role of translation direction and language proficiency. The RHM proposes two independent but interrelated language stores. The storage for the L1 is larger, because bilinguals generally know more words in their L1 than in their L2.

With this model, they try to account for the asymmetries in translation in that it proposes stronger and weaker bi-directional links between the two lexical stores and from the lexical stores to the conceptual level. These links are less strong from the L1 to the L2, because bilinguals associate L2 words stronger with the L1 translation than vice versa. Furthermore, links from the L1 to the conceptual level are stronger than the respective links from the L2 to the conceptual level. This can be explained by the fact that bilinguals link L1 words naturally to the respective concept, whereas L2 words are first associated to the L1 translation equivalent. Still, the RHM is not a static model, since it assumes a possible shift in the dependence of the L2 words on the L1 translation equivalent with increasing language proficiency. Additional support for this model comes from replications of the translation asymmetry and the
differential sensitivity of the translation direction to semantic factors (Sholl, Sankaranarayanan, Kroll 1995).

Nevertheless, the RHM has been challenged and questioned regularly in previous years. Brysbaert and Duyck (2010) suggest that the RHM is antiquated; because a large amount of research has been conducted since its development and new insights have been made. The criticism is primarily directed at the independence of the two lexica and the selective lexical access of the RHM. Furthermore, the RHM does not consider the different levels of lexical access and does not give any information about semantic, phonological or orthographic representation. It is indeed incontestable that the RHM does not provide any detailed evidence about lexical access in language production or comprehension. It is rather a more general sketch of the bilingual lexicon that primarily considers the representation of both languages and not the detailed lexical access. It is true that a large amount of evidence in current research indicates that language selection is non-selective (see chapter 2.2). Still, the exact interdependence between both languages and the location and mechanism of selection rests controversial. Despite some inaccuracies on the different levels and some outdated assumptions, the RHM is still relevant. Especially the idea of weaker and stronger links has received particular attention in research on bilingual lexical access (see the weaker links model in 2.2.1).

The RHM predicts that L1 and L2 translations are sensitive to semantic context, and this idea is also relevant for other models of the bilingual mental lexicon.

Another very early model of the bilingual brain is the distributed conceptual feature model (DCFM) from de Groot (1992) (see Figure 8). This model implies lexical nodes that are associated with a distributed set of conceptual features. The most important aspect of this model is that the author assumes a different degree of overlap of conceptual features for different L1-L2 word pairs. This overlap of conceptual features then determines the translation performance of participants in translation tasks.

![Figure 8. The Distributed Conceptual Feature Model (adapted from de Groot 1992: 1016).](image)

As a first assumption, the authors of the DCFM assume that concrete words in two languages have more semantic overlap than abstract words. Evidence comes from the concreteness-effect
(e.g. de Groot 1992; van Hell, de Groot 1998). De Groot (1992a) performed three word-translation tasks, two normal translation tasks and one translation-recognition task, with Dutch-English bilinguals. In the normal translation tasks, participants were confronted with words from their first language (Dutch), which they had to translate into their second language (English). In the translation-recognition task, participants were confronted with English-Dutch word pairs and they had to decide if these words were translation equivalents. In all three experiments, de Groot found a concreteness effect. That is to say, in the normal translation tasks, concrete words were translated faster than abstract words and, in the translation-recognition task, responses on concrete word pairs were faster and with lower error rates than responses on abstract word pairs.

In an additional normal translation task, de Groot (1992) obtained faster response latencies for cognate words than for noncognate words. These results lead de Groot to establish the DCFM, in which concrete words, abstract words and cognates vary in the overlap of their conceptual representations. However, this model does not differentiate adequately between conceptual and semantic representations and both terms are often used interchangeably. Additional support for these results comes from van Hell and de Groot (1998).

Still, the DCFM has been subject to criticism for different reasons. One point of critique has been highlighted by Heredia and Brown (2004). While some concrete translation equivalents overlap completely in their conceptual representations others do not. For instance, taking the concrete English word ball (e.g. golf ball, football, tennis ball) and the French word ballon, (e.g. ballon de foot, balle de golf; balle de tennis) it becomes evident at first sight that both words do not overlap in all of their features. In contrast, some abstract words from two languages may actually overlap or not in all of their features. Considering this aspect, the solution of the DCFM may indeed be too simple. A further point of criticism comes from Finkbeiner et al. (2004). They point out that the DCFM cannot provide a satisfactory explanation for the translation asymmetry. Translation asymmetry describes the phenomenon that masked priming occurs from the L1 to the L2 but not vice versa (e.g. Gollan et al. 1997; Grainger & Frenck-Mestre 1998; Jiang, Forster, 2001; for a detailed overview see 6.1.1.2).

In an unmasked priming paradigm, the exposure of a visual stimulus influences the response latencies of a later stimulus. Response latencies vary depending on the semantic, phonological or orthographic overlap of the prime stimulus and the target stimulus. In the masked priming paradigm, the prime stimulus is only exposed very shortly, generally for 50 or 100 ms. Furthermore, the prime stimulus is preceded (and in many cases also followed) by a pattern mask of several hash keys, which is exposed for 500 ms. This technique relies on a subliminal processing of the prime stimulus and therefore an unconscious effect on the target stimulus (see chapter 6.1.1.2).

In a consequence, Finkbeiner et al. propose the Sense Model (Figure 9), which is a modification of the DCFM. The Sense Model relies on the assumption that most words are polysemous and that each word has different semantic senses. In their understanding, “lexical semantic rep-
resentations are assumed to be bounded and comprised of distinct ‘bundles’ of features corresponding to distinct usages, which we refer to as semantic senses” (Finkbeiner et al. 2004: 8). Accordingly, ostensible translation equivalents may vary in the overlap of their semantic senses, or meaning patterns as they are called in the present work. Finkbeiner and colleagues refer to this partial equivalence as representational asymmetry.

According to the Sense Model, translation priming does not only depend on the overlap of semantic senses but also on the proportion of primed and unprimed senses in the respective experimental task. These concern in particular the task difference in masked priming tasks, whereby semantic categorization tasks yield different priming effects than lexical decision tasks (Grainger & Frenck-Mestre 1998; Jiang, Forster 2001; Finkbeiner et al. 2004). This task difference describes the phenomenon that L2–L1 priming effects are significantly stronger in semantic categorization than in lexical decision (for a detailed discussion see 6.1.1.2).

To provide evidence for the Sense Model, Finkbeiner et al. (2004) performed 6 experiments. In Experiment 1–3, Japanese-English bilinguals accomplished masked priming tasks, either with lexical decision or semantic categorization. As a result, they replicated the task difference in the translation asymmetry, in that L2–L1 priming occurred in semantic categorization and not in lexical decision. In Experiment 4–6, the underlying assumptions of the Sense Model were tested in a within-language setting with English speakers. The aim of these experiments was to analyze the priming effect from many-to-one senses (e.g. head-skull), comparable with the L1-L2 direction, and one-to-many senses (e.g. skull – head), comparable with the L2–L1 direction (Finkbeiner et al. 2004: 10). Their results indicate that priming was found in a semantic categorization task for both directions. But for lexical decision, priming was only obtained in the many-to-one direction. These results suggest an analogous priming asymmetry similar to the bilingual Experiments 1–3. Finkbeiner et al. (2004) conclude from these findings that response latencies in masked priming are sensitive to polysemous senses. In semantic categorization, one
precise sense is primed and therefore priming occurs from the L1–L2 direction and vice versa. In contrast, in lexical decision, all senses of the words are activated. In the L1–L2 direction, all senses of the L2 word are primed and consequently a priming occurs. In the L2–L1 direction, the L2 word cannot prime all senses of the L1 word and no or few priming effects occur. Further support for the Sense Model comes from Wang and Forster (2010), who performed four different experiments to test hypotheses of the Sense Model.

Further evidence for the fact that response times may be sensitive to semantic senses comes from Rodd et al. (2002). They performed three monolingual lexical decision tasks with polysemous words, homonymous words and unambiguous words. Their results indicate that homonymous words are processed slower than unambiguous words and that polysemous words are processed faster than unambiguous words. They reason from these findings that the character of semantic representations has an impact on response latencies in lexical decision.

In conclusion, it may be noted here that the models of bilingual language representation presented in this subchapter seem to be very different at the first sight. The RHM considers a much broader perspective than the DCFM and the Sense Model, which both focus primarily on semantic/conceptual representations. The RHM and the DCFM do not include the different levels of language processing and only differentiate between a lexical and a conceptual level. However, the Sense Model does not include a conceptual level but differentiates between the lexical form representation and the lexical semantic representations. Furthermore, the RHM visualizes interconnection of both languages at the lexical level, which is not part of the DCFM or the Sense Model. Also, only the RHM and the Sense Model assume bidirectional links from the lexical to the conceptual/semantic level and vice versa.

Still, all models have some aspects in common. All three models rely on the assumption that both languages are stored separately at the lexical level, but interconnected at the conceptual/semantic level. The authors of all three models do not make any statement about the mechanism and the location of language selection. In this context, all three models fail to make adequate assumptions about language selectivity.
2.2 Bilingual models of lexical access and retrieval

The models proposed in chapter give an outline of the problems and possible solutions for models of the bilingual mental lexicon. The main problem still concerns the question to which extent the different levels in the bilingual brain are independent or interdependent. As shown in the preceding chapter, most researchers today assume that the two languages are, at least to some extent, interdependent and influence each other in lexical retrieval and selection. This assumption raises a range of new questions when trying to model the exact stages of lexical access. Lexical access is known as the process when speakers try to retrieve the appropriate lexical representation for a certain concept. The term lexical access may be used for language production and perception, despite the difference in the underlying processes. Therefore, in the present approach the term lexical retrieval will be used referring to language production processes, whereas the term lexical access will be employed for processes of language reception. The current chapter aims to discuss different models of bilingual lexical access. All these models in only regard the process of speech production and cannot be adopted in the same manner for speech perception. In chapter 2.2.2, bilingual models of lexical access in speech perception will be presented. The brief overview of the models is limited to information that is relevant to the present study.

2.2.1 Models of bilingual lexical retrieval in speech production

If two languages were interconnected in the bilingual brain, then bilingual speakers should have particular problems in accessing the right lexical form from the right language. As it is commonly assumed in models of the bilingual lexicon, the two languages share a common conceptual level and differ only at the lexical and feature level. This should lead to more problems in lexical retrieval in bilingual than in monolingual speakers because representations from both languages can be activated in the lexical retrieval process. To account for this disadvantage, researchers have proposed several models of bilingual lexical access that try to explain the retrieval and selection process. According to Finkbeiner et al. (2006), lexical retrieval seems to be very hard to model although bilingual speakers do not seem to have problems in retrieving the right word from the right language at a given moment. Furthermore, it is commonly accepted that bilingual speakers cannot switch one language completely off; certain interference is always given. Two general approaches of bilingual lexical access can be differentiated, a competitive approach and a weaker links approach.

Most recent models assume that bilingual lexical retrieval is a competitive process, that is that lexical nodes compete for selection. While all these models rely on the fact that lexical retrieval and selection is a competitive process, they vary concerning the question of how this selection
is exactly been done. Here, only two current models are presented (for a more detailed overview and discussion see Finkbeiner et al. 2006).

The first model to be presented is the model of language-specific access by Costa et al. (1999):

This model implies the three assumptions that 1. the conceptual level as well as the semantic representations are shared by both languages, 2. The lexical level is language specific, and 3. there is parallel activation of the two languages (Costa et al. 2000:430). Hence, this model does not consider lexical retrieval as a competitive process at the lexical level but only at the level of semantic representations. Experimental evidence comes from the bilingual picture word interference paradigm, and in particular the semantic interference effect between languages (Costa et al. 1999; Costa, Caramazza 1999). In a series of picture-word interference experiments with English-Spanish, Spanish-English (Costa, Caramazza 1999) and Catalan-Spanish bilinguals (Costa et al. 1999), participants named pictures while seeing a distractor word from the same or the other language. In both studies, they found a facilitatory translation equivalent effect when picture and distractor word were the same, independent of the respective language. In contrast, they found slower naming latencies when the distractor was a semantically related word. These results led them to the assumption that there is no competition of languages at the lexical level. This explanation accounts for the fact that translation equivalent may function just as identity primes whereas semantically related words evoke semantic interference effects (Costa et al. 1999).
Still, Costa and colleagues found a language effect in their picture-naming task. Participants showed slower response latencies when unrelated distractor words were in the target language than in the non-target language. This effect challenges the view of language-specific selection because parallel activation of translation equivalents should lead to equal interference in picture naming (Finkbeiner et al. 2006).

Many competitive models of lexical access therefore propose a shared lexical level between languages. But how do these models account for the retrieval and selection of the respective language?

The Inhibitory Control Model (ICM) by Green (1986, 1998) acts on the assumption of a shared lexical level in which all lexical representations are tagged with a language node. In the speech production process, inhibitory control mechanisms suppress the non-relevant languages; translation equivalents are not activated and cannot be selected (Green 1998). The following figure shows a simplified version of the ICM by Finkbeiner et al. (2006):

![Diagram of the Inhibitory Control Model](image)

Figure 11. The Inhibitory Control Model by Green 1986, 1998 (adapted from Finkbeiner et al. 2006: 159)

Green (1998) also takes language proficiency into account and proposes that inhibitory mechanisms are stronger when the L1 has to be suppressed, because the L1 generally receives more activation from the conceptual level. It is regrettable that Green does not differentiate sufficiently between the conceptual and the semantic level so that no clear presumptions concerning this differentiation can be made on the basis of the ICM.

Empirical evidence for this model can be found in studies on asymmetrical language costs in code switching. Meuter and Allport (1999) performed experiments with bilingual speakers that
named digits on a screen in their L1 or their L2, depending on the screen color. They detected that bilinguals showed more switching costs when switching into their more dominant language L1 than into their less dominant language L2. Counterevidence has been provided by Costa and Santesteban (2004). They performed picture naming in a language-switching task with Spanish-Korean and Korean-Spanish learners and with highly proficient Spanish-Catalan bilinguals. While they observe a switching cost from the L2 to the L1 in learners, they report a symmetrical switching cost in highly proficient bilinguals, even in their weaker languages. This leads to the assumption that language proficiency may influence the switching costs and, in addition, the inhibitory mechanisms in the ICM (Finkbeiner et al. 2006: 160).

All these models are set on the premise that lexical access is a competitive process, either on all levels or only on the level of semantic representations. In recent years, it has been challenged that none of these models can account for the whole range of peculiarities in the empirical evidence on bilingual retrieval.

In contrast, Gollan et al. propose a “weaker link hypothesis” (2008) or “frequency-lag hypothesis” (2011) that relies on the proposal that bilinguals are disadvantaged to monolinguals in lexical access. This disadvantage can be attributed to the imbalances in frequency in words in the two languages. That is to say, depending on different factors, words from one language are preferred in a given situation compared to words from the other language. This imbalance concerning the choice of words from one language leads over time to an imbalance in frequency of use and to weaker links to the semantics and phonology of the respective language system (Gollan 2008). In this model, the authors considers that the experimental evidence for and against the competitive models cannot be explained by the competition in lexical access but rather by frequency effects. To provide supporting evidence for the weaker links hypothesis, Gollan et al. (2008) performed two picture naming tasks with low- and high-frequency words with younger and older English monolinguals and Spanish-English bilinguals. They report on the basis of a first experiment that naming latencies were slower; concerning language dominance, bilingualism and age; for low-frequency words. In a second experiment, they showed that the age effect was higher for low-frequency words in the L1. In the L2, the slower naming latencies were restricted to highly-frequency words. These results support the weaker links hypothesis in that they account for frequency-based activation and a smaller language dominance effect for older participants and low-frequency words.

In recent picture naming tasks, reading with lexical decision and eye fixation time experiments, Gollan and colleagues (2011) tested monolingual, Spanish-English bilingual and Dutch-English bilingual participants. The different tasks were designed to compare word frequency effects and semantic constraints, that is the constraining context, in speech production and comprehension.
In these experiments, Gollan et al. compared the effects of word-frequency (high, low), context (none, low-constraining, high-constraining) and language proficiency (monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, Dutch-English bilinguals). The same material was used in all tasks and only the modalities, comprehension and production, changed. Gollan et al. observed robust frequency effects for comprehension while they found larger constraint effects in production (Gollan et al. 2011: 201). Furthermore, frequency effects without constraints were higher in production than in comprehension. In contrast, in high-constraint contexts the frequency effects in production decreased significantly and were even smaller than the frequency effects in comprehension (ibd.). These results reveal important differences in the role of frequency on the bilingual disadvantage in language production and comprehension. Gollan and colleagues state that language production appears to be a more semantically sensitive process while comprehension seems to rely more on frequency driven constraints (ibd.). It has been pointed out by the authors that the two modalities are surely not unequivocally comparable and that the question remains to which extent production and comprehension of language are based on each other.

The weaker links hypothesis is important in that it does not explain all effects in bilingual lexical access with competitive processes but reveals the important role of frequency. Yet it remains to be seen whether this model can account for a wider range of findings on lexical access.

With regard to the weaker links approach and the competitive approach, Schwieter and Sundermann (2008) combine different approaches and propose a selection by proficiency model of bilingual lexical access in speech production (SbP; Figure 12). This model relies on an inhibitory control mechanism for less proficient bilinguals and a language-specific selection mechanism for highly proficient bilinguals (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 231):
This model relies on language proficiency as an important variable in bilingual lexical access. Less proficient bilinguals perform lexical access by means of an inhibitory control mechanism. When a concept is activated, competition arises at the lexical level. As in the RHM by Kroll and Steward (1994), the SbP is set on the premise that the L2 links to the concept level are much weaker than the L1 links. In contrast, highly proficient bilinguals can resort to a language-specific control mechanism in form of a preverbal message. In this case, lexical competition does not occur at a lexical level and therefore no inhibitory mechanism is needed. The preverbal message contains specific information about the target language, the linguistic register and the respective concept (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 233).

To provide empirical evidence for their model, the authors first measured verbal fluency of English-Spanish learners in a design that follows Gollan, Montoya and Werner (2002). Ten semantic categories were taken from Gollan et al. (2002) and participants were confronted with a respective category, with the task to produce as many semantically related L2 words as possible in a time span of 60 seconds (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 223).
In a second step, the participants performed a picture-naming task with language switches, based on Costa and Santesteban (2004). The participants were confronted with pictures that were presented in a colored box on a screen. The respective color of the box indicated the language in which the naming trial had to be performed (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 224). They report main effects in verbal fluency, language and trials that indicate that less proficient speakers with less verbal fluency have more switching difficulties. Their results indicate that the shift from an inhibitory control mechanism to a language-specific control mechanism is based on L2 lexical robustness (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 230). In the visualization of their findings, by means of the SbP model, they postulate stronger and weaker links from a language-specific lexical level to the concept level, depending on the bilinguals’ language proficiency. Here, the highly proficient bilinguals may take recourse to inhibitory control mechanisms in specific situations, whereas the less proficient bilinguals cannot access the language-specific control mechanism without increasing their language proficiency. Schwieter and Sundermann conclude on their findings by defining lexical robustness “as the point in which bilinguals will no longer have to primarily rely on inhibitory control” (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 234).

To conclude this chapter, it can be noted that there is still no complete agreement on the precise mechanisms of lexical access in bilingual speech production. Two main approaches have been presented that is a competitive view on lexical access and a weaker links approach. The main problem in competitive approaches is to which extent the two languages are interconnected at the lexical level. If the two languages are selected language-specifically, it is hard to account for interference in lexical selection, such as the language effect. If the two languages dispose of a common lexical level and are tagged with language nodes (Green 1986, 1998), this does not take into account differing switching costs in high and low proficient bilinguals.

The weaker links hypothesis by Gollan et al. (2002, 2008, 2011) can provide explanations for all these problems, but it does not yet differentiate sufficiently the role of frequency, proficiency and semantic constraints. Further empirical evidence is needed to clarify the exact emergence and evolution of stronger and weaker links. While the weaker links hypothesis relies mainly on word frequency, the SbP by Schwieter and Sundermann (2008) takes into account the impact of language proficiency. They combine a competitive approach with a weaker links approach, depending on the bilinguals’ language skills. While the basis of this approach is indeed very plausible, it still lacks clarification on some points. One important question is the interconnection between concepts and semantic information. Second, the exact process of language retrieval in highly proficient bilinguals rests somehow vague, in that the role of the preverbal message and its detailed impact are not specified in a satisfactory way. Furthermore, it is not specified how the languages of highly proficient bilinguals are exactly interconnected.

It is beyond the aim of these models to focus on a clear differentiation between a conceptual level and a level of semantic representations. This distinction is only made rudimentarily in the lan-
guage-specific account of Costa and colleagues. This lack is due to the fact that most researchers focus on isolated and concrete words. For this aim the distinction between a conceptual and semantic representation level is not crucial and therefore does not take a central place in bilingual lexicon models. In contrast this differentiation is fundamental for the present work, and hence none of the models of bilingual lexical access can be adopted without reservation.

But before turning to an own view on bilingual lexical access, models of language processing in speech perception have to be presented to provide a complete picture of current research on this topic. In a following step (subchapter ) the present findings will be applied to the aspects that are crucial for the present work, that is the processing of pragmatic and semantic information.

2.2.2 Models of bilingual lexical access in speech perception

All models of lexical retrieval, presented in 3.2.1, relate to speech production. It is commonly accepted that lexical access in speech comprehension and production differs by more than the diverging modalities and the starting point of activation. Hence, the aim of this subchapter is to present models that explain how the hearer selects the right language at the right moment and how the spreading activation is distributed over languages.

Macnamara and Kushnir (1971) propose that bilingual speakers dispose of a certain switch mechanism that allows them to select the respective language during sentence comprehension. In contrast, Li (1996) argues that recognizing code-switched words in a sentence does not differ from recognizing monolingual words. To account for this discrepancy in research, the current subchapter presents briefly the BIMOLA by Grosjean and Léwy (Grosjean 1988, 1997; Grosjean & Léwy 2008) as well as the BIA and BIA+ model by Dijkstra and van Heuven (1998, 2002). It has to be mentioned that the models of lexical access in language perception are not central for the present work. They are introduced in this subchapter for the sake of completeness, that is to say to provide a complete picture of current research on bilingual language processing. Furthermore, these models contribute to a better understanding of the experimental investigations (see chapter 6), which are based on language perception.

The BIMOLA by Grosjean and Léwy relies on the assumption that speech comprehension is a competitive process. The concept of lexical competition is also found in monolingual models of speech perception, such as the Cohort Model (Marslen-Wilson & Welsh 1978) and the TRACE Model (McClelland & Elman 1986). The main ambition of the BIMOLA is to account for the processing of speech perception in all stages of the continuum of language modes in a bilingual speaker. The focus does not only lie on purely bilingual or monolingual speech perception but on the interaction of both languages in the various language modes. Grosjean (1997) visualizes the BIMOLA as follows:
Like most models of lexical access, the BIMOLA consists of different levels of processing, in this case the feature level, the phoneme level and the word level. Both languages only share the feature level. In the other levels the different languages are represented in form of subsets, according to the subset hypothesis by Paradis (1989). This hypothesis claims that both languages are independent subsets enclosed in one larger set (Grosjean 2008: 203). The BIMOLA does not include a conceptual level as well as a level of semantic representations. Instead, the label ‘higher linguistic information’ is used to represent these levels in Figure 13. As already mentioned, this unclear distinction is found in most models of auditory and visual language processing, because it is beyond the scope of the underlying investigations. Still, the BIMOLA allows top-down processes from the higher linguistic information to the word and the phoneme level. This effect allows a pre-activation of one or both languages, according to the current language mode of the speaker. Two mechanisms allow controlling language subset activation. First, a subset excitatory mechanism activates the words from the language currently spoken. Grosjean and Léwy state that “the more words in a language are active, the more these signals will be exchanged, and
therefore the greater activation of the word subset as a whole” (Grosjean & Léwy 2008: 207). The second control mechanism focuses on phonotactic characteristics, based on between-phoneme measurements. To account for the different phonetic inventory of languages, Grosjean and Léwy (2008) established a bilingual feature matrix that “provides a measure of distance between sound pairs and hence defines a metric space for phonemes” (Grosjean & Léwy 2008: 205). According to the authors, these two mechanisms are suited to replace the idea of language nodes on every lexical item. The BIMOLA concentrates clearly on the feature and the phoneme level and the processing of acoustic information. In the current approach the BIMOLA cannot be adopted, because it does not model in detail the interaction between semantic, conceptual and pragmatic information.

Another model that aims to illustrate bilingual language perception is the BIA+ (Dijkstra & van Heuven 2002), a further development of the BIA model (Dijkstra & van Heuven 1998). Both models primarily focus on visual word recognition and therefore include orthographic information, which is not considered in the other models presented in this chapter.

Figure 14. The BIA by Dijkstra et al. (1998) (adapted from Schwartz, Kroll 2006: 973)
The precursor of the BIA+, the BIA model (Figure 14), assumes parallel activation of the feature, letter and word level and relies on inhibitory control mechanisms in form of language nodes. The activation of language follows top-down direction, and the respective activation of language nodes provides information about the likelihood that a visual perceived word comes from a certain language (Dijkstra & van Heuven 1998). The BIA model is based on the fact that languages are activated independently and that the activation of both languages affects language processing. Language nodes that operate top-down and control the cross-linguistic influence at the lower levels monitor the recognition of words. The BIA provides an explanation for cross-linguistic influence in language switching costs in that language node activation relies on the previous word and is hindered by language switches (Grainger & Dijkstra 1992).

The BIA+ model, represented in Figure 15, differs from the BIA in several aspects (for a more detailed discussion of the initial BIA model see Dijkstra & van Heuven 1998, 2002, 2010; Grainger et al. 2010).

Figure 15. The BIA+ Dijkstra and van Heuven 2002 (adapted from van Heuven, Dijkstra 2010: 114)

The BIA+ model is divided into a task decision system and a word identification system. The task decision system controls the output of the word identification system and sets parameters
for decisions concerning the weight of the output and possible response strategies. It does not modify the linguistic information; it is concerned with decisions about the adequate treatment of and reaction to the perceived lexical information. The word identification system includes lexical and sublexical information of each language and information about the interaction of both languages. It is able to account not only for visual word recognition but also for acoustic word recognition by including orthographic and phonological representations (Dijkstra & van Heuven 2002). The word identification system underlies two main assumptions: 1. the bilingual lexicon is integrated, and 2. lexical access is nonselective (Dijkstra & van Heuven 2010: 114). The visual input activates the orthographic and phonological sublevels, which in turn activate the orthographic and phonological whole-word representations. These levels can activate the semantic representations and the specific language nodes. In this point, the BIA+ differs from the BIA, in that the language nodes do not influence the other levels of activation (Dijkstra & van Heuven 2010: 115). Hence, the BIA+ assumes no top-down activation from the language nodes and from the task decision system and a bottom-up activation of words. Empirical evidence for the BIA+ model comes from a wide range of studies (e.g. van Heuven et al. 1998; Dijkstra et al. 1999; Price et al. 1999; Hernandez et al. 2000, 2001; Dijkstra & van Heuven 2010; An overview of fMRI and ERP studies supporting the BIA+ model can be found in Dijkstra & van Heuven 2010: 115).

The BIA and BIA+ model differ from the previously presented BIMOLA model particularly by assuming an integrated phonological, lexical and semantic level as well as by postulating that lexical access is clearly nonselective. Support for these assumptions comes from various psycholinguistic studies (e.g., Dijkstra et al. 1999; van Heuven et al. 1998; Jared & Kroll 2001; Francis 1999, 2005). The differentiation between a separated task decision and word identification system relies on neuroimaging and neuropsychological studies assuming that different brain regions govern working memory processes and the language system (e.g. Friederici 2002; Hagoort 2005).

To conclude, recent models of lexical access in speech comprehension presented in this chapter focus particularly on the (non)-selectivity of the languages and the integration of the bilingual lexicon. Grosjean and Léwy explain language selection by the interplay of bottom-up subset activation and top-down pre-activation of higher linguistic material, which is monitored by two different control mechanisms. In contrast, Dijkstra and van Heuven explain language selection in the BIA+ via bottom-up activation of specific language nodes and a separated control mechanism, the task decision system. Unfortunately, the task decision system has not yet been described in more detail. Both models lack to account adequately for the interaction of conceptual, semantic and pragmatic representations, as well as their exact role in bilingual speech perception.
The upcoming subchapter offers an introduction to the problems related to the role and integration of pragmatic markers in language processing. The still unsolved question of the conceptual or procedural nature of pragmatic markers (see chapter) will be discussed.

2.3 Semantic, conceptual and pragmatic representations in bilingual language processing

The preceding parts of this chapter have made clear that current models of bilingual language processing and access generally do not focus on pragmatic information and a clear differentiation between pragmatic, semantic and conceptual representations. Still, the differentiation of these representation levels may be crucial for certain psycholinguistic questions and experimental investigations.

As pointed out by Altarriba and Basnight-Brown (2009), if two languages share a basic word meaning, it is not given that they also share the same underlying concept (Altarriba & Basnight-Brown 2009: 80). As we have seen in part, the DCFM and the Sense Model partly rely on this assumption by stating that the semantic representations of two lexical items from two languages may overlap to varying degrees. Pavlenko (2009) argues that words from two languages may share different degrees of conceptual overlap. As a first possibility, they may be conceptual equivalents or near equivalents, which evoke fewer problems for L2 learners (Pavlenko 2009: 133). As a second possibility, words may be partial (non-)equivalents but there are different ways in which words may overlap. Here, she focuses on the notion of nesting that she defines as “two or more categories of one language are subsumed, fully or partially, within a larger category in another language” (Pavlenko 2009: 134). As a third possibility, words may share no conceptual overlap and therefore are non-equivalent (for an overview about experimental evidence on this differentiation see Pavlenko 2009). As a consequence, she establishes an adapted version of the RHM (see), the modified hierarchical model (MHM).

![The Modified Hierarchical Model (adapted from Pavlenko 2009: 147)](image-url)
In this adapted version of the RHM, Pavlenko accounts for the possible degrees of equivalency of respective translation “equivalents”. As the model relies on language-specific conceptual categories, these categories are also assumed to only be accessed by one language. Still, semantic representations do not appear in the MHM and Pavlenko explains this as follows:

The term semantic representation refers here to the largely implicit knowledge of: (1) the mapping between words and concepts determining how many concepts and which particular concepts are expressed by a particular word via polysemy or metaphoric extension and (2) connections between words, which account for phenomena such as collocation, word association, synonymy and antonymy. (Pavlenko 2009: 148)

According to this view, semantic representations can be found in the links between words and concepts. In doing so, Pavlenko agrees with other models in that semantic representations are most likely to be anchored on a level between conceptual and word level. Although the visualization of this idea may not be completely unequivocal, it is still important to retain the idea of possible degrees of equivalency in conceptual categories.

As an interim summary it can be noted that there is evidence that not only semantic representations of two languages may overlap to varying degrees (see the DCFM and the Sense Model), but also conceptual representations. Furthermore, most models that include conceptual and semantic information assume that the semantic level lies between the conceptual and the lexical level. Still it remains unclear where pragmatic information is integrated into lexical access and how pragmatic information interacts with other representation levels during speech processing.

It is undisputed that words from two languages may have a varying overlap of semantic meanings, but often they also share only parts of their pragmatic functions (see chapter 4). Therefore, it appears as if it is possible to extend the notion of complete, partial and non-equivalency to the pragmatic level. Still, it rests unclear where pragmatic information enters into the process of lexical access. One possible approach is that pragmatic information can only enter into speech processing in sentence context, because single words cannot give much information of the different functions of the respective word. This would mean that pragmatic information is only necessary and accessible in sentence context. In psycholinguistic research on sentence processing, it is still controversially discussed when and how semantic and syntactic information is accessed in sentence processing (see 6.1.1.1).

While the question of the semantic-pragmatic interface has been addressed from a pragmatic perspective in chapter, this problem has not been approached sufficiently from a psycholinguistic perspective.

It is indeed true that only very few experimental studies deal with pragmatic information in an explicit way (see 6.1.1 for an overview of experimental evidence on pragmatic markers in
sentence context). In recent years, a new field of research emerged that is called experimental pragmatics (for an overview see Sperber & Noveck 2004; Meibauer & Steinbach 2011). This field of experimental pragmatics tries to combine experimental psycholinguistics with linguistic pragmatics (see Gibbs 2004). On the one hand, the focus of the respective studies lies on the experimental verification of pragmatic theories, such as the Gricean maxims and relevance theory (e.g. Clark & Bangerter 2004). On the other hand, concrete pragmatic phenomena are verified experimentally, such as scalar implicatures (e.g. Pouscoulous 2007), indirect speech acts (e.g. Gibbs 1979), pragmatic enrichment (e.g. Pylkännen, McElree 2006) and reference resolution (see Noveck & Reboul 2008). All this experimental work on pragmatic phenomena constitutes an important contribution to further findings on the processing of pragmatic information in lexical access and retrieval. The different underlying theories constitute a major problem in the analysis of pragmatic phenomena. Meibauer and Steinbach (2004) as well as Noveck and Reboul (2008) demonstrate on the example of scalar implicatures that the underlying theory may influence the experiment design and therefore results and conclusions may not be generally accepted. This is due to the fact that the underlying theories may make different predictions about the definition and classification of certain phenomena. In this case, scalar implicatures may be approached from a relevance theoretic approach or an approach relying on generalized and particularized conversational implicatures (GClIs, PClIs).

Very few universal statements have been made about the role of pragmatic information in language processing and the field of experimental pragmatics still has to deal with a wide range of controversially discussed theoretic issues. While it is still commonly assumed that pragmatic information only arises from concrete contexts, the question of pragmatics has often been displaced to research on sentence processing. Still, in research on sentence processing, very few statements have been made on the influence of pragmatics on language processing. It is especially problematic that the terms “pragmatic information” and “sentence context” are in most cases not distinguished appropriately (see 6.1.1.1. for detailed discussion).

While the present work focuses on pragmatic markers, these items will be the focus of the present overview.

Except for the semantic-pragmatic interplay, there is another important factor to consider regarding the possible processing of pragmatic markers. As pointed out in chapter it is still controversial if pragmatic markers encode conceptual meaning or if they only encode procedural meaning. In a relevance-theoretic approach, pragmatic markers are defined as not encoding conceptual but only procedural meaning (see 1.).

Still the terminological definitions of ‘conceptual’ and ‘procedural’ are not necessarily used alike in pragmatic and in psycholinguistic research. In relevance theory, ‘concepts’ are mental representations, whereas ‘procedures’ are functions. According to Blakemore (1987), linguistic
encoded meaning is either conceptual or procedural. Sperber and Wilson (1993) include the factors ‘accessibility to consciousness’, ‘truth-evaluability’ and ‘compositionality’, to distinguish procedural from conceptual meaning. Still, from a relevance theoretic perspective, it is not clear how procedural meaning is processed in the mind and how conceptual meaning interacts with the other levels of language processing.

From a psychological perspective, there is no direct differentiation between conceptual and procedural meaning, but between declarative and procedural knowledge. In this view, declarative knowledge constitutes the factual information in the memory. In contrast, the non-declarative or procedural knowledge includes information about how to do things (e.g. ride a bike, play piano…) (Heredia 2008: 40). On the contrary, as stated in the previous parts of this chapter, conceptual representations are often confused and equated with semantic representations in psycholinguistic research (see e.g. Pavlenko 2009).

The present subchapter showed clearly that the differentiation between conceptual, semantic and pragmatic representations is still controversial and is interpreted in very different ways in pragmatic and psycholinguistic research. This constitutes a problem especially for the investigations of pragmatic markers, which are located at the semantic-pragmatic interface. Therefore, it is crucial to clarify the interrelation of these termini for the present work.

With regard to the present study, it will be clearly differentiated between the semantic meaning patterns of pragmatic markers and their pragmatic functions. Here, the semantic meaning patterns are defined as the different polysemous senses of a lexical item, which affect the propositional content of an utterance. In contrast, the pragmatic functions of a lexical item only operate on utterance level that is they modify the illocutionary force of an utterance and do not affect the propositional content.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, this means that semantic meaning patterns can be equated with the semantic senses in the Sense Model from Finkbeiner et al. (2004) (see ). They may have a different degree of overlap in possible translation equivalents, even if they may or may not be linked to the same conceptual representation. In contrast, pragmatic functions cannot be clearly assigned in isolated word forms, but arise in contextualization that is in sentence processing. Therefore, the influence of pragmatic functions can only be investigated properly in sentence context.

The question of conceptual and procedural meaning of pragmatic markers cannot be answered unequivocally at this point, but it will be taken up again in the discussion of the experimental investigation in chapter 6. Still, it can already be stated that the present study follows the more recent approaches that assume that conceptual and procedural meaning do not have to be mutually exclusive (e.g. Pons Bonderia 2008).
For a long time, psycholinguistic research focused mainly on isolated word forms and especially on prototypical word types such as nouns. Pavlenko critiques the stimuli selection of prototypical objects in cross-language picture naming and semantic categorization:

The reliance on tasks involving decontextualized words and single pictures of prototypical objects coupled with avoidance of cross-linguistic differences may have created a somewhat skewed picture of the bilingual lexicon (...). (Pavlenko 2009: 130)

This citation underlines the need for an analysis of non-prototypical word types, such as pragmatic markers, to get a broader picture of the bilingual lexicon. Furthermore, it states that research on larger unities of lexical items, such as sentences, is crucial for psycholinguistic research. It is beyond the scope of the present work to provide a complete overview about research on bilingual sentence processing. Still, it has to be mentioned that research on sentence processing focuses on very different approaches and questions than research on isolated word processing.

Different approaches are associated with different underlying assumptions for sentence processing in speech comprehension. The interactive approach assumes that all types of incoming information interact with each other the whole time during processing (Marslen-Wilson & Tyler 1980; McClelland et al. 1989; Trueswell & Tanenhaus 1994). The serial approach maintains that processes of sentence processing act completely independent and partially sequential, whereas syntax is processed prior to semantic information (Berwick & Weinberg 1984; Ferreira & Clifton 1986). Aside from these strictly opposite approaches (for an overview see Tanenhaus & Trueswell, 1995), other proposals assume a varying degree of interaction of semantic and syntactic information in language processing. In accordance with the serial approach, Frazier (1987) proposes that semantic information only affects syntax at a latter stage of processing. Each of these approaches was established by means of underlying experimental evidence (for an overview of ERP studies on the semantic-syntactic interplay see Martín-Loeches et al. 2006: 180).

Evidence for sequential processing of syntactic information comes from a range of research showing the garden-path effect (e.g. Bever 1970; Frazier & Rayner 1982; Trueswell, Tannenhaus, Garnsey 1994). Garden-path sentences, such as the famous example The horse raced past the barn fell (Bever 1970) support the view of incremental syntactic analysis. Before the final lexeme of the sentence, the reader or hearer interprets raced as an active past-tense verb and is therefore “misled”. Further evidence for sentence parsing and processing comes from studies on syntactic priming (e.g. Pickering & Branigan 1998; Ferreira 2003; Branigan, Pickering & McLean 2005) and semantic ambiguity resolution (e.g. Klepousniotou 2001; Rodd et al. 2002; Gaskell & Marslen-Wilson 2002; Mirman 2008). The exact interaction of syntactic and semantic information in sentence processing still rests unsolved and depends largely on factors such as the underlying model of lexical access, the assumption about top-down or bottom-up processing in
the respective approach and the level on which semantic and syntactic information is integrated into language processing.

The conclusive part of this chapter aims to recapitulate the findings from the present chapter and to propose an own perspective on models of bilingual lexical access. That is to say, it will be discussed why certain models are better suited as underlying models for the present work than others.

2.4 Conclusion

In the previous parts, it has been pointed out extensively that it is extremely important for the present account to differentiate adequately, at least, between conceptual and semantic information. It is therefore evident that a model including this differentiation is best suited as an underlying model for the present work. But, to analyze pragmatic markers in language contact, not only a clear differentiation between conceptual, semantic and pragmatic material is necessary. Besides, it is crucial to choose a model that is not static and that is able to account for possible changes in the semantic overlap of respective translation equivalents. A model that focuses exactly on these two points is the Sense Model by Finkbeiner et al. (2004). Therefore, the Sense Model will serve as theoretic foundation for the psycholinguistic interpretation of the corpus material (chapter 5) and the experimental investigation (chapter 6). It is indeed true that the Sense Model is a very detailed model that cannot account for the other levels of language processing and does not make any assumptions about the complete process of lexical access.

Therefore, the RHM is chosen as a more generally sketched model that can complement some weaknesses of the Sense Model. The RHM does not differentiate sufficiently between semantic and conceptual information, but it assumes, as the Sense Model, a flexible view on language processing, in that it proposes weaker and stronger links. Additionally, the RHM is set on the premise that L1 and L2 translations are sensitive to semantic context. These two points lead to the assumption that the RHM is able to complement the Sense Model from a more general perspective. Both models agree on a common conceptual level but distinct lexical levels. Both models propose a non-static view on language processing, in that links or overlaps may vary according to certain criteria. Therefore, both models agree on the same main assumptions and differ mainly in their concrete visual representation.

To conclude, it can be retained that the Sense Model will serve as main underlying model of the present work while the RHM may help to complement some aspects, which are not covered by the Sense Model.
3

The Franco-Manitoban

This chapter gives an outline of the Manitoban variety of Canadian French that will be the object of research of the analysis in chapter 4. The French language in Manitoba experienced a separate evolution from other French Canadian varieties and a long-term influence of the English language. From the first French settlements in Manitoba up to the invention and distribution of modern communication media, Manitoban French was geographically isolated and underwent very different stages of linguistic policies and varying degrees of linguistic acceptance.

In a first part, the historical evolution of Manitoban French will be illustrated, where the focus lies on the sociolinguistic factors. In this course, the literature on the French varieties spoken in Manitoba will be revued.

In a second part, the FM Corpus, a corpus of spoken Franco-Manitoban, will be introduced. This self-provided corpus is the basis for the qualitative corpus analysis in chapter 4.

3.1 Sociolinguistic and historic background

Manitoba is one of the ten provinces of Canada and belongs, together with Saskatchewan, to the Prairie Provinces (also known as The Plains). Geographically, Manitoba is seen as a part of Western Canada, even if it is situated directly in the middle of the country.

According to the newest census of Statistics Canada\(^1\), Manitoba counts 1.267.000 inhabitants on 552,329.52 km\(^2\), which is a population density of 2.2 persons per km\(^2\). According to Statistics Canada, only 42,090 inhabitants, that are 3.5% of the population, indicate French as their mother tongue\(^2\). Still, 103,145 inhabitants (8.6%) indicate that they know both official languages, which are English and French (ibd.).

Most French speaking Manitobans live in Saint-Boniface, the French quarter of Winnipeg, and neighboring districts of the capital of Manitoba. But French speakers can also be found in French communities outside of Winnipeg, such as La Broquerie, Lorette, St. Anne, etc. Recently, the francophone community in Manitoba is growing, mostly due to the strategic plan of


the Canadian government to foster immigration to francophone minority communities. Still, francophone Manitobans live in a situation of a minority community and experience the strong influence of the English language in their everyday life. However, the French language in Manitoba has a long and eventful history. In the following, only the most important data and events will be presented, for an extensive overview and discussion about French Manitoban history, see e.g. Blay (2010), Hallion (2000), as well as the internet presence of the Société Historique de Saint Boniface (SHSB) and the Société Franco-Manitobaine (SFM).

The first French settlement in Manitoba is closely linked to the Hudson Bay Company (HBC) and the fur traders, the so-called voyageurs. In 1738, the voyageur LaVerendrye was one of the first Europeans to reach the place of today’s Saint Boniface and to establish a first settlement near the Red River. As the francophone fur traders were in constant contact to the indigenous people, especially the Cree, a new ethnic group arose from marriages between Cree women and French fur traders. This new ethnic group is known and recognized until today as the Métis, who also developed their own language Michif (see e.g. Bakker 1997). The Métis people played an important role in the history of Manitoba, which will be explained in the following. More settlements and forts were built in the following years for the purpose of fur trading, giving birth to the Red River Colony, established by French settlers and Métis people. The Red River Colony was administrated by the Hudson Bay Company.

In 1818, the clerics Norbert Provencher and Sévère Dumoulin arrived at the Red River Colony and established a permanent base of the Catholic Church in Western Canada. As in the rest of Canada, the Catholic Church is strongly linked to the French Canadian culture and identity whereas the English Canadian community consists mostly of Protestants. In the 1860s, more and more Anglophone protestant settlers from Ontario settled down in the Red River Colony and in 1869, the territory of the Red River Colony was sold to the newly established Canadian Dominion. These events led to an increasing number of incidents of linguistic and religious nature between Francophone and Anglophone settlers. These problems resulted in the Red River Rebellion, which was initiated and led by the Métis leader Louis Riel and his Métis and Francophone followers. Their protest aimed to gain more linguistic and religious rights. It was directed against the Anglophone Canadian government and resulted in the provisory government of the Red River Colony by Louis Riel and his followers. In 1870, the Manitoba Act allowed the Red River Colony to enter the Canadian Confederation as the Province of Manitoba. In the Manitoba Act, French and English were official languages of Manitoba and separate Francophone schools were acknowledged as well as the practice of the catholic religion. In the following years, Louis Riel was forced into exile, arrested and executed for treason by the Canadian government. He still remains one of the most disputed figures in Canadian history. For the Francophone

---

3 e.g. see http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-641-x/89-641-x2010001-eng.htm
4 http://shsb.mb.ca/Au_pays_de_Riel/Chronologies/Manitoba_francais
5 http://www.sfm.mb.ca/communaute/histoire_du_manitoba_francais
community, Louis Riel still is a regional hero and the father of Manitoba. The Anglophone community considers him a traitor to the nation and a rebel.

In 1883, Saint Boniface became an official city with a regional government. In the following years, more and more Anglophones settled down in the actual site of Winnipeg and Saint Boniface and the Francophone community obtained more and more a minority status. In 1886, only 10% of the inhabitants of Manitoba were French speaking Catholics. This minority situation led to an influential decision of the Manitoban legislation in 1890. As a consequence of several laws, the French language was abolished as an official language of Manitoba. Furthermore the acceptance of religious duality was abolished and the catholic religion was no longer recognized as an official religion in Manitoba. Due to these laws, all Francophone schools were banned but first the Francophone minority found ways to continue teaching in French to a certain degree. In 1916, the Thornton Act ended all compromise about teaching in languages other than English. From this time on, the Francophone community was very limited in expressing their language, culture and identity in public. Children learnt French only from their parents, but the use of the French language was strictly forbidden in school and other public places. Still, the Francophone community in Manitoba continued to exist and founded a French radio station, the CKSB, in 1945, as well as the Société Franco-Manitobaine (SFM) in 1968 and the Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain (CCFM) in 1974. In 1969, the law on the languages was first weakened and French regained the same status as before 1916, that is it was allowed as a teaching language. Only in 1979, all laws from 1890 were abolished and the French community regained the same rights as the English community in Manitoba. French became an official language de jure again and since then, all services in the province have to be provided in both official languages. It was only in 1993 that the Francophone community regained complete control about their school system, the division scolaire Franco-Manitobaine (DSFM).

Today, the French community of Manitoba is a very active community that tries to maintain the Franco-Manitoban culture, identity and language through a large number of events and actions. It is crucial for the Franco-Manitoban community to maintain the French language, the catholic religion and to distinguish themselves from the Anglophone community and other minority communities. The most important Franco-Manitoban event still is the Festival du Voyageur. During this annual ten-day festival the Franco-Manitoban community celebrates its culture and presents itself to the rest of the Manitoban population.

This historical review already gave a first insight into the complexity of the linguistic situation in Manitoba. The French language in Manitoba underwent very different stages of linguistic acceptance and developed, for an important part, isolated from other French Canadian or European French varieties. Especially during the long period in which French was abolished as a teaching language, Franco-Manitoban children only learned French from their parents and spoke

6 http://www.sfm.mb.ca/communaute/histoire_du_manitoba_francais/
it secretly. Due to the lack of international media such as radio, television and Internet, these children were not able to establish a constant contact to other French varieties than the Franco-Manitoban variety. Only since the 1980s, the Franco-Manitoban children learned French in school again and the emergence of the new technologies helped to maintain the French language in Manitoba. Still, Manitoban French followed own evolution paths and developed in a different way than other Canadian French or European French varieties. This is to an important part due to the constant language contact situation with English and the status of English as a dominant language in Manitoba. It is incontestable that the long-term language contact with English had an impact on the Manitoban French variety but it is still not completely clear how big this impact is and how it appears in its lexical, morpho-syntactic and semantic structures.

Most of the linguistic research on Canadian French and its varieties focused and still focuses on Québec French. In the last 30 years, more and more researchers started to investigate other varieties than the Québécois and mainly put the focus on Acadian French and French in Ontario. Even the work of Mougeon and Beniak (1988), aiming to describe the French varieties outside Québec, does not include a single article on French varieties from Western Canada. The Western Canadian varieties, such as the Franco-Manitoban, the Fransaskois, the Franco-Albertan and the Franco-Columbian, have been neglected for a long time in linguistic research on Canadian French. But in recent years, the interest on these varieties arose (e.g. Walker 2005). It is still controversial to which degree these Western varieties differ from the Eastern varieties, such as Québécois, Acadien and Ontario French, and how they differ among themselves. Papen (2004) proposes a comparison of the Franco-Manitoban and the Fransaskois and concludes that «ce sont surtout les anglicismes qui distinguent les parlers de l'Ouest de celui du Québec, et peut-être même ce qui permet de distinguer les parlers de l'Ouest entre eux» (Papen 2004: 42). This may indeed be the case for the lexical level of the Western varieties but these varieties have not been compared extensively on other linguistic levels, such as the phonology, morphosyntax and semantics. Even if some researchers tend to treat all Western varieties as one variety, much research came up in the recent years on specific phenomena of the French language in Manitoba (for a detailed overview about the literature on Manitoban French, see Hallion Bres 2005). First studies on Manitoban French highlighted the lack of research on this respective variety (Amprimoz & Gaborieau 1982). Today, the most extensive overview of the French language in Manitoba comes certainly from the unpublished doctoral thesis of Hallion (2000), focusing on historical, sociolinguistic and morphosyntactic peculiarities of Manitoban French, as well as from Rodriguez (2006), providing a lexicometric analysis of Manitoban French. Other considerable studies focus on a specific language spoken in Manitoba, that is the Michif (see the extensive work of Peter Bakker and Robert Papen), but also on the French language of the Métis people (e.g. see Papen 1993, 2003).
Most recent work on the Franco-Manitoban language still focuses on lexical aspects (Rodriguez 1993, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2003) and only few deal with morphosyntactic aspects (Rodriguez 1991; Hallion 2000; Hallion Bres 2004; Mougeon & Hallion Bres 2007). Marchand (1997, 1998, 2003, 2004) puts the focus on the sociolinguistic aspects of Manitoban French and points out that there is more than one French variety spoken in Manitoba. She distinguishes the variety of Saint-Boniface, the variety of the Red River, la rouge, the variety of the River Seine and the variety of the immigrated French, Swiss and Belgian, called le français de la Montagne (Marchand 2004). Another important research focus lies on the identity and the development of the Francophonie of the Franco-Manitoban community (e.g. Fauchon 2001).

As far as it is known, no work on Franco-Manitoban has focused on semantic peculiarities, on pragmatic markers and their cross-linguistic influence. The present work aims to provide an analysis of the Manitoban French variety spoken in Saint-Boniface, Winnipeg. Here, the focus lies on bilingual speakers, which are currently in a bilingual mode. The underlying corpus data, labeled the FM (Franco-Manitoban) Corpus in the following, will be presented in detail in the following subpart.

### 3.2 The FM Corpus

The FM Corpus aims to give first insights into the informal speech of bilingual Franco-Manitoban speakers. The corpus data was collected in September 2010 in the French quarter of Winnipeg, Saint Boniface. The language distribution of English and French in the data is unbalanced; French represents two thirds of the data while English only rises up to one third. It contains an overall quantity of 35,660 tokens that are distributed into 15 communications of a total of 20 speakers. All speakers are aged between 17 and 30 years and are born and raised in the Franco-Manitoban environment of St. Boniface or neighboring districts. The gender distribution in the speech data is non-balanced; fifteen speakers are male while only five are female.

The recordings were collected through participatory and non-participatory observation. The presence of the interviewer did not influence the speakers’ communication habits in a negative way, due to the long-term familiarity of the interviewer with the Franco-Manitoban community. All recordings were conducted in non-guided and informal situations in the usual environments of the speakers in Saint Boniface. Recording situations range from very informal situations, such as get-togethers of friends for supper or coffee, to partly informal situation, such as lunch break and informal meetings with colleagues at work or a band meeting before the show. All speakers knew each other for a long time and did not only meet for the purpose of the recordings. The communications were not especially induced for the recordings and the speakers selected the topics of conversation freely and regardless of the presence or absence of the interviewer.
All speakers identified themselves strongly with the Franco-Manitoban culture and took an active part in the cultural and social life of the community. They all indicated the French language as their mother tongue and tried to use French as the matrix language in their communications. All speakers can be identified as balanced bilingual speakers of English and French. They followed a purely French education at least until the age of 17 that is to say until completing High School. Due to the sociolinguistic circumstances they were regularly exposed to the English language in everyday life from an early age on. Their degree of bilingualism and their use of the two languages in everyday life is comparable to the participants in the experimental investigation (see 6.1.3). In the course of personal conversation that do not occur in the transcribed speech data, most speakers indicated that they cannot exactly name the age on which they started to acquire English and that English is a language that one ‘simply learns’. Regardless of the fact that all speakers indicate French as their L1, they are very aware of the impact of the English language on their communication habits. Nonetheless, most speakers have the impression that English has a negative influence on their French language skills, which often results in language insecurities. This can be exemplified by two commentaries from the FM Corpus data:

1) DM: c’est/ c’est différent (à cause) que t’as le franco-manitobain qui est très précis • t’sais •ah t’sais • very • • ah proper • disons •puis ensuite t’as le parler de tous les jours right? • puis je sais que c’est la même chose au Québec • • puis/ puis partout right? • • mais • • je pas il y a quelque chose qui me dit que ((1.9s)) I don’t know ((( )) ((1.1s))) t’sais j’avais cette discussion avec Maxime Bélanger puis lui il disait comme on devrait • arrêter de/ d’être tellement • • •ehm ((1.5s)) c’est d’avoir ce complexe là qu’on parle mal • • qu’on parle mal right? on parle la façon qu’on parle ici et il y a rien de mal avec ça. t’sais… Ya c’est ça c’est ça so on devrait juste ((2s)) t’sais • eh comment tu dis eeh ((1.5s)) embrace it • • • ya • • ya.

2) DM: ben c’est ça ben je pense qu’on se compare toujours t’sais comme • • ben • • t’sais si on fait beaucoup de travail avec le Québéc là t’sais avec des demandes de subvention pis toute sorte d’affaire c’est…(…) • ben t’sais/ on/ (…) mais on a ((1s)) on a le complexe là qui nous dit • oui ils sont mieux t’sais ((1.2s)) o/ on croit qu’on est toujours inférieurs so ((1.1s)) j’pas c’est difficile • • c’est… (…)

These commentaries underline the linguistic awareness in the individual speaker’s language perception. Because of simplicity reasons, all corpus data will be denominated Franco-Manitoban in the following, despite the presence of English utterances. This choice can be explained by the fact that French represents the overall matrix language in all recorded communication. The FM Corpus contains an overall number of 35.660 tokens while French amounts to 62% of the data and English only rises to 28% (Figure 17). Sounds, such as ehm, oh and ah, as well as laughter, were classified as nonlexical sounds; false starts include lexemes that were interrupted before they could clearly be assigned to one language.
All transcribed conversations and a completely annotated wordlist are annexed to this work in digital form. All transcribed conversations follow the HIAT (*halbinterpretative Arbeitstranskriptionen*) transcription conventions (Ehlich, Rehbein 1976, 1979, 2004). In the transcriptions, all speakers and other mentioned people, organizations and personal data are anonymised. Due to the lack of anonymity in the actual speech recordings, the accessibility of the data is restricted for persons other than the interviewer and can only be made accessible in parts and on special request.
4

Corpus analysis

The current chapter aims to give a detailed analysis of three pragmatic markers in Manitoban French, as well as one English translation equivalent and one nearly equivalent French marker. These three marker triples were chosen for frequency reasons in the FM Corpus data. The detailed motivations for choosing certain pragmatic markers for analysis will be explained in the respective subchapters. All examples of speech data are, if not indicated explicitly, taken from the previously introduced FM Corpus.

In the first part of this chapter, the pragmatic markers *comme* and *like* will be contrasted in their pragmatic functions and semantic meaning patterns. Furthermore, the marker *comme* needs to be compared with its French counterpart *genre* that is inexistent in Manitoban French discourse. The focus of this part is put on the question if *comme* in Franco-Manitoban replicated patterns from English *like* and if these grammaticalization pathways can be retraced by means of the synchronic data provided.

In the second part of this chapter, the markers *alors, donc* and *so* will be subject to a detailed analysis. After considering the functions and meaning patterns of these markers in their respective standard varieties, their use will be contrasted by means of the FM Corpus data. Here, the emphasis lies on the question if *so* is a case of borrowing in Franco-Manitoban discourse.

The third part of this chapter focuses on the markers *bon, ben* and *well*. As in the previous subchapters, the three markers will be contrasted in their respective standard variety and in the FM Corpus data. It will be discussed if the three markers underwent processes of contact-induced language change in Manitoban French.

A closing part of this chapter aims to give a summary about the possible characteristics of a discourse marking system in a bilingual contact variety. Here, the possible evolution and development paths of the bilingual pragmatic markers in question will be contrasted.
4.1  *Comme* and *like*

### 4.1.1 Current research on *comme* and *like*

In European French, the marker *comme* is a highly multifunctional lexical unit. Already in its diachronic evolution, the lexical unit *comme* has expanded semantic patterns and developed several functions that can also be found in its Portuguese, Spanish and Italian counterparts *como, como* and *come*. Several of these functions can be traced back to the Latin source expression. Aslanov (2009: 23) points out the polyvalence of the Latin adverb *quomodo* ‘in which way’ and states that the exclamative, interrogative and integrative functions of this unit survived in later stages of Latin and Vulgar Latin and even in the Romance Languages. Other than its counterparts in other Romance Languages, *comme* cannot be used in an interrogative way in Contemporary French. This is due to the meaning differentiation between the lexical units *como* and *comment*, which can both be retraced to the Old French source expression *com* (Aslanov 2009: 20).

One of the most frequent uses of *comme* in European French is the adverb use, that is as a marker of similitative comparison or an exclamative particle, as in *Comme il est beau!* (Fuchs & Le Goffic 2005: 1). Besides these functions, Mihatsch (2009) emphasizes its use as a conjunction “and derived from the comparison marker, exemplifying markers, role markers and conformity markers” (Mihatsch 2009: 69). In European French, *comme* also adopted the use as an approximation marker (4) that can be described as an extension of meaning from the comparison marker (4):

3)  Il est têtu comme son père.

4)  On entendait comme un grondement lointain.

(Fuchs & Le Goffic 2005)

From the early stages on, the diachronic evolution of the lexical unit *comme* is characterized by a certain polyfunctionality and by extension of functions through common processes of language change. As pointed out by Fuchs and Le Goffic (2005) the main characteristic of *comme* in contemporary French, besides its polyfunctionality, is its polysemy on the semantic level. According to Fuchs and Le Goffic, the polyfunctionality of *comme* shows at the morpho-syntactic level, whereas the polysemy only affects the semantic level of *comme* (Fuchs & Le Goffic 2005: 1). In the present understanding, the pragmatic and discourse-structuring functions of a pragmatic marker do not affect the truth-conditions of the utterance and do not modify the propositional content. In contrast, the semantic senses of a polysemous lexical item do modify the propositional content of the utterance.

In Spoken American English, *like* functions as a highly polysemous and syntactic flexible lexical unit that can take several discourse functions.
Meehan (1991) traces the lexical item *like* back to the Old English adjective *gelic* ‘having the form of’ and the adverb meaning ‘in the same manner or to the same extent as’. According to Meehan, *like* is known in its function as a conjunction since the 14th century and from there on developed new functions, such as its use in exemplification and its different discourse functions, such as focus and quotative (Meehan 1991: 49). Besides these functions, *like* can also appear as a hedge and as a hesitation marker. Some of the discourse functions of *like*, such as its use as a focus and a quotative marker, only emerged in more recent times and became very frequent in oral speech. This frequency in spoken language, first restricted to young speakers of American English, rapidly expanded to other sociolinguistic groups and also to other varieties of English spoken outside the U.S. This fast evolution of language change, which took place since the mid-20th century, attracted much attention of researchers in different branches of linguistics. This is why the discourse functions of *like* have been subject to many scientific discussions. Most of this research has focused on the diachronic evolution of *like* (e.g. Romaine & Lange 1991; Meehan 1991; D’Arcy 2005), on the emergence of specific pragmatic functions of *like* (e.g. Buchstaller 2002; Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009; Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009) and on the description of the synchronic uses and the sociolinguistic distribution of these functions (Schourup 1985; Underhill 1988; Dailey-O’Cain 2000; Tagliamonte & Hudson 2000; Siegel 2002).

Therefore the most important question in the following will be if *comme* in Franco-Manitoban has developed similar pragmatic functions and if these functions follow comparable paths of language change. In the following, the main focus is on the emerging pragmatic functions of *comme* that can be found in different varieties of Canadian French. Therefore, first the recent research on *comme* will be introduced. In a second step, the pragmatic functions and semantic pattern of *comme* will be analyzed with regard to *like* on the basis of the FM Corpus data. These patterns will be described regarding the marker *genre* in spoken and informal European French, sharing a functional similarity with *comme* and *like*. In the third part of this chapter, possible grammaticalization paths of *comme* will be considered in order to link the evolution of this marker to the process of grammatical replication.

For this aim, the grammaticalization paths of the markers *comme* and *like* will be compared. This step is particularly important to detect which processes of language change have triggered the peculiarities of *comme* in Canadian French.

### 4.1.2 *Comme* in Canadian French

In Canadian French, the lexical unit *comme* shows some important peculiarities. Most research in the field of pragmatic markers in Canadian French has focused on a small amount of different varieties. Researchers mainly analyzed the use and functions of pragmatic markers in Acadian
French (e.g. Perrot 1992; Chevalier 2001, 2007; Arsenault 2001) and Québec French (e.g. Dostie 1995; Vincent 2005; Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007). On the one hand, the focus of these studies lies on corpus analysis to identify and describe the semantic properties and pragmatic functions of the markers of these varieties. On the other, the located properties are compared to the equivalent markers of English to point out common patterns. All of these researchers are in agreement that comme in varieties of Canadian French underwent some kind of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic expansion.

For Québec French, Beaulieu-Masson et al. (2007) point out several additional functions, including hedging (atténuation), exemplification and quotation (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 37).

For the functions of comme in the Acadian French variety Chiac, spoken in Moncton, New Brunswick, Chevalier (2001) establishes the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Approximation</th>
<th>Exemplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comme ça (comparatif)</td>
<td>Approximation qualitative</td>
<td>Exemple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comme ça (résumptif)</td>
<td>Approximation quantitative</td>
<td>Explication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comme + dire</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>comme + Point de vue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discours rapporté direct</td>
<td>Autocitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18. Functions of comme in Acadian French (adapted from Chevalier 2001: 26)

In this classification, Chevalier distinguishes three main functions of comme that are comparison, approximation and exemplification. The comparison and exemplification functions can clearly be found in European French as well. Regarding the approximation function, only the ‘approximation qualitative’ is in current use in European French. In this work, this function will be referred to as adaptor use, according to the terminology of Prince et al. (1982), introduced in chapter 1.

Therefore, the new functions in Figure 18 are the ‘approximation quantitative’, that is the rounder function according to Prince et al. (1982), the ‘discours rapporté direct’ and ‘autocitation’ functions, which will be defined as quotative functions in the following, and the ‘assertion’ function. Chevalier describes the ‘assertion’ use of comme as «comme a une portée sur des évènements, des états de fait qui prennent la forme d’énoncés entiers» (Chevalier 2001: 20). In current research on like, this function is, from a syntactic perspective, commonly referred to as sentence-final use, or, from a pragmatic perspective, as focus function (see Underhill 1988). Depending on the pragmatic function of like in the specific utterance, the ‘assertion’ can also comprehend shield functions, according to the terminology of Prince et al. (1982).
These findings suggest that *comme* in Canadian French developed functions that are not attested for *comme* in European French. According to these research results, the most salient new functions of *comme* seem to include the extension in its use as a hedge (e.g. a quantitative approximation marker) and its use in quotation. In European French, *comme* cannot fulfill this set of functions. Fleischman and Yaguello (2004) observe that the lexical unit *genre* has emerged as a pragmatic marker in European French and can be used in several of the functions listed above. The functional equivalency of *comme* and *genre* will be highlighted in more detail in the upcoming analysis.

Therefore, the question arises which underlying process of language change can be identified for the new meanings and functions of *comme* in Canadian French. This emergence could possibly be explained by the language contact situation of French and English in Canada.

Chevalier presumes that *like*, sharing important semantic patterns with *comme*, could be the source expression for the changes stated in Canadian French (Chevalier 2001: 36). But without analyzing this question in detail, she states:

(...) mais on ne peut expliquer la récente prédilection pour ce marqueur en français canadien, de préférence à *genre*, privilégié en français hexagonal, ou à *like*, source présumée de sa vogue dans la communauté acadienne de Moncton.

(Chevalier 2001: 36)

In contrast to this statement, Beaulieu-Masson et al. try to identify different characteristics of *comme* and point out that the meaning and function extensions could possibly underlie the process of pragmaticalization:

(...) il nous semble tangible de croire que l’emploi du lexème *comme* dans certains contextes particuliers à l’usage québécois puisse découler de ce processus. (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 36)

Furthermore Beaulieu-Masson et al. compare the pragmaticalized functions of *comme* with the functions of the possible source expression *like*. They conclude that most of the new functions of *comme* are also found in the pragmatic uses of *like*, but still they reason that “de là à en déduire que l’un est un calque de l’autre, il y a un pas” (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 38).

To conclude, *comme* shows several new functions and an extension of meaning in Acadian and Québec French. The question whether the emergence of these functions is due to processes of language contact is still unsolved. Hence, the following section aims to contribute to an answer of this question by first comparing semantic patterns and pragmatic functions of *comme* and *like* in the Franco-Manitobain variety of Canadian French.
4.1.3 **comme and like** in Franco-Manitoban

The markers *comme* and *like* both seem to be very frequent in Manitoban French while the partial equivalent French marker *genre* does not occur at all.

In the FM Corpus data, *comme* occurs 577 times, whereas *like* appears 255 times. When regarding the occurrences of *like* in the FM Corpus, 237 items out of 255, that are 93%, appear in the functioning of a pragmatic marker. The other 7% include occurrences of *like* as a verb or as a comparison marker. For *comme*, 554 occurrences of the item, that are 96%, appear in functions of a pragmatic marker.

In contrast, an analysis of hundred randomly chosen occurrences of *comme* in the European French C-Oral ROM Corpus7 revealed that only 14% of the data shows *comme* as a pragmatic marker. That is to say, in 86% of the occurrences, *comme* takes other functions, e.g. as a comparison marker. These numbers underline the frequency of the pragmatic functions of *comme* in the FM Corpus data. The upcoming analysis aims to give a detailed overview about the different pragmatic functions of the marker *comme* in Manitoban French. These functions will be compared to English *like* and differences and similarities will be emphasized.

4.1.3.1 Hedging functions of *comme* and *like*

The present understanding, definition and classification of hedges follows Prince et al. (1982) and has already been described in detail in chapter 1.

As already mentioned, *comme* in spoken European French can function as an adaptor, but not as a rounder or a shield. The functions as an adaptor (5) and a rounder (6) are very frequent in spoken English as the following examples from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (CoCA)8:

5) What were once destinations for music, poetry and lively debate are often now more *like* college computer labs. (110130)

6) So now we’re outside; there was *like* 80 or 90 of friends, neighbors and us. (20020704)

The first example shows that *like* can serve to attenuate the following lexical unit. This function can be described as lexical approximation and is very frequent for adaptors. Lexical approximation affects the semantics of a lexical unit, while numerical approximation approaches quantities and other concepts on a scale (see Mihatsch 2010: 262). In contrast, pragmatic attenuation may

---


function through attenuation of the epistemic force (ibd.). As shown in example (5) in its adaptor function, *like* mostly modifies a following NP. In contrast to this, *like* does not serve pragmatic attenuation in the second example. Here, it takes the function of a rounder and reflects a degree of incertitude of the speaker concerning the truth-value of the following expression. In this example, the incertitude about the exactness of the named numerical value is underlined by a disjunction and a second modifying numerical expression.

The use of *comme* fulfilling hedging functions has been outlined for different varieties of Canadian French. As shown in Figure 18, Chevalier (2001) distinguishes five different kinds of approximation, which are found in the *Chiac* variety of Canadian French. In her study, she differentiates between approximation qualitative (adaptors), approximation quantitative (rounder), assertion (shields and utterance-final use), discours rapporté direct (quotative use) and autocitation (quotative use) (Chevalier 2001: 20f.). To distinguish between the latter two cases, Chevalier states examples for the discours rapporté direct (7), in which a direct speech of a person is introduced, and the autocitation, in which an own thought or own speech is introduced:

7) so ma soeur vient icitte pis c’est COMME : «T’as pas un poste français sur ton chose?» – Non, j’ai dit, je les ai éliminés. (P091F30)

8) pis j’ai COMME : «Well Hello j’aime un petit peu plus des gars que – especially S.16— que yelle [elle] (rires) comme whatever. (A161F14) (Chevalier 2001: 21)

Only the three initially named kinds of approximation accord to the present understanding of approximation functions and are hence treated in this section. For Québéc French, Beaulieu-Masson et al. state the use of *comme* as a hedge (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 30ff.). In their understanding, the process of *atténuation* (hedging) can be defined as follows:

L’atténuation, elle, consiste plutôt à diminuer l’impact de nos paroles au moyen de ce *comme* exprimant une relation de ressemblance/divergence entre deux éléments. (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 31)

In a further explanation, they relate the approximator use of *comme* to an alienation of the speaker to a certain term or expression (ibd.).

This definition is not exhaustive in that hedging functions can be by far more complex. Still, it is important to analyze if *comme* shows related functions and patterns in the Franco-Manitoban variety of Canadian French. The use of *comme* as an adaptor appears to be well established in the Franco-Manitoban variety of French and can be illustrated on the basis of examples taken from the FM corpus:

9) ZA: oh non c’est *comme* des presales • peut-être ou quelque chose de même.

10) CAR: on fait ( ( )) *comme* un petit skit • • au début.
In both examples, *comme* triggers loose reading of the following NP in that there is a discrepancy between the intended and the uttered expression. This is underlined by the fact that in both examples the noun that follows *comme*, is expressed in English, i.e. a language that does not occur in the sentence beforehand. On the basis of the data of the FM corpus, it can be stated that the adaptor function of *comme* often goes along with one-word switches. But the adaptor use of *comme* also appears in monolingual sentences:

11) WIL: ça sera *comme* une compilation de reprises des classiques franco-manitobaines là • •

12) DM: • • •puis ya, nous autres c’est tellement cher parce que faut qu’on achète tous nos •/ *comme* un ordinateur de trois mille pièces

13) PJ: if you want you *comme* hésite pas d’appeller puis’

14) SA: mais eh ya so j’ai tout lâché and then j’ai (kinda) *comme* hangé out comme j’ai enseigné beaucoup de musique

In the first two examples, *comme* shows the adaptor function as explained above, that is it triggers the loose reading of a following lexical item. In the third and forth example, it affects the propositional content of a following verb or VP. In example (14) this use can partly be explained by the knowledge of the speaker about the incorrectness of the form *hangé out* and hence his effort to attenuate the truth-condition of this expression. It is still striking that in the examples (13) and (14) *comme* shows a syntactic flexibility and a varying scope that is not attested for the adaptor *comme* in European French (see Mihatsch 2010).

The adaptor function of *comme* cannot be regarded as having been influenced by the English functional similar expression *like* in its emergence since it can also be found in European French. In fact, the adaptor use of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban (and in other varieties of Canadian French) can be regarded as a possible point of origin in the extension of new functions. One of these new functions is the use of *comme* as a shield in Canadian French, present in the following examples:

15) DM: (…) in the meantime euhm je travaillais juste à *comme* • produire le document lui-même.

16) DM: ils/ il était juste en avant de chez moi • puis je les ai invité de • *comme* camper en arrière chez nous.

These examples show clearly that shields do not affect the propositional level of an utterance but modify the illocutionary force. In that, pragmatic markers in shield functions fulfill communicative strategies and do not act on the semantic level. In both above-named examples, *comme* functions to introduce a lexical item that might not be the best lexical choice. Furthermore, in both examples the pragmatic marker takes a broader scope and consequently obtains more syn-
tactic flexibility. These factors allowed the marker *comme* to move to more peripherical positions in the sentence, as for example the utterance-initial position:

17) WIL: *comme* ok on pense que ça va marcher but • • (jusqu’on aurait) une réponse on peut pas vraiment te donner le go ahead.

18) WIL: *comme* c’est ça mon argument là ce que elle elle a dit à Ronny Vallée

This syntactic position seems to be very typical for the shield function and also appears for *like* in English utterance of the FM Corpus:

19) DM: *like* what if • all the services and everything was already done • in French you know

This example underlines that *like* is a highly flexible item that can appear in different positions of an utterance. This increase of syntactic flexibility can also be found in Franco-Manitoban *like* (21) and *comme* (21):

20) ZA: • I wanna do a *like* solo album pendant l’hiver

21) DAN: notre biographie nous • • nous *comme* présente *comme* • • des êtres • • supérieurs.

22) SA: c’est la langue *comme* la plus parlée • au monde

Example (21) gives an impression of the syntactic flexibility of *like* that can even occur inside a NP. Examples (21) and (2) indicate that, although not as flexible as *like*, *comme* has achieved a higher syntactic flexibility as it is commonly stated for European French. In example (21) *comme* takes the position between a personal pronoun and the corresponding verb, in ( *comme* occurs in a NP.

Another semantic effect associated with hedging that is not attested in European French is the function as a rounder. A rounder states imprecise numerical values and therefore affects the truth-value of the speaker’s assertion. This function is well established for the lexical unit *like* (see D’Arcy 2005: 33 ff.) and can also be found frequently in the FM corpus:

23) GR: well he’s got • his eeh wine cellar in the basement he’s got *about like* forty bottles.

24) DM: that’s about • ok at that time it was probably *like* four thousand Canadian so.

In these examples, *like* is combined with the hedges *about* and *probably*, which that add to the insecurity of the speaker about the truth-value of the precise value mentioned. The rounder function also appears to be frequent in Franco-Manitoban:
In example (25) the speaker uses the marker comme, as in the examples shown above, to express his insecurity about a precise value by attenuating the following numerical expression. Example (26) presents a different type of rounder function because here comme operates on a numerical value that quantifies an immeasurable entity. In this example, comme does not represent an approximation to a precise number on a scale but affects an unreal and randomly chosen value.

To conclude, these examples have shown that comme in Franco-Manitoban can take hedging functions that cannot be observed in European French, more precisely shield and rounder functions. The adaptor function is established in European French but seems to be more frequent in Canadian varieties of French. As shown in the beginning of this chapter, comme only infrequently takes pragmatic functions in European French, whereas they are highly frequent in Manitoban French. The question which grammaticalization paths are taken in detail to accomplish an emergence of these new functions will be analyzed in section 4.1.5.2 of this paper.

4.1.3.2 Quotative functions of comme and like

The quotative function of the lexical unit like has been the topic of many scientific analyses in the last decades (e.g. Schourup 1983; Blythe et al. 1990; Ferrara & Bell 1995; Fleischman 1998; Jucker et al. 1998; Tagliamonte & Hudson 2000; Siegel 2002; Buchstaller 2002; D’Arcy 2005; Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009). This function has been of particular interest because it is one of the newest pragmatic functions of like that emerged in the last century and spread very quickly. From a diachronic view, it seems most plausible that the quotative function of like emerged from the use of like as a hedge (for further diachronic evidence see 4.1.5). Buchstaller explains this expansion as follows:

> When quoting, speakers report the utterance, but its form and content can only be rendered approximately because of the idiosyncrasy of expression in terms of suprasegmentals such as accent, style, prosody of the original speaker. (Buchstaller 2002: 4)

Since the quotative like generally does not occur in isolation, the focus in this section will lie on the frequent combinations be like and go like and their possible Franco-Manitoban counterparts (see Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009).

The first linguistic analysis of the quotative be like can be found in Butters (1982: 149), but the rise of this pragmatic function appears to be even older. The origin of this quotative is traced
back to the 1960s by Vandelanotte and Davidse (2009: 795) and can be geographically narrowed to the United States. According to Vandelanotte and Davidse, the emergence can even be determined more clearly and goes back to the so-called ‘Valley Girls’, “young, white, female speakers in the U.S., especially California” (Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009: 779). From there on, be like experienced a very fast propagation in different Anglophone countries and is now attested among others for Canada, Singapore, India, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, the U.K. (see Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009: 292).

In early research on be like, this quotative was mainly identified with the factors age and gender and it was stated that its pragmatic use was restricted to the utterances of female teenagers (see Dailey & O’Cain 2000). This constraint had to be abandoned since be like got more and more frequent throughout different age groups, social classes and gender (see Tagliamonte, D’Arcy 2004). However, Tagliamonte and D’Arcy highlight two constraints that are still involved in the use of be like. First, they state that be like occurs mainly in the first person and, second, they point out that be like introduces frequently “non-lexical sounds” and “internal thought” (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy 2004: 495). While it is questionable if these constraints can be generalized in the use of be like in different geographic and sociolinguistic situations, the impact of this quotative in Anglophone communication cannot be doubted anymore.

In research on pragmatic markers in Canadian French, the appearance of the quotative comme has been mentioned as well (Beaulieu-Masson et al. 2007: 37; Chevalier 2001: 21). As mentioned above, Chevalier distinguishes between ‘discours rapporté direct’ and ‘autocitation’ and underlines the approximative character of the quotative comme. In the research on the quotative comme in Canadian French, this marker has mostly been regarded as an isolated item and not in combination with verbs such as être and aller.

In the following, the quotative function of be like will be compared to the quotative être comme in Franco-Manitobain. Referring to Fleischman and Yaguello, the quotative use can be subdivided into quoted thought, quoted speech and quoted attitude (see Fleischman & Yaguello 2004).

In the FM Corpus, like can fulfill different quotative functions that are commonly attested in different varieties of English, e.g. introducing a quoted speech (27) a quoted thought (28) and a quoted attitude (29):

27) DM: I called his eh constituency office the other day and I said I wanted to meet with them • • I was like “I wanna meet you” eh • they/ they phoned back and they said that it was all booked up for September I’m like “that’s fine because I’m on a trip.”

28) ZA: alors c’est eux qui s’occupent de la distribution c’est/ they do all the work for me and submit it to festivals so I’m like “oh good I don’t have to worry about this.”
29) WIL: and then • all of a sudden • she’s like “what a great Francophone scene we have there is in Winnipeg.”

In these examples, _be + like_ functions as an introductory item for quotation. In example (27) the speaker reports the course of an actual conversation that happened in the past. By using the quotative _be_ like, the speaker attenuates the truth-value of the following quotations and expresses thereby a possible discrepancy between the utterance of the actual conversation and the quoted speech. In contrast to this, _like_ in example (28) and (29) introduces a mindset that has not been verbalized before. In example (28), the speaker utters an own thought that he did not pronounce in front of the persons he talks about. The quotation of the thought can thereby only be an approximation to the train of thought that the speaker conducted in the reported situation. In example (29), the speaker tries to verbalize the attitude a person has shown in a certain situation. The utterance introduced by _be like_ is an attempt to express the attitude a certain person has shown towards the speaker. Since this attitude has not been verbalized by this person, a description of its characteristics can only be approximative and thereby introduced by the quotative _be like_. In this context, the quotative form _go like_ has to be mentioned. This quotative is not as frequent as _be like_ but it still occurs commonly in English spoken language, as an example from the CoCa Corpus can show:

30) When they _go like_ “You know, it’s really bad. „ And, „ I heard this. „ And da, da, da, da. You know. (CoCa, Fall2005, Vol. 35 Issue 4, p695-731, 37p)

As pointed out by Vandelanotte and Davidse, the quotative _go_ is much older than the form _be like_ and is found in texts since the 18th century (Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009: 798). Still it can be stated that the quotative _go_ only experienced an expansion to _go like_ in the last decades. Vandelanotte and Davidse explain this process:

Following the rise of _be like_ and the attendant initial decline in the use of _go_, _go_ has picked up again but has also undergone the influence of _be like_ to produce _go like_, a process which was facilitated by the existence of the copulative uses of _go_, allowing _go_ to be grouped with copulative _be_ and get combining with _like_. (Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009: 799f.)

In this citation, Vandelanotte and Davidse explain the recent rise of the expression _go like_ with the fast spread and thereby the high influence of the quotative _be like_. Furthermore they state that the quotative _be like_ supports the productivity of _verb + like_ combinations to introduce quotations. To conclude, the emergence of _be like_ had a strong impact on the whole English quotative system and still continues to influence it. In the following, the Franco-Manitoban counterpart _être comme_ will be regarded in more detail.

With regard to the FM Corpus, one can observe a striking use of _être comme_ as a quotative. As in different varieties of English, _être comme_ can fulfill the functions of introducing quoted speech (31), quoted thought (32) and quoted attitude (33):
31) GER: so Joey était comme • • “how about premier novembre?” ils sont comme “ok” • • he (did) a writing • he est comme “perfect”

32) WIL: • • ça c’est la rumeur qui/ qui passe maintenant puis j’suis comme «I don’t care I’m getting her out.»

33) GR: là tout le monde est comme «oh my god».

These examples demonstrate clearly that Franco-Manitoban être comme can fulfill the same functions as shown for be like in the examples (27)–(29). Furthermore, the examples illustrate a strong flexibility in grammatical gender and tenses. In example (31), être comme functions in past and present tenses and varies in grammatical number. These findings suggest an important expansion of flexibility and productivity in the use of être comme. This hypothesis can be underlined by the fact that quotative être comme appears frequently in the impersonal form c’est comme (34) and, particularly noticeable, in isolation without a preceding verb form, as in (35) and (36):

34) DM: they phoned” puis j’ai rappellé • puis c’est comme • • “we’re wondering if you’re still interested” puis j’étais comme “fuck…”

35) AN: tu sais que le CU a une résidence • propre à ces rassemblements là • • comme • ce genre d’auberge de jeunesse propre au CU là comme «oui on a une maison ou • une Katimahouse.»

36) NI: puis tout/ sont toutes (eu) du talent • comme t/ tu les regardes p/ puis comme • • « geez» like • • ils ont toutes une chanson à chanter (…)

In example (34), c’est comme introduces a quoted speech, but in the FM Corpus this form is also commonly used to introduce quoted thought and quoted attitude. In example (35) comme introduces an utterance that has not been verbalized in the past but that could be uttered under certain circumstances in the future. The speaker in (35) tries to argue that a guesthouse would be favorable for the CU and therefore uses the utterance, introduced by comme, in her line of argumentation. In this case, the speaker is aware of the hypothetical nature of the utterance and comme highlights this aspect of the quotation.

In example (36), comme functions without a preceding verb form to introduce a quoted thought. In this case, the speaker aims to highlight the generality of the utterance with the lack of a personal pronoun + verb form preceding comme. Earlier in the sentence, the speaker uses the impersonal pronoun tu that already introduces the general aspect of the utterance.

Another striking finding can underline the fact that comme in Franco-Manitoban shows important similarities to like in its evolution paths. In the preceding, the new quotative go like was introduced that appears to be a newly introduced expression that arose from the combination of the older quotativ go and the new appearance of like in quotative forms. As shown in (37) and (38), a parallel evolution can be stated in Franco-Manitoban:
In example (37), *va comme* introduces what Tagliamonte and D’Arcy call “non-lexical sounds” (Tagliamonte, D’Arcy 2004: 495). In these cases, the approximative character of the quotative *comme* becomes specifically clear because the imitation of the sound the speaker utters only can be an approximation to the real sound. In example (38), the speaker shows dance moves while singing a song. In this case *va comme* does not primarily refer to the utterance but rather to the gestures. Nonetheless, *comme* keeps its approximative character in this example and introduces a discrepancy between the actual dance performance with several participants and the unprofessional imitation of the speaker. Later on in the same example, the speaker uses the quotative form *on va* in its original form. Regarding the occurrences of the expression *aller + comme* in Franco-Manitoban, it is striking that it never occurs with typical quoted speech, thought or attitude but only with “non lexical sounds” or gestures. This leads to the hypothesis that the combination *aller + comme* has not yet evolved as far as *go + like* in English, in that it can only stand with sounds, gestures and vocals. Still, the lack of diachronic data and large-scale corpora does not allow one to make unequivocal statements about the status of *aller + comme* in Manitoban French.

To conclude, it can be stated that quotative *comme* in Franco-Manitobain fulfills functions that are commonly well known for quotative *like* in English.

Regarding the expressions *être/aller + comme* it can be suggested that the quotative *comme* shows a similar productivity and flexibility as *like*.

*4.1.3.3 Comme and like as focus marker*

The focus function of *like* has been discussed in many scientific settings in the past. According to Meehan (1991), the focus use of *like* is one of the most current functions and only emerged in the second half of the last century (Meehan 1991: 49). One of the first and most influential papers on this topic is the essay ‘*like is, like, focus*’ by Underhill (1988). In this article, Underhill defines the focus use of *like* as “entirely ungrammatical and makes sentences seem disjointed to many listeners” (Underhill 1988: 234). Furthermore, he restricts the focuser *like* to “functions with great reliability as a marker of new information and focus” (ibd.). Furthermore, Underhill attributes a large scope to the focuser *like*, that “marks as focal information whatever occurs to
the right of it (…)” (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 131). This means that like as a focuser can have a scope that varies from an isolated lexical expression up to a whole utterance.

Miller and Weinert state that “like is a non-introducing, non-contrastive focuser that can focus on new or given information or entities” (Miller, Weinert 1998: 319). Due to these characteristics, like differs from other focus markers such as wh- and it-clefts (Miller & Weinert 1998: 318).

Even if it is without controversy that like in English can fulfill focus functions in utterances, there is no common agreement on the definition and classification of the focuser like. The following example from Underhill (1988) can demonstrate these problems:

39) But then the first day of our skiing, you know we’re getting all excited to go skiing the first day it’s like snowing…blizzard snowing. (Underhill 1988: 243-244)

In this example, Underhill defines like as a focus marker. According to him, the entity snowing…blizzard snowing is new information that is essential for upcoming events (Underhill 1988: 235). But there are indeed some problems with his analysis. In this example, like obviously does not mark focus but furthermore indicates loose reading of the following lexical expression. The example shows the adaptor use of like in that it demonstrates a discrepancy of what is said and what the speaker aims to say. In this case, the correction blizzard snowing indicates that the lexical item modified by like does not express the exact thought of the speaker. Therefore the speaker first uses the expression snowing before he utters the more specialized expression blizzard snowing.

Another general problem in defining the focus function of like is the dissociation from other pragmatic functions. For example, the focuser like has been often confused and mixed with the quotative use of like, as in the following citation:

Reported speech usually is the most focused part of the narrative. Thus, if like co-occurs with quoted material, it focuses on the most significant information in a sentence. The quotation can then be interpreted as a variant of that focus. (Buchstaller 2001: 3)

This point of view will be completely rejected in this work and the focus use of like will be considered separately from its quotative use. This is because the focus use of like is not considered to express mainly approximation, whereas the main discourse functions of quotative like can be linked to approximation. In addition, the rounder function of like has often been associated with the focus function. Schourup (1985) already notes that the focuser like appears in particular before numerical expressions (Schourup 1985: 38-39). Also Fleischman and Yaguello mention the focal character of like in modifying numerical values, as in the following example:

40) She’s been here for like three weeks. (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004:133)
According to the authors, in this example “the focal information is an expression of quantity” (ibd.). However, they state that the focus use of like can be seen as an “extension of the lexical meaning ‘approximately’” (ibd.). In the present work, the rounder use and the focus use will be treated as two distinct pragmatic functions that fulfill different tasks in an utterance.

The difficulty to establish a clear definition of like as a focuser can be partly explained by its large scope and thereby its syntactic flexibility. According to Underhill, focuser like can take six different syntactic positions, these are 1) before a noun phrase, 2) before a predicate adjective or adjective phrase, 3) before an adverb or adverb phrase or a prepositional phrase functioning adverbially, 4) before a verb phrase, 5) before a subordinate clause and 6) before the entire sentence (see Underhill 1988: 243-244). While it is questionable if all these syntactic positions refer only to the focus function of like, it is indisputable that like shows a highly varying scope and flexibility in the syntactic positioning. Especially the emergence of sentence-initial and sentence-final positions of like has been subject of scientific research and will be treated in detail in the upcoming subchapters of this work. In the FM Corpus, like frequently appears as a focus marker, as in:

41) ZA: ben c’est un film d’une heure et demi hein? • comme it’s a feature length • • • deal • it’s like huge • •  
42) ZA: we got a B • and • • in the individual album • • revue site • ça dit four stars • so it’s like sweet •

In both examples, like has a very narrow scope, the focal information it marks consists only of one lexical item. Furthermore, in both examples like is not used as in approximation marker. In the first example, the speaker emphasizes the importance of its feature length film, which is introduced by like. In the second example, the speaker aims to highlight the very positive evaluation of his album. In other examples, the scope broadens to nominal phrases:

43) SA: they gonna get married apparently and like and this was like the hottest chick ((laughs))  
44) SA: (c’était) comme à Vancouver ((…)) it’s like a lots of driving.

In these examples, like marks the focal information of a subsequent lexical item or phrase. In these examples, like is non-introducing and non-contrastive and thus functions differently as other focus items (see Miller & Weinert 1998: 317).

In Franco-Manitoban, comme fulfills focus functions that seem very similar to the functions found in English utterances:

45) CAR: (…) Homer is trying to gain weight • il achète ces affaires là ((laughs)) puis il est comme tout gros • puis le gars est comme • • • “thank god for you that doesn’t work”  
46) CAR: elle est vraiment comme la meilleure artiste de nos jours • •
In (46) the focus marker *comme* modifies a complex NP and therefore has a quite large scope. In (45), *comme* has a narrow scope that affects the focal information of the two subsequent items. Hence, this utterance already shows that *comme*, as *like* in English, cannot encode emphasis (see Miller & Weinert 1998). According to Fleischman and Yaguello (2004), focus frequently contains emphasis but in the case of *like* the emphasis is mostly expressed by an intensifying adverb (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 132). According to Quirk et al. (1985) it is possible to distinguish between intensifiers, which increase the intensity with which a following item is expressed, and emphasis, which reinforce the truth-value of an utterance. This distinction becomes clear in (45) where the adverb *tout* follows the marker *comme* to put more emphasis on the item *gros*. This phenomenon appears frequently in the FM Corpus:

47) ZA: (…) I can move on. • je suis *comme* tellement tanné de ce projet là c’est comme «whatever I don’t even care».

48) DM: j’ai eu un entrevue qui était *comme* super awesome • • eh vraiment confortable • really • • really good

Both examples show clearly the focus/emphasis-distinction mentioned above. The adverbs *telle-ment* and *super* intensify the subsequent adjective while the marker *comme* puts more focus on the upcoming sequence.

As mentioned above, the focuser *like* and *comme* can vary in scope and generally modifies every item that appears on the right of it. In some cases, the scope of the focuser is ambiguous because it has no right boundary. ‘Bracketing’ can solve this problem of scope ambiguity; the speaker inserts the focuser before each segment (see Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 132):

49) SA: so they didn’t look like/ like magazine cutouts or anything so *comme* on pensait *like* it’s *like* for real • *like* he just *like* went out there *like* • and picked up *like* this • hot young Eastern European (…)

50) SA: ya • ah Québec c’est *like* (( )) there’s so much stuff (( )) especially *like* • • *like* natural stuff *like* there are *like* the hikes and *like* the (lakes) and stuff

These examples show high frequencies of the marker *like* and not in all cases it appears at a focus marker. Still it becomes very clear that *like* has discourse structuring functions, especially in the second part of the examples. This ‘bracketing’ function also appears in French utterances of the FM Corpus:

51) ZA: this is retarded! • *comme* sérieusement (là) *comme*’

52) NI: ils ont toutes une chanson à chanter puis là *comme* tu voyais *comme* Alexander en arrière qui est *comme* t’sais pas mal modeste là

53) WIL: so eh est-ce que vous avez *comme* vraiment *comme* renvoyé les vingt mille pièces *comme* • (take it back)
In (51), the focal character of the ‘bracketing’ function becomes very clear because the second *comme* stands utterance-final and does not modifies a new upcoming item. As in the above-named English examples, *comme* in ‘bracketing’ serves basically discourse-structuring functions and does not necessarily always encode focus. In (52) the third occurrence of *comme* could also be explained by its use as a shield. In (53), the second occurrence of *comme* has a certain approximative character and could be explained by its adaptor function.

In summary, the focus use of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban shows a striking functional similarity to the focus use of *like* in English discourse. *Comme* is syntactically very flexible, varies strongly in its scope and can focus on lexical items in the same way as *like* in English.

### 4.1.3.4 *Comme* and *like* as hesitation and self repair marker

The use of *like* as a hesitation marker or filler has been mentioned in nearly every paper on this pragmatic marker. However, researchers mostly mention this use to demonstrate that *like* is not only a filler or hesitation marker but encodes several other pragmatic functions (see Schourup 1985; Miller & Weinert 1998; Andersen 2000). In his classification of uses of *like*, Schourup points out that *like* can be inserted in discourse as an interjection while the upcoming items are not fully formulated yet (Schourup 1985: 37-63). Thereby the speaker does not need to formulate his thought overtly but still signals that the utterance is not finished and that he is engaged in thinking. Andersen (2000) negates the question that *like* is only a filler, but he accepts the fact that *like* can indeed “collocate with planning difficulties and self repair” (Andersen 2000: 19). According to Miller and Weinert, *like* does rarely function as a hesitation marker and therefore this use is “untypical” (Miller & Weinert 1998: 314). In the following, they “discard the hypothesis that *like* is a filler in favor of the hypothesis that it is a discourse organizer” (Miller & Weinert 1998: 315). While it is indisputable that *like* encodes indeed more pragmatic functions than merely functioning as a filler and hesitation device, this use will not be neglected in the present study.

In past research on the emergence of new discourse functions of *comme* in Canadian French, the use as a hesitation marker or filler is not mentioned explicitly. This is why it seems particularly interesting to compare the hesitation and filler functions of *comme* to the better-known functions of English *like*.

In psycholinguistics, hesitations in speech and self-repair mechanisms play an important role to gain insights into the possible processing of lexical items and the modeling of the mental lexicon. As pointed out in earlier works, pragmatic markers such as *like* can appear in hesitation situations to gain more time to formulate the upcoming lexical items (Schourup 1985).

This hesitation use of *like* is present in the FM Corpus as well:
54) DM: (…) •like she’s (( )) “he’s working for me, too” • •like • • that’s • •Jean and Charlotte just kinda laughed

55) SA: I was like • like • like “no way man”

In (54), like clearly functions as a reformulation device. After the quoted speech, the speaker has to plan how to continue the utterance and needs time to reformulate his thought. In ( , the speaker talks very quickly and therefore repeats the quotative marker like in order to gain some time to formulate the upcoming quoted thought.

This hesitation use is also common for comme in the FM Corpus:

56) PJ: on va pas les apporter en tournée » 'cause • • comme • en plus ils avaient pas l’air super beau.

57) WIL: tu penserais là/ à un place comme Promo Musique • • • comme • idéalement là they wanna be a world class funder.

These examples represent prototypical cases of what has been referred to as the use of comme and like as hesitation markers. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) distinguish four classes of repair mechanisms, that is self-initiated self-repairs, other-initiated self-repairs, self-initiated other-repairs and other-initiated other-repairs. For the purpose of psycholinguistic research, the self-initiated self-repairs seem to be the most important because they give information about the internal structure of repair mechanisms. Therefore, Levelt (1983) developed a more detailed classification of self-initiated self-repairs and distinguishes ‘error repairs’, ‘appropriateness repairs’, ‘different message repairs’ and ‘covert repairs’. He furthermore notes that during the process of a self-repair, so-called ‘editing terms’ can appear before the actual repair is initiated (Levelt 1983: 70ff.). These editing terms introduce the actual repair process and are hence important for the listener. By using an editing term in a repair process, the speaker can signal that he is initiating a repair and thus advises the listener of the upcoming change in discourse. Editing terms mainly are interjections such as uh, eh or ehm or pragmatic markers such as like, y’know, I mean, well etc. Therefore the question arises if English like and French comme also function as editing terms in self-repairs in the FM Corpus.

According to Levelt, an error repair involves that the speaker discovers a lexical, syntactic or phonological error in its utterance and hence replaces the error by the correct item (Levelt 1983: 53f.). In the FM Corpus, several examples indicate that like and comme can function as an introducing device for error repairs:

58) SA: ya • we like we did like …

59) ZA: (…) ya man si vous voulez ts/ • comme moi je serais super (( )) de travailler avec vous-autres là-dessus •

60) JO: alors elle a deux/ comme tout un après-midi avec les mêmes étudiants.
In (59) the speaker starts an utterance and then has to reformulate by using the editing term *like*. In (59), the speaker realizes while talking that he does not want to continue the utterance as he has planned and therefore interrupts his speech, introduces the editing term *comme* and continues the same utterance in a different manner. In (60), the speaker commits a lexical error and corrects it after introducing *comme*.

The appropriateness-repair describes the repair mechanisms where “the speaker may, while speaking, become aware that the way he expresses the intended information (...) needs qualification in view of context of expression” (Levelt 1983: 52). According to Levelt, these repairs “are potential ambiguity given the context, the use of appropriate level terminology, and coherence with previously used terms or expressions” (ibid.). Therefore the appropriateness-repair is clearly listener-orientated because it aims to reduce the ambiguity of an utterance. It can be found in the FM Corpus introduced by *like* (61) as well as by *comme* (62) and (63):

61) DM: dakota is a aboriginal • eh language, so *like* Indians • *like* the North American indians.ya • •

62) FLO: est-ce que • il ya des gros changements là *comme* • d’instrument or whatever (,,,)?

63) DM: il y a eu quelques p’rites affaires de • • eh pas correc’ là • *comme* ses informations mais • •

All these examples include one or more repairs that intend ambiguity reduction by clarifying ambiguous or not necessarily specified information. In (61), two appropriateness-repairs are necessary to define the appropriate level of terminology in a way that is unambiguous for the listener. The editing term *like* introduces both repairs, once appearing in combination with the pragmatic marker *so*. In the other two examples the appropriateness-repairs include a specification of the given information that is additional context material. In (62), the appropriateness-repair, introduced by *comme*, explains that the changes concern the music instruments. In (63), the speaker adds the information, again introduced by *comme*, that the incorrect issues were in fact incorrect information.

The different message repair is characterized by the fact that “the speaker realizes that another idea than the current one has to be expressed first and interrupts his speech to start anew” (Levelt 1983: 51). According to Levelt, this repair is necessary because of ordering problems, that is the speaker is unsure about what to say first and what to say after (ibid.). Regarding the speech data in the FM Corpus, the pragmatic marker *like* frequently introduces the different message repair:

64) DAN: j’veux pas cette! *like* c’est le sien • et il marche encore

65) WIL: puis ça c’est un autre *like* • réellement là • • • au début I was fine with that concept • •
It is striking that in both examples *like* functions as a one-word-switch. But this is surely not due to the fact that *comme* cannot fulfill the function of introducing ‘different message repairs’:

66) PJ: mais en même temps il est *comme* • • if you hang out with him you realize he’s very ((2.4s)) childish (…)

67) ANT: puis ya t’as *comme* • • nous-autres deux on est là • • CLR les autres deux • puis…

These examples show that *comme* fulfills similar functions as *like* in different message repair mechanisms. That is to say, *like* and *comme* can stand with pauses and other hesitation signals, as in:

68) DM: c’est ça ben je pense qu’on se compare toujours *t’sais comme* • • ben • •
*t’sais si* on fait beaucoup de travail avec le Québéc là (…)

In this example, the different message repair is combined with several hesitation signals and pauses. An explanation for this combination is certainly the fact that the speaker needed more time to formulate the new thought.

The last type of repair mechanisms mentioned by Levelt (1983) is the ‘covert repair’. According to Levelt, “they are characterized by either just an interruption plus editing term (…), or the repeat of one or more lexical items” (Levelt 1983: 55). In these cases, markers such as *like* and *comme* can function as “editing terms”, that is items introducing the repair, as shown in:

69) SA: for some reason eh *like* I (en dedans) une semaine on a watché • deux Holocaust movies

70) FLO: ya il ya avoir du • temps pendant le show après le show *comme* ben/ après votre set • •

Schade, Berg and Laubenstein (2003: 334) mention that the covert repair often entails the combination of different hesitation signals and markers, as seen in the examples mentioned above. In summary, it can be stated that *comme* as well as *like* functions as editing terms in different self-repair strategies.

It is striking that in the FM Corpus the hesitation and repair marker *comme* appears frequently in the combination *c’est comme*:

71) JO: alors c’est *comme* de/ de savoir d/ qu’est-ce • • qu’est-ce que c’est le tout. (…)

72) NI: “I want one” • • • *c’est comme* • •

73) PJ: ya • • c’est *comme* • • busy • busy vacation • • avec du travail • • on dormait pas beaucoup though.
These examples point out that the combination *c’est comme* fulfills different functions as editing term. In (71), *c’est comme* introduces a covert repair in combination with *alors*. In (72), this combination functions as a hesitation marker and in utterance-final position, whereas in (73), *c’est comme* only fulfills hesitation functions.

### 4.1.4. Comparison of *comme* and *genre*

As shown in the previous parts of this chapter, *comme* in Franco-Manitoban appears to be a highly polysemous and multifunctional item that is syntactically flexible and can vary strongly in its scope.

In previous research on the use of *comme*, different authors pointed out that *comme* in Canadian French can take functions and meaning patterns that are not attested in European French (Chevalier 2001; Beaulieu et al. 2007; Mihatsch 2009). In a detailed analysis of comparative data from French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish by means of the C-Oral ROM Corpus, Mihatsch (2012) shows that European French *comme* can only take restricted pragmatic functions. In the whole data, she detects 17 occurrences of *comme* taking discourse functions, among them 13 semantic approximations, one pragmatic attenuation, one hesitation marker, one metadiscursive marker and one unclear occurrence (Mihatsch 2012: 251). In an own analysis of the occurrences of *comme* in the C-Oral ROM Corpus *comme* can indeed be found taking adaptor functions:

74) PIE: (...) ça fait *comme* des barres comme ça (...)

75) PIE: (...) d’un côté à l’autre de l’épave qui fait *comme* un ballet devant (…)

(C-ORAL ROM, ffamcv01)

These examples show the adaptor use of *comme* with a restricted scope. All the adaptor uses of *comme* in the C-ORAL ROM corpus are characterized by a restricted scope that is limited to nouns and NP’s that consist of a noun and its determiner. Another discourse structuring use of *comme* in European French is the use as a repair marker:

76) DEL: que je suis tombée en panne de [/] *comme* la batterie a lâché à Carrefour là //#$ (C-ORAL ROM, ffamcv11)

In this example, it is not clear if *comme* only functions as a repair marker or also takes adaptor functions with a scope over the NP *la batterie*. It is even possible to interpret *comme* in this example as a causal marker.

Nevertheless, the evolution of pragmatic functions of *comme* in European French seems to be restricted to the cases shown in (74) and (75).
Fleischman and Yaguello (2004) argue that the pragmatic functions of *comme* shown in the previous subchapters are expressed by the marker *genre* in spoken and informal European French. They state that *genre* shows a functional similarity to the pragmatic marker *like* in English, in that it can function as a focus marker, approximator and as a quotative marker (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 131ff.). Mihatsch (2012) differentiates between two adaptors on the basis of genre, which are *genre* and *genre de*. According to Mihatsch (2012), *genre de* is documented as an approximation marker since the 15th century (Mihatsch 2012: 161), while *genre* only emerged as an adaptor function in the 20th century. In her comparative analysis of the emergence of approximation out of taxonomic classification in Romance languages, Mihatsch (2012) detects *genre* as an adaptor, a quotative and a rounder in spoken European French (Mihatsch 2012: 204). Still, *genre* occurs unfrequently in these functions, Mihatsch counts one occurrence of *genre* in a rounder function, three quotative functions and three adaptor functions (ibd.).

In an own analysis of the occurrences of *genre* in the C-ORAL ROM corpus, the ELICOP corpus\(^9\), the Corpus de la Parole\(^10\) and the CLAPI corpus\(^11\), very few occurrences of different pragmatic functions of *genre* were stated. Still, other studies confirm that *genre* is indeed a newly emerged and very frequent pragmatic marker (see Secova 2011: 81 ff. as well as Mihatsch 2012 for a detailed analysis). The difference may be due to the moment of data collection and the underlying group of speakers, respectively their age, gender, sociolinguistic environment, etc.

The own analysis underlines that *genre* in European French can take adaptor functions (77) but also expanded to take shield functions (78):

77) SOP: ou alors d’une nouvelle forme de consommation *genre* euh biscuits.
   (Corpus de la Parole : Conversations Lyon Saxe LSG35 )

78) spk2: *genre* euh je sais pas euh difficultés du français ou l’art d’écrire ou ?
   (Corpus de la Parole: ESLO - bande 109)

In (77), *genre* modifies an upcoming noun in its truth-conditional value. In (78), *genre* takes a far broader scope and attenuates the illocutionary force of the upcoming utterance. Furthermore, this example can indicate an amplified syntactic flexibility of the marker *genre*. This flexibility is possibly evoked by the expansion of *genre* taking shield functions that are highly syntactically flexible and can also appear in positions that are peripheral to the utterance.

Furthermore, the pragmatic marker *genre* seems indeed to be able to take rounder functions in spoken European French:

79) ML: Non, c’était pas sur le campus en fait. Ouais, c’était pas loin, mais euh, c’était à *genre* à un quart d’heure de la fac. (Corpus de la Parole: PFC : Enquête Dijon)

---

\(^9\) http://bach.arts.kuleuven.be/elicop/
\(^10\) http://corpusdelaparole.in2p3.fr/
\(^11\) http://clapi.univ-lyon2.fr/
80) JEB (…) non non non une euh (0.7) ’fin une toute petite euh une petite euh genre dix quinze personnes qu’ est [récente] (…) (CLAPI: Code : m5/h5a)

These examples show a striking functional similarity to the rounder functions of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban and to *like* in American English. In their work, Fleischman and Yaguello confounded the rounder function of *genre* with its focus function. They state that “in the majority of our examples, *genre* functions as a focus marker” (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 131). After this citation, they cite three examples, whereat two of these examples cited below, are clear uses of *genre* as a rounder:

81) Elle téléphone *genre* dix fois par jour.

82) Ils ont mis *genre* deux espaces fumeurs par étage. (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 131)

In the present analysis of different corpora of spoken European French, *genre* did not once occur as a focus marker and therefore the frequency of this use is questionable. Another pragmatic functions of *genre* in European French that is fulfilled by *comme* in Franco-Manitoban, is its use as a quotative marker. As its Franco-Manitoban counterpart, *genre* can express quoted speech (83) as well as quoted attitude (84):

83) M (…)Et puis il me faisait le chantage *genre* «et si je sais pas si c’est une fille ou un garçon je vais pas réussir à trouver un prénom». (CLAPI: code : 1f/2i4)

84) JOSj’ crois qu’ j’ai des vieux joueurs/ (4.6) JUL fais pas *genre* tu connais les joueurs/ (…) JOS mais ferme ta gueule/ (CLAPI: code : n6/9c)

In (83), the utterance of another speaker is rendered approximately whereas in (84) the speaker JUL expresses the attitude of the speaker JOS in an approximate way. In the present analysis, no occurrences of *genre* expressing quoted thought could be found. Fleischman and Yaguello state two examples of quoted thought in their work:

85) Elle me demande tout le temps de l’aider, *genre* elle a rien compris au cours. (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 136)

86) Elle a fait une tête, *genre* tout le monde devrait être à ses pieds (Fleischman & Yaguello 2004: 136)

These examples show indeed the expression of the quotative use of *genre* but it is questionable if these examples render quoted thought. It seems more plausible that these examples express the same kind of quoted attitude as in (84). Therefore, the use of *genre* expressing quoted thought cannot be confirmed definitely by means of the present corpus data.
In Franco-Manitoban, where the pragmatic functions demonstrated above are taken by *comme*, the lexical unit *genre* occurs rarely, even in its use as a noun. In the FM corpus, eight occurrences of *genre* can be counted whereas only two seem to take somehow pragmatic functions:

87) JO: ça c’est ouais *genre* de comme « oh wow ça c’est • • majestueux» • des majestueuses orgues • • c’est • • ouais’

88) SA: oh ben comme tous les instruments. comme c’est comme pour des high-school bands *genre* d’affaire.

Example (87) shows a very unusual combination of the markers *genre* and *comme*. In this utterance, *comme* introduces the quoted speech as a quotative marker and the preceding marker *genre* serves to attenuate the upcoming utterance even more. But this combination of the two markers is an isolated case in the FM corpus and cannot be regarded as grammaticalized in Franco-Manitoban. Example (88) shows the combination *genre d’affaire* that seems to take the function of a general extender. In this specific example, it even seems plausible to explain this unusual construction with the language contact situation. The expression *genre d’affaire* appears at first sight like a calque from English *kind of* or *type of thing*. In the FM Corpus data, this calque is an innovation that only occurs once. Hence, it is not possible to make any further statement on this construction. In summary, it becomes evident that *genre* does not function as an isolated pragmatic marker in Franco-Manitoban but only occurs infrequently and in combination with other hedging devices.

To conclude, it can be stated that *genre* in European French indeed shows a certain functional similarity to the pragmatic use of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban. Nevertheless, the pragmatic uses of *genre* are by far not as frequent as the uses of its Franco-Manitoban counterpart. On the basis of a corpus analysis, it has been shown that *comme* in European French can fulfill pragmatic functions in a restricted sense, that is the adaptor function and the function as a repair and hesitation marker. However, the use of *comme* as a pragmatic marker is not very frequent in European French and therefore differs from the pragmatic marker *comme* in Franco-Manitoban. Hence, the question arises how *comme* emerged and developed as a pragmatic marker in Franco-Manitoban and which grammaticalization paths are underlying to this expansion. In the following, the aim is to retrace the evolution of the pragmatic functions and polysemous patterns of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban and to contrast it with the grammaticalization paths of its English counterpart *like*. The next part of this paper tends to answer the question if *comme* replicates polysemous patterns from *like* and if this phenomenon is truly a case of grammatical replication as defined by Heine and Kuteva (2005).
4.1.5 Grammaticalization paths of *comme* and *like*

This chapter aims to answer the question if *comme* in Franco-Manitoban follows processes of language change as described in chapter 1.2 of this work. As stated before, processes of language change can take amongst others the form of grammaticalization, pragmatization and grammatical replication. In the preceding parts of this chapter it has been shown that *comme* in Franco-Manitoban shows a striking functional similarity to the uses of the pragmatic marker *like* in English. Therefore the question arises if the expansion of pragmatic functions and polysemous patterns of *comme* underlies processes of contact-induced language change as defined by Heine and Kuteva (2005). According to them, grammatical replication describes the process of linguistic transfer of “meanings (including grammatical meaning or functions) or combinations of meanings” (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 2). Thereby it is important that not only a lexical form is borrowed but that the item in the replica language follows the same grammaticalization paths as the item in the model language (see chapter 1.2). Hence, in a first part of this subchapter, the emergence of the pragmatic functions of *like* in English will be retraced with the focus on the bridging context that are necessary to develop a new pragmatic function. In a second part, the emergence of the pragmatic functions of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban will be analyzed on the basis of synchronic data from the FM corpus. The focus will be on the evolution of the functions of *comme* that are not attested in European French to answer the role of language contact in their emergence.

4.1.5.1 The emergence of the pragmatic marker *like*

The evolution of the pragmatic functions of *like* has been an object of research and lively scientific debate in the last 30 years. Especially from the late 1980’s on, researchers tried to retrace the diachronic pathway that is underlying to the changes of *like* in the second half of the 20th century (Schourup 1985; Underhill 1988; Blyth et al. 1990; Romaine & Lange 1991; Meehan 1991; Ferrara & Bell 1995). But also in the beginning of the 21th century, researchers focused on the still unsolved and therefore controversial emergence of the pragmatic functions of *like* (Dailey & O’Cain 2000; Tagliamonte & Hudson 2000; Siegel 2002; Streek 2002; D’Arcy 2005; Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009; Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009). The main goal of the early papers on *like* was to retrace its evolution up to the emergence of its pragmatic functions. In one of the first attempts to develop a schema on the diachronic pathway of *like*, Romaine and Lange (1991) proposed a grammaticalization model based on the model of Traugott (1982):
In this figure, Romaine and Lange state that the pragmatic marker *like* developed from the conjunction *like* and that the grammaticalization follows the rule of unidirectionality. What is striking about this pathway is that the authors do not consider the quotative use as a pragmatic function but furthermore as a grammatical function that emerged from the conjunction *like*. This evolution path has to be rejected here because the quotative *like* will be considered as a function that emerged out of other pragmatic functions. D’Arcy (2005) refined the evolution of *like* as proposed by Romaine and Lange (1991):

a. preposition  
   It looks **LIKE** a snail; it just is a snail. (I/@/f/19)

b. conjunction  
   It felt **LIKE** everything had dropped away. (I/TM/m/40)

c. sentence adverb  
   We need to smarten it up a bit **LIKE**. (N/©/f/76)

d. discourse marker  
   **LIKE** the week had already gone by. (N/Q/f/72)

(D’Arcy 2005: 206)

This model employs the same pathways as Romaine and Lange (1991) and also states unidirectionality in the evolution of *like* (D’Arcy 2005: 206). The prominent difference to the preceding model consists of the use of *like* as a sentence adverb, from which the discourse marker use derived. While it is plausible that the pragmatic marker derived from the conjunction *like*, the example of the sentence adverb *like* is questionable. In example b. in the model proposed by D’Arcy (2005) the utterance is already an example for a pragmatic function of *like* and therefore cannot be seen as the underlying function in the emergence of the pragmatic functions of *like*. It is quite possible that the pragmatic functions of *like* appear to have emerged from the conjunction use of *like*. But some models of the diachronic evolution try to account for this precise path in a more detailed way.
In an early illustration on *like*, Meehan (1991) retraced the development of its new functions on the basis of data from the Old English Dictionary (OED) (Meehan 1991: 39). Apart from identifying the source expression *gelic*, she stated that the underlying meaning of *like* is the ‘similar to’ sense that “is an adverbial extension of the adjectival use which means ‘in the same manner or to the same extent as’ “ (Meehan 1991: 39). Based on this early meaning of *like* that she traces back to the beginning of the 14th century, she establishes a diachronic trajectory. This analysis is cited below in the version of a network, proposed by Vandelanotte and Davidse (2009) on the basis of the model of Meehan (1991):

![Network model of the emergence of functions of like](image)

**Examples:**

- similar to
- as if
- approximately
- for example
- focus
- quotative

...now we're like brother and sister.
Like you could afford the house I want.
I wrote it in like ten minutes.
Do you have like a mint or something?
I had to wash my hair because it was like gros.
...and he's like "Well I don't think I'll be here next year."

In this model, Vandelanotte and Davidse develop an “interrelated network of interlocking paths, rather like a diachronic version of a schematic network” (Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009: 794). But they still distinguish, like Meehan (1991), between three different evolution paths, one leading to the quotative use, one to the focus marker and one to the exemplification marker. Hereby, the terminology differs strongly from the present approach. It is visible in the model in Figure 20 and in the examples cited below that the ‘approximately’ sense of *like* refers to what is
calledrounderfunctioninthepresentaccount.Apartfromthedifferencesterminology,thepresentstudyactsona
differentstructureofthediacronicevolutionof*like*. Beforeanalyzingtheemergenceofthedifferent pragmatomicfunctions of*like* inEnglish, it is important to clarify whichpragmaticfunctionappearedfirstandwhichistheunderlyingbridgingcontextofthis
development. D’Arcy proposes that a broadening of scope of the proposition *like* is responsible
for the further evolution of *like* as a pragmatic marker. “Thus, in the initial stage, scope broadens,
allowingtheformtomovemovefromwithinthepropositiontoitsedges,ultimatelyendingupinthe
syntacticadjunctslotwhereitlinkssquencesofdiscourse” (D’Arcy 2005: 221). The increase of
scopehasbeenmentioneditobeatypicalcharacteristicoftheemergenceofitemsturninginto
pragmaticmarkers(Traugott&Dasher2002:40). Whiletheroleofbroadeningofscoperelycannot
be neglected, there has to be a step beforehand that allows the transition from *like* asacomparison
marker to *like* as an adaptor. A broadening of scope cannot be the only consequence
of this development because the adaptor function does not necessarily comprehend abroader
scope. To explain the evolution of *like* turning into an adaptor, D’Arcy uses the following example:

89) My great Conversion from prodigious Profaneseeto something LIKE a

90) I have had nothing LIKE a bad fall lately. (1791 G. Gambado Ann. Horsem
i.67)(D’Arcy 2005: 68)

D’Arcy sees in these examples from the 17th and 18th century a bridging context from com-
parison to the pragmatic uses of *like* because they imply pragmatic strengthening, in that they
include subjectivity, and a weakening of the similarity function. Referring to the example cited
in (90), she states:

(…) what constitutes a ‘bad fall’ is already subjective, since the designation of
‘bad’ can vary from person to person. This subjectivity is compounded by the
speaker professing his opinion that he has had nothing resembling what he con-
siders to be a bad fall. (D’Arcy 2005: 68)

In this citation, D’Arcy explains that the ambiguity of an utterance like (89) and (90) can be
seen as a possible bridging context from comparative functions to the pragmatic adaptor func-
tion. This pathway seems indeed to be a plausible reason for a reanalysis of *like* by the hearer as
taking more speaker-oriented functions. In this phase of linguistic change, the emergence of the
new pragmatic function does not include broadening of scope but a reanalysis of an ambiguous
utterance by the listener.

On the basis of this ambiguous bridging context, *like* possibly began not only to modify a fol-
lowing NP or PP but also to alter more complex parts of utterances and thereby developed a
broader scope. This broadening of scope from the adaptor function first initiated the emergence
of the shield function of *like* in English. But the emergence of the shield function did not only
include a broadening of scope, taking place on the syntactic level of an expression, but occurs also at the pragmatic and semantic level of the utterance. While the adaptor *like* operates on the semantic level and modifies the propositional content of an utterance, the shield *like* operates on a pragmatic level, modifies the illocutionary force of an utterance and thereby softens an assertion. While seeking for bridging contexts from the adaptor to the shield function it is therefore important to not only search for a higher syntactic flexibility but also for a change in the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of the marker *like*. Even if these changes took place in an earlier stage of the evolution of the English language, this bridging context is still visible in synchronic data, for example in the FM corpus. The following examples show the broadening of scope of the adaptor function in Manitoban English:

91) DM: so I proposed *like* an archeological dig of a site for the dakota

92) DM: there was *like* this thing with the health care system ((1.3s)) eehm • •

(...)

In these examples, *like* clearly takes an adaptor function but already takes a broader scope in that it modifies the complex NPs in both examples. Despite the broader scope, *like* operates on the semantic level and attenuates the truth-value of the upcoming lexical items.

However, other examples from the FM corpus show the evolution from the adaptor use of *like* to its shield function:

93) SA: who was *like* a rancher • *like* travelling from ranch to ranch

94) ZA: ya • they *like* shoot you if you show any dissent to (their) government but tattoos are cool ((laughs))

The second use of *like* in (93) and its use in (94) show a different case of the pragmatic functions of *like*. The marker does not operate on a semantic level anymore but rather is used for pragmatic mitigation and modifies the illocutionary force of the utterance. Therefore the examples show the evolution from an adaptor with a broad scope to the shield function. The most important change does not take place on the syntactic level but is rather shown by a shift from the marker operating on the semantic level to a marker that operates on the pragmatic level.

On a syntactic level, the emergence of the shield function of *like* allowed more syntactic flexibility in the positioning of this marker in an utterance. Hence, *like* moved also to more peripheral positions in the sentence, including the sentence-initial location that is typical for the shield function. The shield function of *like* seems to be an appropriate starting point for the emergence of new pragmatic functions of this marker. This is not only due to its syntactic characteristics but also because of its impact on the pragmatic level. Mihatsch (2010) proposes that the rounder function of diverse pragmatic markers in different languages emerged via the shield function:
She explains “that we have to assume an intermediate step of adaptor uses as shields signaling some communicative inadequacy or deviation, for instance diasystematic markedness, of an expression” (Mihatsch 2010: 113). This citation can be exemplified by means of an utterance from the FM Corpus:

WIL: (...) or whatever • and start like • you know une fois par année • on fait des envois de • • des nouveautés.

In this example, like can be interpreted either as a shield or as a rounder. After the two English pragmatic markers, there is a code-switching situation in the utterance, because the speaker possibly cannot think of an adequate expression in English. Despite this language shift, the scope of the marker like is not clear in (95). Therefore, this ambiguity demonstrates a possible bridging context from the shield function of like to its rounder function. An important reason to suppose that the rounder function emerged out of the shield function is that the rounder operates rather on a pragmatic level than on a semantic level. Siegel states that the rounder like differs in its functions from other rounders in English, such as about (2002: 50). This can be explained by the fact that about operates on a semantic level whereas like includes pragmatic mitigation and attenuation (see Mihatsch 2010: 253). If the rounder like modifies the pragmatic content of an utterance, it is plausible to suppose that the rounder like emerged out of a function that also operates on the pragmatic level that is the shield function.

According to Meehan (1991), the emergence of the rounder function that she classifies as belonging to the ‘approximately’ -sense took place before the end of the 16th century. She states that the ‘as-if’-sense, traced back to the 14th century, has a much broader scope than the ‘approximately’-sense (Meehan 1991: 40). Therefore, diachronic data can support the hypothesis of the rounder functions that emerged out of the shield function because it only appeared later in the course of the evolution of English language.

In the following, the question arises how the other pragmatic functions, the focus use and the quotative use, emerged. As stated in 3.3 of this work, the focus use is one of the most recent functions of like and only emerged in the second half of the last century. The focuser like is a syntactically flexible unit that can have a large scope over the information that occurs on the right
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of it. This fact leads to the suggestion that the focuser emerged out of the syntactically flexible shield function but this assumption needs further clarification. As shown before, also adaptors can have a broad scope and vary in their syntactic position. Therefore, the answer to the emergence of the focuser lies in the nature of the scope it takes that is if it operates on a semantic or a pragmatic level. A well-known example from the influencing article of Underhill (1988) can shed first light on this question:

96) Bookstore clerk (responding to a request for a particular book): You go like in the back room and they’re like in the left corner. (Underhill 1988: 234 in Mihatsch 2009: 85)

This example shows that the focuser like precedes upcoming new information. What is more important in this example is that the marker like seems to operate rather on a pragmatic level than on the semantic level, in that it does not affect the truth-conditional value of the modified lexical items. Therefore it seems plausible to act on the assumption that the focuser emerged via the intermediate state of a shield and not directly from the adaptor. Despite this suggestion, the bridging context developed in Mihatsch (2009) still seems to be plausible, that is the development of the focuser by the frequent use of the shield preceding rhematic information (Mihatsch 2009: 85). Further evidence for this bridging context can also be found in the FM Corpus:

97) PJ: so it’s just like totally the wrong pictures and they fucked with them.

98) WIL: t’sais c’est justel c’est tellement • • • like it’s ridiculous • • •it’s a complete mess •

In both examples, the scope of the marker like is not entirely clear. What becomes clear in these examples is that the focuser like operates indeed on the pragmatic level and modifies parts of speech whose meanings are highly subjective to the intuition and the perception of the speaker. Another striking fact can be found in these examples because like always stands with an intensifying adverb that puts further emphasis on the following utterance. This combination of like modifying rhematic information and standing with an emphatic item could had possibly an influence on the emergence of the focus function. To conclude, it can be stated that there is strong evidence that the focus marker like emerged via the shield function through the positioning of like preceding rhematic information that includes a subjective evaluation of the speaker.

As explained before, the quotative use of like only emerged in the last 50 years and has been object of different research. In the research on be like it has either been associated with the approximative use of like or with its focus function. While Buchstaller (2001) estimates that quotative like is a variant of focus, because it focuses on the rhematic information in an utterance, other authors (e.g. Tagliamonte & D’Arcy 2004) proposed that quotative like is a variant of approximative, because it renders a part of speech or a thought in an approximative way. The present
account does not consider the quotative use of *like* as any kind of variant of another function but rather as a new function that emerged through bridging contexts from other functions. Therefore, the question arises if the quotative *be like* emerged via the hedging functions of *like*.

As mentioned before, several authors stated that the quotative *be like* appeared first in two specific environments, that are in the first person singular and introducing onomatopoeias (see Blyth et al 1990; Ferrara & Bell 1995; Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009). This fact leads to the assumption that *be like* has indeed an underlying approximative sense. It helped to attenuate the truth-value of an uttered part of speech or a thought or to render a certain sound in an approximative way. Another indication to the underlying approximative meaning of the quotative *like* can be seen in its impersonal use in the combination *it’s like*:

99) DR: il me semblait s’était ça, hein? quand c’est juste ça *it’s like* you assume • it’s racine carrée mais j’suis pas certain.

100) GER: ya ya. *it’s like* où où sont ses règlements • qui est en train/qu’en train de/ (d’inventer) • s/ (ils sont) pas sûre dans le formulaire ils sont pas dans le site web.

In these examples, the combination *it’s like* does not have a pure quotative function. It also contains certain aspects of the shield use of *like* in that it modifies the illocutionary force of the subsequent utterance. While it cannot be clearly stated that these examples represent a specific bridging context from the shield to the quotative function, they still can highlight a certain correlation between these two uses. More diachronic evidence is needed to clarify the connection between the shield and the quotative function of *like* in more detail. With a view to the already cited evidence, it can be assumed that *be like* emerged from the approximator functions of *like*. During the expansion of this quotative in different varieties of English and its increasing frequency, the marker *like* became more flexible and speakers started to combine it with other quotative verbs, such as *go*. Vandelanotte and Davidse (2009) developed a table to visualize the paths of evolution of the quotative *go like*:

![Figure 22. The emergence of *go like* (adapted from Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009):](image-url)
They state that the quotative *go* appeared earlier in the evolution of the English language but that it is quite possible that the newly emerged quotative *be like* had an influence on the emergence of *go like*:

As *go* had well-established copulative uses by the time *be like* came along, it may, by analogy with the pattern with the prototypical copula *be*, have started combining with *like*. (Vandelanotte & Davidse 2009: 799)

This explanation seems very plausible, particularly regarding the flexibility of *like* to function with other copula verbs such as *get*, in:

101) J: Remember when we used to pretend-fight in the halls? M: And people would *get like*, “Oh, my God.” (Romaine & Lange 1991: 247)

To conclude, it can be stated that there is strong evidence that the quotative *be like* emerged via the shield function of *like* and from there on developed an increasing flexibility to function with different copula verbs and even in isolation. Because of these paths, it is quite possible that the grammaticalization of the quotative *like* is not at its end yet.

In summary, this section retraced the grammaticalization paths of *like*. Thereby, it seems plausible that the adaptor use of *like*, representing the first pragmatic function of this marker, emerged via a bridging context from ambiguous uses of comparative functions. In the following, the adaptor *like* gained a broader scope and syntactic flexibility and began to operate on a pragmatic level, which led to the emergence of the shield function of *like*. This function plays a very important role in the evolution of other pragmatic functions of *like*. There is strong evidence that the rounder function, the focus function and the quotative function of *like* all emerged via the shield use. Nevertheless, more diachronic data is needed to rule out other possible bridging contexts completely.

In the following, the emergence of the pragmatic functions of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban will be retraced and compared to the emergence of *like* in English to prove possible contact-induced processes of language change.

### 4.1.5.2 The emergence of the pragmatic marker *comme*

After a detailed analysis of the grammaticalization paths of *like* in English it is now important to retrace the evolution of *comme* with regard to the processes described in the previous subchapter. As mentioned, the peculiarities of *comme* in Canadian French have been analyzed in different varieties of Canadian French, such as Acadian French (Perrot 1992; Chevalier 2001, 2007; Arsenault 2001) and Québec French (Dostie 1995; Vincent 2005; Beaulie-Masson et al. 2007).
Although all these authors state that there has been an evolution of pragmatic functions of \textit{comme} in Canadian French, little attempt has been made to explain these changes or to retrace the paths that led to them. Therefore, in a first part of this subchapter, the emergence of the adaptor function of \textit{comme} in French will be regarded. In a second part, the emergence of the pragmatic functions of \textit{comme} in Franco-Manitoban will be analyzed with regard to the paths analyzed for \textit{like} in the previous part. Because of the lack of diachronic data of spoken language in Franco-Manitoban, this analysis has to rely on the synchronic data of the FM corpus.

As noted in the beginning of this chapter, \textit{comme} can take adaptor functions not only in Canadian French but also in European French. Hence, the question arises how the adaptor use developed in European French.

Diachronically, this evolution may be explained by bridging contexts. Based on the fact that \textit{comme} is highly frequent in its use as a comparison marker, Fuchs and Le Goffic (2005) state that the extension of the comparison expression $X$ \textit{comme} $N$ to the elliptic expression \textit{comme} $N$ marks one possible bridging context. However, Mihatsch (2009) proposes a second possible bridging context that is “ambiguous copula phrases that allow the reanalysis of the comparative preposition as an adaptor” (Mihatsch 2009: 86). This last bridging context resembles the context proposed by D’Arcy (2005) for English \textit{like} because the underlying examples show an ambiguity between a comparative element and a linguistic approximation. To underline the adequateness of this bridging context, Mihatsch cites an example from the C-ORAL Rom Corpus:

\begin{equation}
&\text{102)} \text{ &euh c’est comme du karaoké/en fait pour moi# c’est (l) &euh je dois partir sur telle mesure (C-ORAL-ROM, fflamdlO4 in Mihatsch 2009: 75)}
\end{equation}

In this example it is not clear if the listener has to deal with a comparison or an approximation. In the present study it is assumed that this second bridging context is more plausible. This is because it is more likely that the emergence of the adaptor use of \textit{comme} is due to a reanalysis of an ambiguous context by the listener, than to the ellipsis of a lexical item by the speaker. As earlier examples have shown, \textit{comme} can take adaptor functions in European French, but this function does not seem to be nearly as frequent as the adaptor use in Franco-Manitoban. This increased frequency could have led to the use of the adaptor \textit{comme} in more ambiguous contexts that could have been triggered by an increasing flexibility of the marker. A first step towards the emergence of the shield function is certainly a broadening of scope of the adaptor function. This step seems to be of high relevance in the evolution of the pragmatic functions of \textit{comme} because it is until now not well-established in European French. First, the adaptor took a broader scope in taking over more complex NP constructions. It is plausible that this development triggered a higher syntactic flexibility in that \textit{comme} could not only modify NPs but also prepositional phrases (103) and verb phrases (104) and (105):

\begin{equation}
&\text{103)} \text{ NI: on la voit toujours comme dans un garage}
\end{equation}
104) ZA: alors comme il faut vraiment que tu l’écoutes tout d’un coup presque. • comme garder le fil des affaires là.

105) NI: so ehm j’ai la chance de comme faire des visites avec lui

The first example shows an interesting case because the scope of comme is still relatively restricted. Furthermore, comme in this example takes clear adaptor functions but also modifies a PP. In the second and third example, comme already takes a broader scope and modifies more complex VPs. Here, it is not clear anymore if comme still functions as an adaptor or as a shield. This is because comme does not really affect the propositional content of the following utterance, but rather weakens its illocutionary force. In this step of the evolution of comme we can not only see a broadening of scope and linked to this an increasing syntactic flexibility but also a shift from comme modifying the propositional content of an expression to comme modifying the illocutionary force and by this a mitigation of the utterance.

In a further step, this shield use of comme has apparently gained more syntactic flexibility in that it can also take a scope on whole phrases:

106) PJ: mais des fois c’est comme they/ they just gonna goof off.

In this stage of the evolution of comme, the marker modifies a complex part of an utterance, but still keeps its utterance-internal position. It is quite possible that constructions as in (106) led to the emergence of comme taking more peripheral positions in the sentence, such as the utterance-initial position. This is shown in the following examples:

107) WIL: elle fait des promesses à du monde d’un côté elle fait les autres payer pour • • fuck you! comme c’est ça mon argument là ce que elle elle a dit à Ronny Vallée

108) ZA: comme vous s/l lancez des jeunes dans la nature (and they) try to survive • • “you’re on your own” ((laughing))

It is very feasible that the utterance-initial shield use of comme derived from contexts such as in (106). Due to the lack of diachronic data of spoken Franco-Manitoban, this path cannot be verified in detail. A closer analysis of diachronic data from other varieties of Canadian French is needed to gain more insights into this question. Still it was shown that the shield use of comme in Franco-Manitoban clearly derived from the adaptor use and thereby shows the same development paths as like in English. It has been stated above that the shield use of like seems to be a point of origin for the emergence of other pragmatic functions of like. In view of this evolution of like, the grammaticalization paths of other pragmatic functions in Franco-Manitoban will be regarded in the following.

As shown earlier in this chapter, the rounder use of comme is very frequent in Franco-Manitoban but does not exist in European French. Mihatsch (2010b) proposed that the rounder function
of different groups of rounders possibly emerged through the shield function because of its pragmatic and syntactic similarities (Mihatsch 2010b: 117). As shown in the previous parts, this pathway seems to be plausible for the emergence of *like* in English and therefore it is important to show if *comme* in Franco-Manitoban underwent a similar evolution. The answer to this question again lies in the pragmatic and syntactic functioning of *comme*. As already demonstrated, *comme* as a rounder normally has a fairly restricted scope that only modifies a following quantifying expression. This could lead to the assumption that the rounder emerged directly from the adaptor use. Still, in the FM corpus there is evidence for the first assumption that is the emergence of the rounder via the shield function:

109) NI: puis il y en a qui • qui prennent *comme* un mois • • à/ de travailler *comme* de huit heures le matin à sept heures le soir à tous les jours

110) CA: ça va être *comme* • peut-être un peu plus qu’une semaine • •

111) ZA: j’pas • *comme* il y a un couple de semaines • •

112) CA: ils nous ont demandé de jouer *comme* un couple de shows puis faire un showcase.

In the first of these four examples, the first occurrence of *comme* can be clearly considered as a typical rounder use, while the second use of *comme* is quite more ambiguous. Here, the marker takes a very broad scope and does not only modify the numerical expression but rather everything that stands on the right of it. Therefore, it is not clear if *comme* takes a rounder or a shield function. In the second example, *comme* takes shield functions, in that has a quite broad scope. But, together with the hedging advice *peut-être*, it modifies the imprecise numerical expression *un peu plus qu’une semaine*. That is why this context is very ambiguous and it is not definitely clear if the marker takes rounder or shield functions. And even in the shield function, it is not clear to which extent *comme* modifies the illocutionary force in this example. In the third example, *comme* has a clear function of pragmatic attenuation; it appears in a syntactic peripheral position of the utterance and operates on a pragmatic level. This would lead to the assumption that the marker functions as a shield in this example. But it operates on the propositional level of the expression, because it modifies a numerical value. Therefore, the context is not clear enough to decide whether *comme* fulfills shield or rounder functions and to which extent it modifies the illocutionary force of the utterance. In the last example *comme* also modifies an imprecise numerical value but furthermore it is not clear if it has a scope over the whole following utterance or only over the expression *un couple de shows*.

All these examples lead to the conclusion that the rounder *comme* in Franco-Manitoban emerged via ambiguous shield uses, i.e. uses where the shield *comme* modifies a quantifying expression that contains a precise or an imprecise numerical value. This possible bridging context can only be demonstrated by means of synchronic data of Franco-Manitoban but it shows a striking
resemblance to the evolution of the functional equivalent marker *like* (see 4.1). Therefore it is possible to act on the assumption that the rounder *comme* followed similar grammaticalization paths as its English counterpart *like*.

As stated in the previous subchapter, there is strong evidence that the focus marker *like* emerged via the shield function because it also acts on a pragmatic level and is able to take a varying scope. Ambiguous contexts can be found where the shield marker modifies an upcoming focal expression. Hence the question arises if similar evolution paths can be found in Franco-Manitoban for *comme*. As mentioned before, this pragmatic marker can in fact take focus functions in Franco-Manitoban in that it can mark focal information, for example a rhematic expression, and highlight information that is particularly important to the speaker. There is little evidence in the FM Corpus on the possible bridging context leading from the shield function to the focus function, but some examples can help to gain more insights into the underlying diachronic process:

113) NI: *comme* • • pretty much ils les ont juste arrosés

114) CAR: elle est vraiment *comme la meilleure artiste de nos jours*

These examples do not show a clear bridging context but they point out some important peculiarities of the focus marker *comme*. In both examples, *comme* takes quite a large scope, either in a sentence-initial or in a sentence-internal position. These syntactic positions and the pragmatic impact are normally well established for the shield function. Both examples also indicate that *comme* in these positions can introduce rhematic or focal information that needs to be highlighted by the speaker through specific pragmatic strategies. This evidence infers to the fact that the focus marker *comme* could have emerged through the shield function preceding focal or rhematic information. However, the examples (113) and (114) give further information about possible influences on the emergence of the focus marker. In both examples, *comme* stands with an intensifying adverb, either preceding or following this item. As pointed out before, the focus marker *comme* often stands with an additional item that expresses emphasis. This fact could have triggered a reanalysis of the shield *comme* by the listener as expressing focus.

To conclude, two possible bridging contexts were detected in the FM corpus. The first one assumes a reanalysis by the listener of the shield marker *comme* that precedes rhematic and focal information. The second one indicates a reanalysis of the shield marker *comme* that precedes or follows an intensifying adverb. Because of the lack of diachronic evidence it cannot be stated definitively which process had the most impact on the emergence of the shield marker. Hence, it is possible that both contexts had an effect. While it is very plausible that the focus marker emerged from the shield *comme* in Franco-Manitoban, the exact bridging context remains unresolved.

The quotative use seems to be the most frequent pragmatic function of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban. This increase of frequency can possibly be explained by the influence of the highly
frequent English quotative marker *like*. Hence, the question arises if the emergence of the Franco-Manitoban quotative can also be related to the grammaticalization paths of *like*. It is very plausible that the quotative *like* emerged through the adaptor function that modified parts of quoted thought, speech and attitude. First evidence for a similar bridging context for *comme* can be found in the FM Corpus:

115) WIL: puis elle a dit que *comme* t’sais de la marde qui m/ que Renée me fait elle faisait à l’AMIC tout le temps

116) GER: j’étais pas trésorier mais *j’étais comme* brought it up puis *j’étais comme* ((1.5s)) kinda wanna do certain things • •

In the first example, the speaker introduces a quoted speech with the typical expression *elle a dit que*. But then, the speaker inserts the pragmatic markers *comme* and *t’sais*, before starting the quoted speech. The marker *comme* in this example takes therefore a shield function that underlines the subjective intuition of the speaker concerning the content of the quoted speech. Furthermore, it marks a stylistic discrepancy in that it expresses the inadequacy of the following expression *de la marde*. Most likely, his expression was not uttered by the speaker in the first place and consequently is flagged by the markers *comme* and *t’sais* as expressing subjectivity. All these characteristics lead to the assumption that *comme* in (115) is used as a shield marker that introduces quoted speech. Increases in use of this ambiguous context possibly lead to an ellipsis of the quotative expression *dire que* and the emergence of the expression *être comme*.

Example (116) shows another ambiguous context of the use of the quotative *être comme* in Franco-Manitoban. The speaker first seems to introduce a quoted speech or thought by using the quotative form *être comme* in the first person singular but then no quoted speech follows but rather a continuation of the initially initiated utterance. Still the utterance introduced by *être comme* cannot be considered as a quoted attitude. It does not fulfill the characteristics of a quoted expression by lacking for example a noun or a personal pronoun at the beginning of the utterance. It further seems as if the speaker aims to attenuate the utterances preceded by *être comme*, possibly because of communicative inadequacy that is expressed by the language switch in both cases. All these facts point to a shield use of *comme* in example (116). This is remarkable because the form *être comme* does not generally appear in shield functions.

To conclude, two ambiguous contexts have been shown that could have had an impact on the emergence of *comme* as a quotative marker. One is the use of shield *comme* as an introductory item for quoted expressions. The other one is the use of the form *être comme* in shield positions. In the present account, the first context seems to be more plausible for the emergence of the quotative *comme* because of its higher productivity. Furthermore, a similar evolution has been stated for *like* in English. This indicates that the emergence of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban follows similar grammaticalization paths as *like* in English.
4.1.6 Preliminary conclusion

In this part of the chapter it was shown that *comme* in Manitoban French does follow parallel grammaticalization paths to *like* in Standard English. This leads to the assumption that we have to deal with a sort of language change that may be triggered by language contact. The evolution in Franco-Manitoban suggests that *comme* represents a case of grammatical replication, as defined earlier in this work (chapter 1.2).

But this hypothesis is not the only possible explanation of the processes observed in Franco-Manitoban. Another possible reasoning is based on the presumption that the grammaticalization pathways of *like* and *comme* may underlie universal processes that can be detected in different languages. This possibility would suggest that similar grammaticalization paths could be detected in different languages, geographic areas and non-contact situations. A last possible explanation suggests that the emergence of new discourse-pragmatic functions of *comme* is purely due to internal change, which is potentially accelerated by language contact. In this case, the same evolution of *comme* should take place in European French as well.

In the following part of this work, these possible explanations of the linguistic change of *comme* in Franco-Manitoban will be contrasted. Furthermore, different mechanisms will be presented that help to detect phenomena of contact-induced language change, such as grammatical replication.

4.1.7 *Comme* in Franco-Manitoban – a case of grammatical replication?

When change occurs in a language variety that is in strong contact with another language or language variety, it first seems apparent to suppose that this change is due to the language contact situation. But this is not necessarily always the case and it is very important to utter such statements with caution. As stated above, language change may have multiple reasons and it is not always easy to detect contact-induced change and to rule out other possibilities. One possible way of detecting contact-induced change is to compare the contact variety with the non-contact variety of a language. Poplack and Levey (2010) propose the following approach to detect contact-induced change:

A candidate for contact-induced change in a contact variety is present in the presumed source variety and either 1) absent in the pre-contact or non-contact variety, or 2) if present (e.g., through interlingual coincidence), is not conditioned in the same way as in the source, and 3) can also be shown to parallel in some non-trivial way the behavior of a counterpart feature in the source. (Poplack & Levey 2010:398)
To detect contact-induced language change reliably, they propose a certain number of steps, based on Thomason (2001: 93-94):

1. Situate the proposed change with respect to its host linguistic system
2. Identify a presumed source of the change
3. Locate structural features shared by the source and recipient languages
4. Prove that the proposed interference features were not present in the pre-contact variety
5. Prove that the proposed interference features were present in the source variety prior to contact
6. Rule out (or situate) internal motivations (Poplack & Levey 2010:410)

All these steps, except step 6, were followed in the previous part of this work for the marker pair *comme* and *like*. According to these conditions, it is likely to postulate the contact-induced influence of *like* on the emergence of the new functions of *comme* in Canadian respectively Manitoban French. Still, condition 6 is hard to be satisfied in most of the cases of possible contact-induced change. Poplack and Levey (2010) test the internal motivations for change by means of variationist approaches, that is “systematic quantitative analysis of the data in accordance with the principle of accountability”. (Poplack & Levey 2010: 400). Even if the variationist approach is not suited for the present work, it is certainly an appropriate tool for the analysis of large-scale corpora. In the present study, a qualitative analysis of the relevant markers already revealed the possible occurrence of contact-induced language change, and therefore it is important to rule out the purely internal motivations for the change. This can be done by looking at the indications of grammatical replication, established by Heine and Kuteva (2007):

1. Intertranslatability
2. Genetic patterning
3. Rare grammatical category
4. Paired structural similarity
5. Frequency of use
6. Demographic variables
7. Differences in grammaticalization
8. Rare grammaticalization
9. Paired grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 4-17)

The indications 1., 5., 6. and 7. can be applied without much hesitation to the case of language change in the present work. The pragmatic markers *comme* and *like* are, as shown earlier, immediately intertranslatable in Franco-Manitoban discourse. The pattern *comme* is by far more frequent in Manitoban French than in the non-contact variety, that is European French, and it differs in its functions and semantic senses from its counterpart in European French. All these indications lead to the assumption that *comme* is a clear case of grammatical replication. But
there are other indications, cited above, which challenge this apparently clear case. It is important to take a closer look at the indications 2, 3, 4 and 8 from Heine and Kuteva (2007). They paraphrase indication 2 as follows:

PR is not found in other dialects or languages closely related to R, while the corresponding category PM of M does not show such restrictions. (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 7)

It was already demonstrated earlier that comme in European French also shows tendencies of developing pragmatic functions, in that it can already be employed as an adaptor. This accounts for the fact that the first part of the grammaticalization path, retraced in a previous part of this chapter, is also accomplished in European French. Hence, the comparison marker comme can develop hedging functions without any language contact situation. This adaptor use, and even to some extent the shield function, is also very frequent in Spanish and less frequent, but existent, in Portuguese (Mihatsch 2009: 72). It was also shown previously that the European French marker comme cannot take pragmatic functions such as the rounder, focus and shield function. In other varieties of Romance languages, the rounder function is attested for counterparts of French comme, such as Portuguese como and Spanish como, as shown by Mihatsch (2009):

Haverá na cidade como dous mil judeus.
‘In the city there must be like two thousand Jews.’ (ADLF, s.v. como)

Porque tenían bueno la casa la llevan haciendo como tres años.
‘Because they had well they have been building the house for like three years’ (C.ORAL-ROM, cfamcv05 in Mihatsch 2009: 82)

These examples prove that the grammaticalization path from a comparative marker to a rounder is indeed possible in Romance languages. This fact also contradicts the indications 3, 4 and 8 from the previous page, which are paraphrased by Heine and Kuteva as follows:

If two neighboring, genetically unrelated (or only remotely related) languages share a grammatical category that is crosslinguistically highly unusual, then there is some probability that this commonality is due to language contact. (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 10)

There is a set of two or more properties shared by M and R whose presence cannot be coincidental nor can it be due to shared genetic relationship. (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 10)

R and M share a grammaticalization process that is crosslinguistically uncommon. (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 15)

These citations confirm that grammatical replication can only be proven unequivocally if the agreement of the pattern in common cannot be coincidental. This is hardly possible, when the pattern in question is a pattern that can be found in different languages of the world. Fleischman
(1999) confirms that the evolution from comparative markers to approximation markers is present in many different languages that are not necessarily in contact with English.

When regarding all these facts, it is impossible to declare the evolution of comme in Manitoban French as an irrefutable and incontrovertible case of grammatical replication. This is because the newly emerged pragmatic functions do not seem to be a case of contact-induced innovation in the Replica Language French. Still it is striking that the emergence of specific pragmatic functions took place in different varieties of Canadian French and not in European French. This comparison with the non-contact variety hypothesizes that the contact with the English language must have had some impact on the evolution of the marker comme. Even if it is not possible to talk about grammatical replication in a strict sense, it is possible to account for the influence of English like, which is irrefutable.

It cannot be proven that the change in the present case is purely contact-induced. It may as well be a case of internal change that is privileged by language contact. Therefore, it is more appropriate to employ the term contact-promoted language change instead of contact-induced language change.

Here, the term ‘promote’ is chosen to highlight the fact that the emergence of the patterns is not a given fact in the non-contact variety. In European French, the emergence of new pragmatic functions of comme may or may not happen in the future. The term contact-accelerated language seems inappropriate in this context; because it implies that the change will necessarily also happen in the non-contact variety. In contrast, the term contact-promoted language change suggests that a lexical item that might be suited for a possible broadening of its functions and meanings undergoes these changes due to language contact. Contact-promoted language change, as defined here, is an attenuated variant of contact-induced change and follows similar grammaticalization path. The only difference in these two processes is the fact that contact-promoted language change is not necessarily crosslinguistically uncommon and may also occur in genetically related language of the source language that have not experienced long-term language contact. Therefore, contact-promoted change is regarded as a subtype of contact-induced change in the present study.

That is to say that comme as a comparative marker may be inherently suited for a further evolution to an approximation marker and further on to a rounder, quotative and focus marker. This theory would imply that the mental lexicon of the speakers contains semantic links that promote the emergence of certain new functions and meanings. These links may be particularly evolved in bilingual speakers where the partial translation counterpart like already emerged pragmatic functions and new meanings. This implies that the contact-promoted change as such follows internal grammaticalization paths that are inspired by semantic meaning patterns that exist in
the source language. That is to say that language contact is only the trigger for the new grammaticalization process, the process as such follows language-internal evolution.

The impacts of how this change may be represented in the bilingual mental lexicon will be considered in chapter 6 of this work.

4.2  Alors, donc and so

In this chapter, the pair of pragmatic markers donc, alors and their English counterpart so will be analyzed in the Franco Manitoban Corpus. The partial equivalent marker (ça) fait que will not be part of the present analysis due to its absence in Manitoban French. It still has to be mentioned that this marker has been analyzed as a partially equivalent marker of alors and so in other varieties of Canadian French (see e.g. Mougeon & Beniak 1991).

In a first part, current research on the markers and their functions in monolingual discourse will be reviewed. At the end of the first part, the functions of donc, alors and so will be contrasted. This is necessary to establish an underlying scheme for the corpus analysis that takes into account all relevant literature on this topic.

In a second part of this chapter, the discourse-pragmatic functions of donc, alors and so in Franco-Manitoban will be discussed and analyzed on the basis of corpus data. The findings of the corpus analysis will then be compared to the functions of donc, alors and so in monolingual corpora and in literature on the monolingual use of these markers.

In a third part, the reasons for the use of so in French and bilingual discourse will be discussed. These findings will be compared to current research on so in other multilingual language contact situations. Here, the focus is on the question if so has been subject to contact-induced language change in Franco-Manitoban or if it can be classified as a borrowing or as a simple one-word switch.

4.2.1. Current research on donc, alors and so

4.2.1.1  Donc and alors in European French

In current research on French pragmatic markers, alors and donc have commonly been treated together. Mosegaard Hansen (1998) explains this by the fact that both markers “originate in temporal anaphoric expressions” (Mosegaard Hansen 1998:321) and that both are “frequently used in argumentational structures, where they mark a result or a conclusion” (ibid.). Diachronically,
the pragmatic marker *donc* emerged from Old French *donc*, originating from the Latin adverb *dum* (Mosegaard Hansen 1997: 163). In old French, *donc* already had several functions, among them the temporal use, the emphatic use in imperative phrases and introducing results and conclusions as well as apodosis in si-construction (ibd.). It is very striking that *donc* completely lost its temporal use in Modern French but developed new discourse-pragmatic functions. According to Zénone (1981), *donc* in Modern French has five different uses: a discursive use (*Que ta maison est donc jolie!*), an argumentative use (*B ne l’a pas lu donc il ne peut rien dire*), a metadiscursive use (*C’est votre point de vue donc que vous êtes en train d’éconcer?*) and a recapitulative use (*Tout individu humain a donc une dignité naturelle que le stoïcisme a thématisée…*) as well as the function of marking resumption (Zénone 1981 in Mosegaard Hansen 1997: 164ff.). Mosegaard Hansen combines these uses into two main functions: marking a conclusion, a consequence or a result and marking repetitions such as reformulations, paraphrases or summaries (Mosegaard Hansen 1997: 165). Furthermore, *donc* can take emphatic functions that are not restricted to imperative phrases, as shown for Old French (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 329). For *donc* as a marker of discourse structuring, Bolly and Degand (2009) establish a differentiation between its syntactic-semantic functions and its discourse functions. As a syntactic-semantic function, they list the use of *donc* as a conclusion or consequence marker (Bolly & Degand 2009: 7). As discourse functions, they specify the use of *donc* as a repetition marker, as a marker of participative transition and as a marker of conceptual structuring (Bolly & Degand 2009: 12). Thereby, they distinguish two kinds of repetition markers: First, a repetition marker of conclusive orientation that includes a recapitulation and second, a repetition marker that implies reformulation and explications (Bolly & Degand 2009: 12). According to Bolly and Degand, *donc* as a marker of participative transition marks a possible transition between the speakers, as in:

117) L3 moi-| je trouve que / enfin même même avant de commencer j’allais déjà vous demander comment vous vous appelez quoi / même avant de commencer |- l’expérience donc euh (…) (Bolly & Degand 2009: 9)

In contrast, *donc* as a marker of conceptual structuring marks a reorientation towards a new subject or a subject that has been mentioned earlier in the conversation:

118) E2 [IDENTITÉ DU CONVOYEUR] et euh le convoyeur c’était une dame et elle était enceinte et euh elle avait vraiment le poigné complètement cassé l’os qui elle avait vraiment l’os qui ressortait quoi [RÉACTION DU PÈRE] et donc mon père comme elle est enceinte et bon c’est encore plus plus dangereux donc mon père l’a pris l’a mis sur le côté (LANCOM (FB), cassette 31, série 57, séquence 5) (Bolly & Degand 2009: 9)

As already mentioned earlier, *alors* descends from a temporal expression that is Latin *illa hora at that hour* (Mosegaard Hansen 1997: 163). In Old French, only the temporal sense of *alors* is attested, expressing temporal simultaneity, sometimes combined with “a sense of duration” (Degand & Fagard 2011: 5). In current research, three functions of *alors* can commonly be distin-
guished, which are the temporal, the causal and the discourse-structuring function (cf. Degand & Fagard 2011, Le Draoulec & Bras 2007, Mosegaard Hansen 1997).

Unlike *donc*, *alors* can still take the temporal sense in Modern French. It is quite plausible that the causal function of *alors* emerged from its temporal use. The path from temporal to causal functions has been found in different languages and has even been described as a universal path (see Heine & Kuteva 2005). However, it is not clear if the resultative structure of *alors* evolved diachronically after this evolution or preceded it (Mosegaard Hansen 1997: 181). Apart from this lack of consistency in its diachronic evolution, there is agreement on the fact that *alors* can take clear functions as a consequence or result marker in Modern French (Degand & Fagard 2011: 9). As a causal marker, *alors* still contributes to the propositional content of an utterance. This is not the case for the metadiscursive use of *alors*, where the marker only modifies the illocutionary force of the utterance and “can be left out without changing the semantic content” (Degand & Fagard 2011: 15). As a metadiscursive device, *alors* structures discourse or introduces new topics or topic shifts, as in:

119) L1 oui ça m’embête (rire) -| L2 alors quelles photos est-ce que je dois agrandir maintenant (silence) m // pas le / Vimanmek ah oui la trente-cinq A (silence) m // la treize A elle ne donnera pas hein? (20th c. – spoken) (Degand & Fagard 2011: 14)

Apart from its functioning marking results or conclusions, Mosegaard Hansen highlights two main functions of *alors*: First, marking re-perspectivization or reorientation (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 335) and second, marking foregrounding (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 348).

By re-perspectivization or reorientation, Mosegaard Hansen understands the uses of *alors* as a structuring device, to introduce a new topic, parentheses or citations. Furthermore, in this function, *alors* can be used as a topic and discourse starter (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 335). When marking foregrounding, *alors* marks “transitions from more backgrounded to more foregrounded material, especially, but not exclusively in narrative” (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 348).

All of these functions can be summed up in a semantic network:
This figure does not only recapture the important functions of *alors* and demonstrates its strong multifunctionality, but also illustrates the diachronic evolution of *alors* from a clear temporal device to a causal marker and then to the emergence of purely discourse-pragmatic functions.

In conclusion, it can be stated that *donc* and *alors* are commonly treated together because of their diachronic evolution and their overlapping semantic senses and pragmatic functions. Even though the two markers share certain important patterns in European French, they still differentiate in others:

- *donc* has lost its temporal use, *alors* can still appear as a temporal particle
- *donc* can fulfill emphatic functions, *alors* cannot do so
- *alors* can take foregrounding functions, *donc* cannot take this function
- as a resultative marker, *alors* marks a subjective conclusion whereas *donc* marks inferential conclusion
- *alors* is frequently used in utterance-initial position whereas *donc* mostly takes utterance-medial positions
- *alors* can mark topic change and topic starting whereas *donc* can mark repetition (reformulation, summary, etc.)

All these patterns will be exemplified by means of corpus data in the upcoming chapters. In the following, the meaning patterns and pragmatic functions of the English pragmatic marker *so* will be presented and contrasted with the patterns of *alors* and *donc*. 
4.2.1.2 So in Standard English

From a crosslinguistic perspective, the English marker *so* is generally considered the translation equivalent of the French markers *alors* and *donc*. Rarely, in literature, the marker *then* is listed as approximate equivalent of *alors* (cf. Le Draoulec & Bras 2007: 81). This marker will not be an object of the current investigation because it does not share important discourse-pragmatic functions with *alors* and *donc*.

The marker *so* is amongst the best-investigated pragmatic markers in the English language. It is well known that *so* is a very multifunctional particle that can occur in different grammatical and discourse-pragmatic functions. *So* can, for example, occur as an adverbial modifier like in *I am so happy*, a function that *alors* and *donc* cannot take in French. Furthermore, it can occur as a connective as in:

120) I moved from Brixton to St. John’s Wood. *So* I won’t be bothered by the noisy neighbors. (Matsui 2000:187)

It can also be used as a conjunction in:

121) He took the taxi *so* as not to be late. (Bolden 2009:976)

Despite the large amount of research on *so*, little is known about its diachronic evolution and the emergence and the pathways of pragmaticalization of its discourse-pragmatic functions. The Oxford English Dictionary\(^\text{12}\) states that *so* originates in Old English *swē*, *swē*, *swē*. This item is of Germanic origin but its exact origin is not definitively documented. This lexical item is attested in the English language since the 8\(^\text{th}\) century with the meaning “In the way or manner described, indicated, or suggested; in that style or fashion”\(^\text{13}\). According to the OED, Old English *so* already was a very multifunctional item that had a wide range of polysemic senses.

In the current study, only uses of *so* that are directly relevant to the emergence of its discourse-pragmatic functions will be mentioned.

Schiffrin (1987) detects two separate but not exclusive functions of *so*. First, she points out the functioning of *so* as a causal marker that connects propositional content or illocutionary acts. Second, she focuses on the purely discursive functions of *so* as an interaction marker (Schiffrin 1987: 218), demonstrates that Schiffrin attributes the basic meaning of *result* to *so* at a discourse level. At a level of knowledge, she points out its inferential functions.

---

\(^{12}\) [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)

\(^{13}\) [http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/183635](http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/183635)
In addition, in informal speech, “so is a turn-transition device which marks a speaker’s readiness to relinquish a turn” (Schiffrin 1987: 218). Blakemore (1988) considers the marker so from a relevance theoretic approach and also emphasizes its inferential functions. Howe (1991) focuses on the utterance-initial positioned so and describes it as having primarily functions as a “marker of connection” and prefacing “topic beginners” (Howe 1991: 93).

Lam (2009) distinguishes the textual from the interpersonal functions of so. According to his analysis, the textual functions of so include framing, linking and resultative uses (Lam 2009: 360-62). While in its framing function, so is used to mark boundaries, e.g. topic change and digression, in its linking function it aims to establish sequential or non-sequential relations between segments of discourse (Lam 2009: 360-61) As an interpersonal marker, so can link responses to the prior discourse (responsive function), indicate a speaker’s planning process (processing function) or manage turns (Lam 2009: 363-64).

Bolden (2009) clearly distinguishes the inferential use of so from its utterance-initial functioning. According to Bolden, so can be seen as a marker of “emergence of incipiency” and it “is a resource for establishing discourse coherence and (…) accomplishing understanding” (Bolden 2009: 996). Utterance-initial so is “used in contexts where a particular course of action is oriented to by the interlocutors as having been pending or relevantly missing” and “on turn constructional units that pursue abandoned or interrupted interactional projects” (Bolden 2009: 996).

This short overview of the discourse-pragmatic functions of so showed that in spite of the differences in the terminology so seems to fulfill certain very specific uses in Standard English. These uses can be reduced to the following three:

- so as a consequence, result and conclusion marker
- so introducing a recapitulation or reformulation of something said earlier
- so marking reorientation and reperspectivization, e.g. topic starting or topic changing

In addition, Bolden’s distinction between the utterance-initial use of so and its inferential functions seems to be very plausible.
4.2.1.3 Functions and meanings of *alors*, *donc*, *so*

This section aimed at giving a first overview of the discourse-pragmatic functions of the markers *donc*, *alors* and *so*. It can be concluded, that these markers have been investigated very closely in the last 25 years and that different discourse functions have been demonstrated using written and spoken speech data.

The first part of this chapter already demonstrated that *donc* and *alors* are not completely equivalent in their semantic meaning patterns and their pragmatic functions. The same assumption can be made when comparing the two French markers to the English marker *so*. Even if the markers are commonly regarded as translation equivalents, a concrete comparison of their functions does not exist. Figure 25 aims to visualize and contrast the functions of *donc*, *alors* and *so* that are pointed out in current research. The black boxes indicate functions that are not possible for the respective item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th><em>donc</em></th>
<th><em>alors</em></th>
<th><em>so</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consequence, Result</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Repetition (Recapitulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Repetition (Reformulation, Explication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reorientation, Reperspectivization (Turn Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emphasis</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Foregrounding</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This figure demonstrated clearly that *donc*, *alors* and *so* do not overlap in all their functions. However, *so* can take certain functions in Standard English that can be translated by *donc* or *alors* in European French. These discourse-pragmatic functions can be underlined by examples from monolingual corpora.

Utterance-final *donc* is often used in European French to mark a conclusion (122) or to signal to the interlocutor that a conclusion is missing (123), as these examples from C-Oral ROM demonstrate:

122) *MAR: peut-être parce que le nord / c’est plus / &euh # populaire /*$ c’est plus des [/] enfin les anciennes mines /*$ &euh c’est xxx dur *donc* /*$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv03)

123) *ALE: la passion / ben c’est une maladie /*$ &la /*$ *VAL: *voilà /*$ *ALE: *passion*$ *CYR: <ah le couple>$ <tue l’amour *donc* ?>$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv01)
This syntactic position of *done* does not appear at all in the FM Corpus.

Utterance-initial *done* mostly is employed in European French to mark reperspectivization or reorientation that is generally topic changing (124) or marking the beginning of an utterance (125). But in some cases also to mark a conclusion (126) or in questions to point out a missing conclusion (127):

124) *JAC: <voilà // *done on commence à parler de rentabilité // attention //>$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv06)

125) *ALE: s’il te plait / pour essayer de parler de la même chose // parce que sinon / on va pas s’en en sortir // hhh$ %exp : rires (hhh) *done un an dépassé / un an // #$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv01)

126) *ALE: l’éternel équilibre #$ *CHA: <voilà / et>$ *ALE: / <entre les choses> /$ *CHA: *done l’aventure$ <quoi>///$ *ALE: <ouï> // #$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv01)

127) *ALE: <mais pourquoi ? tu y penses quand &euh> ?$ *VAL: <done il y a l’amour>$ *CHA: <ben quand tu veux> //$ (C-Oral ROM ffamcv01)

Often, utterance-initial *done* in European French appears in combination with other pragmatic markers, such as in the following examples:

128) **CHA: (…) consommer l’amour enfin // je sais pas / ça me fait [/] ça m’a fait bizarre // #$ et &euh [/] # et périssable //#$ done ben ça voilà / je vais en parler quoi // #$ (C-oral ROM ffamcv01)

129) *SOP: <et alors [/] et donc>$ toi tu y vas quel soir ? #$ (C-oral ROM ffamcv02)

In European French, utterance-medial *done* generally marks a consequence or result (130) a recapitulation (131) a reformulation or explication (132) or emphasis (133):

130) *VAL: <parce que j’ai pas [/] parce que j’ai pas voulu adapter> // #$ *ALE: parce que tu as$ <pas voulu // donc c’est un refus catégorique> ///$ (C-oral ROM ffamcv01)

131) *VAL: <ça tue> ///$ *CYR: donc ça va ///$ <tu vois / c’est> …$ *VAL: <eh bé done ça tue ///> #$ *CYR: <ouais> ///$ (C-oral ROM ffamcv01)

132) *SOP: ben oui // mais ils sont moins nombreux *done / &euh obligatoire-ment / ils se sentent moins forts //#$ (C-oral ROM ffamcv03)

133) *MAR: je crois que la muse vénéale / au début / donc était seule ///$ ensuite elle a été divisée ///#$

As mentioned previously, *alors* in spoken European French is a highly polysemous marker that can fulfill various discourse-pragmatic functions, here exemplified by means of data from the C-Oral ROM Corpus. In the first two examples, *alors* marks a conclusion (134) and a missing
conclusion (135), which both belong to the group of functions expressing a consequence, a result or a conclusion (see Figure 25):

134) *JUL: ouais mais tu vois / il est pas revenu après // #$ il est pas revenu après // $ alors je me dis dis merde / ( si ) ça se trouve en fait / il venait voir juste la voiture quoi // #$ hhh$ (ffamcv07)

135) *DEL: mais franchement / de loin / je préfèrais la 106 parce que la Clio / tu pouvais même pas redémarrer en seconde / ça broutait comme c’ est pas permis // #$ la 106 elle a une pêche$ *CHR: <xxx du moteur alors /> *EST: <vous l’ avez achetée où ?> #$ (ffamcv11)

In the following example, it is not explicitly clear if alors really introduces an explanation, belonging to the function of replication (see Figure 25), or if this function is primarily due to the marker ben and its combination with alors:

136) *JOS: tu sais faire le pain de poisson ?$ *MAI: ben alors c’était la première fois que je le faisais / mais alors … *NAT: c’ est bon ça // (ffamcv05)

Still, it is unambiguous that alors can mark a missing explication, especially in utterance-final position (137). In this case, alors even seems to express the metacommunicative function of reproach:

137) *JAC: bon / c’ est quoi le truc qui va pas alors ? il y a bien un truc qui va pas ?$ (ffamcv06)

As a reorientation marker, alors takes different functions in turn management and discourse structuring, especially in utterance-initial position. The following examples illustrate cases of alors as a topic changer (138), a discourse starter (139), a discourse structuring device (140) and a foregrounding device (141):

138) *JUL: (…) #$ donc c’ est peut-être aussi pour ça / qu’ elle fait la gueule //$ parce que je suis rentrée / #$ &ehu ils étaient à table / je dis non non c’ est bon / j’ ai mangé //$ je suis montée direct dans ma chambre / et puis je suis redescendue pour leur dire au revoir / et c’ est tout // #$ ouais ben ouais // #$ <mais ils sont chiants> //$ *MON: <alors raconte ton après-midi> #$ *JUL: <on avait>$ (ffamcv06)

139) *DAV: […] alors (146) est-ce que tu *BEN: […] alors (147) moi je viens *DAV: […] et aujourd’ hui alors (148) quelles sont tes *BEN: […] tth alors (149) ici on emploie *DAV: […] alors (150) est-ce que tu (…) (ffammn27)

140) *MAR: […] un autre examen alors (87) que je savais à deux classes alors (88) il y avait deux appartements au-dessus alors (89) les deux classes en en puisance alors (90) qu’ est-ce qu’ le chaque côté alors (91) on tombe une la cour là-bas alors (92) le matin il y dormais pas alors (93) j’ étais pas de mes parents alors (94) ils évitaient que pas du gâteau alors (95) section enfantine ils leur première année alors (96) avec aller au cabinet alors (97) il m’ est problèmes
parce que *alors* (98) je leur donnais un rouleau quoi *alors* (99) j’étais arrivée en rappelle celui-là *alors* (100) je lui dis  

141) *JOS: et ça va pas alors avec la tapisserie que vous avez pris ? #$ (ffamcv05)

It is important to mention that not all uses of these pragmatic markers in spoken language are as clearly assignable as the preceding examples and that different functions can appear at the same time in one occurrence of a marker. Furthermore, some of the functions mentioned above can be subdivided into different subfunctions that are not relevant at this point in the review of the literature (for an overview see Mosegaard-Hansen 1998).

Just as the French markers, the functions of the English marker *so* (see Figure 25) can be documented by means of monolingual corpus data.

In the following, these functions can be exemplified by spoken discourse data from the COCA Corpus. It is not essential to analyze these examples in detail. They rather aim to provide a starting point for a comparison of the pragmatic functions of *so* in spoken American English with the functions of *so* in the FM Corpus data. The first two examples show *so* marking a consequence or result (142) and a missing conclusion (143):

142) MORRISON: (Voiceover) She walked to the house where Mark made a habit of leaving the carport door unlocked *so* the employees could use the bathroom. (110121)

143) Mr-BRODERICK: We were at a family friend’s house down the street. They ca -- they kind of knew what was going on because the family friend went over with my mom’s boyfriend to check to see if my dad was all right. WINFREY: *So* your mom had a boyfriend? Mr-BRODERICK: Yes. (20051122)

In the latter example, it is not exactly clear if *so* marks a missing conclusion because the following question had already been answered by the other speaker. In this case, *so* may also represent a case of recapitulation.

The following examples also show *so* marking different kinds of repetition, such as recapitulation (144), reformulation or explanation (145) and missing explanation (146):

144) APPLEGATE: *So* you say it was the native religion of the peoples of Europe before Christianity… Ms-RIGGS-BERGESEN: Absolutely. (19971025)

145) SMITH: I think that she’s tying the fact that in our culture we don’t want to look at the fact that the rumor is true, like we’re not going to live forever. Our inability to look at that, you know, she’s tying that to some other kinds of behaviors that we have, and in this case the obsession with the body. And she talks about -- BEHAR: *So* the obsession with the body is like a distraction from this horrible truth that were all going to die. (091015)
146) UNIDENTIFIED-FEMAL: Why did he tell police that you weren’t there? MISTY-CROSLIN: Trying to get out of jail. That’s what I think. UNIDENTIFIED-FEMAL: So your brother was in jail? MISTY-CROSLIN: Yes, he was in jail. Yes. (091015)

Apart from these functions, so may, as well as its French counterparts, help in turn management and discourse structuring. It may functions as a topic starter (147) a topic changing device (148) and a discourse structuring device (149):

147) Ms. SARAH HASKINS: Thank you very much it’s nice to be here. ROBERTS: So we just heard this clip about beauty contraptions. Tell us how that happening?

148) GIFFORD: The guys -- and they couldn’t even hold me straight. KOTB: That was getting on your nerves. GIFFORD: So I’m going to the side. KOTB: Yeah. GIFFORD: I’m -- they’re pulling me over, see to the right, and I can’t go (mumbles) So anyway, I -- the stuff I’ll do for a laugh. (110124)

149) CHRIS-WRAGGE: Okay. JOE-CALDERONE: So -- CHRIS-WRAGGE: We have got this. JOE-CALDERONE: It -- it gives it a kind of a rounder feeling. So we mix this all in here. You want to mix that? (110128)

Apart from the pragmatic functions of the markers, the syntactic position also offers important information on their uses. It is striking, that despite their overlapping pragmatic functions, the three markers often appear in different syntactic positions. The syntactic position of a lexical item may be very important for its classification and its functioning. As Waltereit and Detges point out, the syntactic position may be an indication if a lexical item functions as a pragmatic marker or a modal particle (Waltereit, Detges 2007: 63). A variable syntactic position is characteristic for pragmatic markers. Still, a respective marker may occur frequently in a specific syntactic position, while another syntactic position may be very infrequent. As mentioned earlier, so as a pragmatic marker frequently occurs in utterance-initial positions and very rarely on the right periphery of an utterance.

In contrast, alors appears frequently in utterance-initial, utterance-medial and utterance-final positions. The pragmatic marker donc rarely appears in utterance-initial positions but frequently in utterance-medial and -final places.

While this subchapter mirrors the current research of the particles in European French respectively in Standard English, it is the aim of the next part to point out the functions of the markers in Manitoban French.
4.2.2 Alors, donc and so in Franco-Manitoban

The aim of this subchapter is to verify if the pragmatic markers donc, alors and so have undergone some kind of contact-induced change in Manitoban French. To get a first impression of the distribution of these markers in the Corpus data, their total frequencies have been contrasted. Out of a total of 245 occurrences in the FM Corpus, so appears 186 times (76%), alors 47 (19%) and donc 12 (5%).

An analysis of the speaker distribution shows that only 4 speakers utter donc, whereas only 5 speakers use alors. That means they are not only very infrequent in Franco-Manitoban discourse but they are also uttered by a relatively small amount of speakers. In the following, the discourse-pragmatic functions of donc and alors in Franco-Manitoban will be analyzed in detail. Afterwards, the influence of English so on Franco-Manitoban discourse will be demonstrated by means of the FM Corpus data.

4.2.2.1 Alors and donc in Franco-Manitoban

In the FM Corpus, the pragmatic markers donc and alors occur only in French discourse environments. That is to say that they only occur in utterances where the matrix language is French and that they never proceed or follow parts of English discourse. This is very striking because pragmatic markers are generally known for their ability of being inserted in bilingual discourse that is amongst others due to their semantic and syntactic detachability (see chapter 1.1).

On the beginning of the analysis on donc and alors in Franco-Manitoban, it is already possible to conclude certain important facts:

– donc and alors are used very infrequently in Franco-Manitoban discourse
– donc and alors are used by a very small amount of Franco-Manitoban speakers
– donc and alors are neither used in bilingual Franco-Manitoban discourse nor in English discourse

Starting with these assumptions, it is relevant to take a detailed look at the different discourse-pragmatic functions of donc and alors in Franco-Manitoban. The underlying question for this analysis can be formulated as follows: Do donc and alors conserve their large amount of polysemic patterns and their multifunctionality in Franco-Manitoban despite their decline in frequency or do they undergo processes of language change that are possibly due to language contact? Furthermore, it is important to analyze if the frequent occurrence of the English marker so is the reason for possible processes of language change in alors and donc.
As mentioned on the previous page, *donc* has only 12 occurrences in the FM Corpus. It is striking that out of the four speakers that use the marker *donc* three speakers solely use it in utterance-initial positions (5 occurrences) while only one speaker uses exclusively utterance-medial *donc* (7 occurrences).

In the FM Corpus, the rare occurrences of utterance-initial *donc* can fulfill similar functions as in European French, that are as a topic changer (151), as a topic starter (151) and as a marker of a conclusion or consequence (152):

150) FLO : • • ehm • • *donc* • Inga est-ce que tu l’as commencé ton chose ?

151) FLO : Word ! • • • ok • • • *donc* est-ce que vous avez besoin du temps • • • on stage • avant de commencer ?

152) DAN : À cause y a/ dans un chanson • • je • je nomme tous les membres du groupe. FLO : cool • ok • *donc* moi j’v/ j’… j’ai pas besoin d’T faire (…)

The only function of utterance-initial *donc* that does not occur in the FM Corpus is pointing out a missing conclusion. The fact that this function does not appear in the data does not rule out the existence of this function in Franco-Manitoban discourse. Furthermore, it is striking, that *donc* in the FM Corpus never occurs in combination with other markers such as *voilà donc* or *alors donc*.

In the FM Corpus, only two of these four functions of *donc* in utterance-medial are present, namely as a consequence or result marker in (153) and (154) or as a reformulation marker (155):

153) WIL : (…) en enlevant ça de mon/ de mes/ ma liste de dépenses • • • tu m’obliges de prendre leur quinze pourcent vers des coûts • • • d’autres coûts • • • et *donc* je (suis) déçue de ce moment là • • •

154) WIL : (…) Vous allez pas couvrir ces coûts là, vous allez couvrir ces coûts là au lieu • • • *donc* • • • t’as pas besoin de faire l’invitation c’est moi qui l’a fait • • •

155) WIL : (…) c’est elle qui décide combien d’argent est donné • • • (…) … ya c/ mais non • ça c’est pas efficace • • • *donc* ((1.2s)) c’est elle qui écrit la lettre (…)

Certainly, this analysis of the marker *donc* in utterance-medial position cannot be representative for its general use in Franco-Manitoban discourse because it is only used by one speaker. Still it can be stated that utterance-medial *donc* is not used as an emphasis marker or a marker of recapitulation in the whole FM Corpus while this function is relatively common in spoken European French.

It can be concluded at this point that *donc* in Franco-Manitoban is very infrequent but it still kept most of the pragmatic functions that are documented in spoken European French. Only
the utterance-final use of *done* and its use as an emphatic devise seem not to be present in the FM Corpus data.

In the FM Corpus data, *alors* is used very infrequently and by a small amount of speakers. Still, certain of its discourse-pragmatic functions that are documented in European French are also shown in Franco-Manitoban spoken discourse. *Alors* appears as a marker of consequence or result in (156) and (157) as a marker of repetition (explication) in (158):

156) JO: puis c'était comme/ ya comme des battles dans la classe t'sais comme tout le monde qui jete (comme) des classeurs • • *alors* • elle est comme «non c’est/ il devrait pas ((laughs)) pas avoir ce problème là»

157) JO: puis c’est comme « ya je va me changer» *alors* il se change puis là il sort puis il avait sa casquette là puis ça • j’étais comme «what the…?»

158) JO: elle travaille à • • à temps partiel *alors* elle travaille les après-midis puis c’est une classe d’onzième (...)

Furthermore, in the FM Corpus data, the marker *alors* is used for turn management, for example as a topic changer (159) and as a topic starter (160):

159) JO: oh il était ici avant? NI: oui. JO: oh ya? • • • ha. NI: *alors* vous prenez un cours ensemble? c’est quoi? (...)

160) NI: (...) t’sais comme on se sert encore de ces choses là JO ((laughs)) ha. NI: mais eh *alors* lui il doit apprendre comme comment on travail/ travaille avec le cuir • puis la fourrure

In the FM data, *alors* does not appear as a discourse-structuring device but in the following example it is used to bridge a moment of discourse planning:

161) JO: mais quand même t’sais les personnes l’appellent Macaroni puis il y avait • • des (( )) comme ça • ici puis *alors*...ouais ça • • • *alors* quand même j’ pense ça/ ça eu un effet à cause de la seule famille italienne (...)

As the marker *done* in the FM Corpus, *alors* also occurs in a high number of pragmatic functions if compared to its infrequent use. The only pragmatic function of *alors* that does not show in the FM Corpus data is the foregrounding function. Furthermore, it is very striking that *alors* in the FM Corpus does not appear in utterance-final position, such as to highlight a missing conclusion or a missing explanation. As a consequence, *alors* in the FM Corpus is never used by the interlocutors to claim a conclusion or an explanation.

Apart from the infrequent use of *alors*, it also infrequently occurs together with other markers. But other than in European French, where *alors* commonly appears in combination with *done*, it is only combined with *comme, là or et puis* in the FM Corpus;
162) ZA: c’est comme • • c’est tout un album concept hein? *alors comme* il faut vraiment que tu l’écoutes tout d’un coup presque.

163) JO: mais eux-autres sont/ eh ils peuvent pas faire la gig *alors là* • • • c’est comme • • • ils ont appelés pour faire la gig (…)

164) NI: ehm *et puis* • *alors* • • *t’éais* parce que lui il connaît pas ça du tout

To conclude, it can be stated that *donc* and *alors* did not suffer a loss of their important discourse-pragmatic functions in Franco-Manitoban discourse despite their infrequent appearance. It is remarkable that both, *donc* and *alors* seem not to be used in a syntactic utterance-final position. Furthermore, both markers do not occur in the FM Corpus data to mark emphasis or foregrounding.

In the following, it will be analyzed which discourse-pragmatic functions are taken by *so* in the FM Corpus Data and if *so* also takes functions of *donc* and *alors* in French and bilingual discourse of the corpus data.

4.2.2.2 *So* in Franco-Manitoban

In colloquial spoken American English, *so* can take various different discourse functions. Still, all examples mentioned earlier in this chapter can only demonstrate the use of *so* in exclusively monolingual contexts. Therefore, the following part of this chapter aims first to point out the distribution of *so* in the different language contexts in the FM Corpus and second to exemplify the pragmatic functions of *so* in the Franco-Manitoban variety of French.

In Franco-Manitoban discourse, *so* appears in purely French and purely English discourse environments as well as in bilingual discourse.

In this context, an utterance is considered as bilingual if one language occurs on the left side of the marker *so* and another language at the right side, as in:

165) PJ: Ils ont fait une autre comme négative *so* it’s just like totally the wrong picture.

166) PJ: (…) but the most of it is there *so* je pourrais envoyer ça.

When looking at the distribution of *so* in the FM Corpus, it is very striking that it does appear in the majority in bilingual or French sentence environments. The result is demonstrated in:
This figure shows a total of 186 occurrences of *so* in the FM Corpus. Out of all these occurrences, *so* appears 78 times in French utterances, 71 times in English utterances and 37 times in bilingual utterances. The distribution of *so* in non-English utterances already leads to the assumption that this is one reason for the infrequent use of *alors* and *donc* in the FM Corpus data. Still, it is important to take a closer look at the individual discourse-pragmatic functions of *so* in the respective contexts.

As already mentioned *so* is a relatively frequent marker in Franco-Manitoban discourse. For the current analysis the focus will be on *so* in French and bilingual contexts. These environments can give more insight into the distribution of *so* in non-English discourse and possible impacts of language contact.

When indicating resultant parts of utterances, *so* in the FM Corpus can mark results, as in (167) and (168), and consequences, as in (170) and (170):

167) PJ: Ils ont fait une autre comme négative so it’s just like totally the wrong pictures and they fucked with them.

168) NI: mais là je me sens un peu conné parce que j’ai jamais été voir non plus (ce qu) ils étaient en train de faire • • • so t’sais on/on est coupable là-dedans nous aussi.

169) DR: puis Damian va être ici aussi so he’s canning the date with you tomorrow…

170) CA: moi j’étais comme • la première toune I love puis les autres je suis comme «ih» so j’pense pas que je les • réécoute.

When marking a conclusion, *so* often includes the pragmatic functioning of introducing an explication, as in (171) and (172), or a reasoning (of something said earlier: 

\[ \text{French} \]
\[ \text{English} \]
\[ \text{Bilingual} \]
171) FLO aah vous avez l’âge à mon petit frère (puis) ma petite sœur ((1.s)) je me sens vieil le. GER c’est des jumeaux? FLO non • • mais l’une (est née) en quatre-vingt-onze puis l’un en quatre-vingt-treize • • so you are in the middle so’

172) NI: good ya mais je je pense pas (que)’cause • elle est nouvelle so ils vont tester leur ((())) avec elle • puis là ils savent qu’elle peut rien faire

173) NI: mais ça coupe pas les mauvais herbes • • so on arait • on avait une atten/ une entente avec/

The same observation counts for so introducing a missing explication:

174) CA puis on va jouer ehm • au Festival encore • ya • puis/ ah oui puis on s’en va à Moncton aussi on fait la Francofête. ZA that’s awesome! so tout ça dans les prochains mois là?

In this example, so introduces an utterance that aims to signal to the interlocutor that some kind of information is missing. In this case, the speaker ZA wishes to receive a conclusive explanation of the statement that CA uttered before.

In spoken American English so can function as a repetition marker to introduce a recapitulation of something said earlier. The same functioning can be found in the FM Corpus:

175) PJ: yeah • that • most of it comme honnêtement j’ai mis ensemble le document qui • dit quelle page has what on it • • we have all the ads • il nous manque un peu de texte but the most of it is there so je pourrais envoyer ça
(…) definitely • puis • t’as quoi? how about what I’ll do c’est je va t’envoyer aussi un timeline de genre quand qu’on a besoin de ces choses • • comme ça ça peut t/ donner un meilleur idée ‘cause I don’t/ right now c’est juste un peu abstrait aussi • • ehm • mais • tout cela étant dit on va quand même avoir un peu plus d’argent (à verser vers ça) • • eh pour les bannières • • and • juste pour donner une idée qu’on a quand même/ • • eh we’ll have a little bit more to work with you know? • • ehm • so je peux quand même t’envoyer cles numéros • aussi • so peut-être je vais juste t’envoyer un ‘tit courriel • pour résumer • what we talked about • puis • donner un peu plus de détail côté eh • • date puis • • puis budget et tout.

In this sample, so does not only introduce a recapitulation, it also fulfills discourse structuring functions. In the first occurrence of so, it marks a provisional recapitulation whereas the second and third occurrences of so introduce the definite recapitulation of the conversation.

In the same way, so as a repetition marker can introduce a further explication (176) or a reformulation (177) of something said earlier:

176) GR: ça parle de • • • comment que • l/ les français on voulait/ • les francophone on voulait nos droits puis là il y avait un backlash politique • sévère • • so il y a des anglophones • on pense • qui ont • • brûlé le bâtiment de la Société Franco-Manitobaine
In the first example, *so* gives a more detailed explication of the nature of the political backlash mentioned earlier in the utterance. In the second example, the speaker first introduces the languages in which his thesis is translated and the reasons why he chose these languages. At the end of the utterance, *so* introduces a summing up reformulation of what the speaker said earlier.

But *so* as a repetition marker can also be used by the interlocutor to advice the speaker that an explication is missing:

In this example, the speaker ZA raises the topic of a distribution aspect of his film scholarship. The speaker CA seizes this topic and signals that she would like to get a more detailed explication on this aspect and its consequences for ZA. The allusion to the missing explication is introduced by *so*.

All these examples indicate that *so* is often employed to structure discourse in some way. It has been pointed out that *so* frequently reintroduces a topic that has been pending or specifies a recent topic by a further explanation or conclusion. Nevertheless, it must be stated again that the different discourse-pragmatic functions of *so* cannot always be separated indubitably.

This can be demonstrated by means of the following example, where *so* functions as an utterance starter, a discourse planning device and a conclusion marker:

Still, *so* also can fulfill typical discourse management functions, such as topic starting (180), topic changing (182), discourse structuring (182) and discourse planning (180):

But as a repetition marker can also be used by the interlocutor to advice the speaker that an explication is missing:

In this example, the speaker ZA raises the topic of a distribution aspect of his film scholarship. The speaker CA seizes this topic and signals that she would like to get a more detailed explication on this aspect and its consequences for ZA. The allusion to the missing explication is introduced by *so*.

All these examples indicate that *so* is often employed to structure discourse in some way. It has been pointed out that *so* frequently reintroduces a topic that has been pending or specifies a recent topic by a further explanation or conclusion. Nevertheless, it must be stated again that the different discourse-pragmatic functions of *so* cannot always be separated indubitably.

This can be demonstrated by means of the following example, where *so* functions as an utterance starter, a discourse planning device and a conclusion marker:

Still, *so* also can fulfill typical discourse management functions, such as topic starting (180), topic changing (182), discourse structuring (182) and discourse planning (182):

But as a repetition marker can also be used by the interlocutor to advice the speaker that an explication is missing:

In this example, the speaker ZA raises the topic of a distribution aspect of his film scholarship. The speaker CA seizes this topic and signals that she would like to get a more detailed explication on this aspect and its consequences for ZA. The allusion to the missing explication is introduced by *so*.

All these examples indicate that *so* is often employed to structure discourse in some way. It has been pointed out that *so* frequently reintroduces a topic that has been pending or specifies a recent topic by a further explanation or conclusion. Nevertheless, it must be stated again that the different discourse-pragmatic functions of *so* cannot always be separated indubitably.

This can be demonstrated by means of the following example, where *so* functions as an utterance starter, a discourse planning device and a conclusion marker:

Still, *so* also can fulfill typical discourse management functions, such as topic starting (180), topic changing (182), discourse structuring (182) and discourse planning (180):
comme un • un • un bottom line • so she’ll get up on top of that • • grab the foot • • • il y a comme un foot thing • (…)

183) PJ: • • • c’est ça (ouais) • c’est ça • • • so • this is this puis • • • (( )) • • • il est venu • • (puis he opens) ((3s)) and eh • • (( )) fucked up with the designs.

In all the preceding examples, so mostly appears in utterance-initial or utterance-medial position. Unlike alors and donc in Franco-Manitoban discourse, so can occur in utterance-final positions in the FM Corpus data without problems:

184) WIL: ya we’re just trying to (( )) fuck • les applications les rendent là • pour lundi prochain là so ((1.1s)) huu.

185) DM: well they’re pretty lucky they had/ they were pretty close to him so eh. ya.

In these examples, so as an utterance-final item marks the end of the utterance of the speakers, that is it fulfills turn management functions.

All the above-named examples demonstrate clearly that so in Franco-Manitoban discourse is a very multifunctional and polysemous item. It cannot only occur in diverse discourse-pragmatic functions, but also in various language environments, more precisely in English, French and bilingual utterances of the corpus data.

Especially the distribution of so in the different language environments leads to the assumption that so is not only a pure one-word switch but rather an item that is in some way integrated in Franco-Manitoban discourse.

This question will be analyzed further in the following part of this chapter.

4.2.3 Preliminary conclusion

As demonstrated in the previous section, the corpus data from the FM Corpus clearly suggests a certain cross-linguistic influence in the use of the pragmatic markers donc, alors and so in Franco-Manitoban discourse. The analysis of the corpus data showed that donc and alors decreased considerably in their frequency in Franco-Manitoban speech compared to their use in European French oral discourse. Surprisingly, it became clear that, despite their decline in frequency, donc and alors still keep the majority of their discourse-pragmatic functions. This is particularly interesting with regard to the grammaticalization and pragmatalization debate introduced in chapter 1.2. The pragmatic markers donc and alors in Manitoban French, as well as in European French, show a clear case of grammaticalization respectively pragmaticalization. Still, a decline in their frequency in Manitoban French does, according to the present corpus data, not lead to degrammaticalization as described in chapter . This phenomenon seems to support the hypoth-
esis of unidirectionality (chapter 1.2), in that a decline in frequency does not lead to the loss of discourse-pragmatic functions. This question will be considered in more detail with regard to the results of the experimental investigation in chapter 6.

Furthermore, the evolution of donc, so and alors is all the more striking because these markers do not change the same way as the markers comme, genre, like, which have been analyzed in the previous part. In the case of donc, so and alors, none of the markers emerges new discourse-pragmatic functions or semantic senses from another partially equivalent marker.

Strikingly, only the two French markers donc and alors coexist in Franco-Manitoban. The marker ça fait quel fait que is very frequent in other varieties of Canadian French, e.g. Québécois (Desasureault-Dober 1975) Acadien and Ontario French (Mougeon & Beniak 1991), but does not exist at all in Franco-Manitoban oral discourse. Regrettably, the absence of this marker cannot be explained adequately by means of the present corpus data. Because of the scarce diachronic oral corpus data from Franco-Manitoban, it cannot be ruled out completely that this marker never existed in Manitoban French.

At the same time, the corpus data proves a very high frequency of the English marker so in French and bilingual utterances. It was shown in the previous part of this chapter that the increase in frequency of so in these discourse environments does not go along with an increase of its discourse-pragmatic functions.

That is to say that donc, alors and so fulfill principally the same pragmatic functions and that the fact of using one or another marker cannot be due to the semantic meaning or the pragmatic functioning of these items.

At this point, the question arises which role so takes in Franco-Manitoban discourse and which influence language contact has on the evolution of the marker pair donc, alors and so. Is so a pure one-word switch or is it a fully integrated borrowing?

4.2.4 So in Franco-Manitoban – a case of borrowing?

The marker so has not only been subject to research on the monolingual functioning of pragmatic markers but also to research on bilingual markers. Mougeon and Beniak (1991) state that so in Ontarian French can be regarded as a core lexical borrowing (Mougeon & Beniak 1991:199). They assert that the use of so in Canadian French discourse may be due to intensive long-term language contact because it is particularly present in Canadian French varieties that have experienced strong language contact to English (Mougeon & Beniak 1991: 201). Although they argue that the “degree of bilingualism is a poor predictor of variation in so usage” (ibd.), they still find out that so is mostly used by speakers that encounter the most contact to English
in their everyday life. This fact leads them to the assumption that “core lexical borrowings like so or other sentence connectors may start out as code-switches (either as single words or as part of switched sentences) which by dint of repetition become loanwords” (Mougeon & Beniak 1991: 211). That is to say, more fluent bilingual speakers introduce the English marker to French discourse and less fluent speakers repeat this linguistic behavior. Still, they take into account an explanation proposed by Weinreich and Haugen under which these kinds of borrowings emerge through the “acculturation of bilingual speakers who experience high levels of contact with a superordinate language” (Mougeon & Beniak 1991:212).

As Mougeon and Beniak (1991), Sankoff et al. (1997) exclude donc from their analysis of pragmatic markers in discourse of Anglophone Montreal French speakers and propose instead the pair of markers ca fait que/ fait que, alors and so. They state that the speakers from their sample “occasionally used discourse markers of English origin while speaking French. In order of frequency, these were you know, so, like, and well.” (Sankoff et al. 1997:199). Contrarily to Mougeon and Beniak (1991), Sankoff et al. do not categorize the English markers in French discourse as borrowings but rather as irregularly appearing lexical items from the mother tongue of the speakers of the sample.

The phenomenon to integrate English pragmatic markers in the discourse of another language is in no case restricted to the language pair English-French. Several authors investigated the language contact of Spanish in the United States and precisely the use of so and its Spanish equivalent entonces in Spanish discourse of bilingual speakers (Silva-Corvalán 1995; Aaron 2004; Torres 2002; Lipski 2005; Torres & Potowski 2008).

Apart from Lipski (2005), all of these authors claim that so in Spanish discourse of bilingual speakers in the United States is a fully integrated loan respectively a core borrowing. These findings go along with the findings of Mougeon and Beniak (1991) for the Canadian French variety spoken in Ontario. While most studies cannot prove clearly the connection between language proficiency and the use of so in bilingual discourse, Torres and Potowski state that “there is a clear indication that as Spanish proficiency decreases, so does use of entonces as it is replaced by so” (Torres & Potowski 2008: 276).

This citation highlights the problem of comparability of the bilingual community situation of speakers in bilingual Canadian provinces such as Ontario or Manitoba and speakers that immigrated to the United States, an officially monolingual country. Although the Spanish-speaking community in the United States is of great importance, Spanish is still considered an immigrant language and does not have the same status as French in Canada. Even though the bilingual communities are not entirely comparable, the tendencies of the use of so in Spanish respectively French discourse seem to concur. The same phenomenon can even be proved for other bilingual speakers, such as Croatian-English bilinguals (Hlavac 2006). He explains the frequent occur-
rences of *so* in bilingual Croatian discourse by its polyfunctionality. This characteristic cannot be assigned to its several Croatian equivalents (Hlavac 2006: 1896).

The explanation of Hlavac cannot be adopted for the Spanish-English respectively French-English bilingual marker pairs. *So* as well as *donc* and *alors* are very multifunctional items that can appear in several semantic senses.

Therefore, the question persists why bilingual speakers integrate *so* into their oral communication and how this phenomenon can be described by means of an appropriate terminology.

Lipski (2005) argues that English *so* insertion into Spanish discourse is a case of “metalinguistic bracketing” that is “Spanish discourse filtered through the English metasystem” (Lipski 2005:13). He further postulates that this is possibly due to the simultaneous activation of the two languages (Lipski 2005:6). This means, the speakers utter the English marker unconsciously and this is to some degree a sign of the acculturation the speakers’ experience. This idea points in the same direction as Matras (2000), who claims a cognitive trigger for bilingual discourse markers. According to Matras, “this cognitive motivation (...) is so strong that it will at times override the social and communicative constraints on the discourse, leading to counterstrategic, accidental, or unintentional choices (i.e., slips)” (Matras 2000: 514). This idea of a metasystem or cognitive filter cannot be adopted in the present work because it does not account for the fact that not all pragmatic markers of a language seem to underlie this filter and that the different markers of a language behave very differently in language contact. Furthermore, the data of the present study does not allow making any assumptions neither about the clear dominance of the English language in the speakers’ everyday life nor about the acculturation of the speakers to the Anglophone Canadian culture.

Besides, as demonstrated in chapter 2, it is commonly accepted that bilingual speakers only switch languages according to certain rules and that they can control the lexical access to their languages very precisely. Current psycholinguistic models of lexical access propose different possibilities of controlling the languages in the selection process. Language selection may be controlled through an inhibitory control mechanism, for instance through language nodes, a preverbal message or through stronger and weaker links in lexical access (see chapter 2). Furthermore, some models even assume that languages do not compete at the lexical level but only at the conceptual and semantic level (see chapter 2).

In all cases, it does not seem plausible that *so* is integrated in French discourse by pure coincidence. To approach an answer to this problem, it is necessary to clarify if *so* in French and bilingual utterances is a case of core borrowing or rather a case of one word code switching. As already mentioned earlier, most researchers argue that *so* in discourse of bilingual speakers can be regarded as a core borrowing respectively as an integrated loan. One of the main arguments for this claim is that *so* very frequently appears surrounded by entirely French or Spanish discourse.
Corpus analysis (Torres & Potowski 2008: 277). In case of a one-word-switch, there would be the high probability that *so* co-occurs with other pragmatic markers. This is the case neither in the present corpus data nor in the corpus data of other researchers, e.g. Torres & Potowski. It is striking that in the present corpus data *so* triggers code switching either to French discourse or to English discourse. In bilingual utterances including *so*, there is no clear preference for one direction of code switching. This fact disagrees with the hypothesis that *so* is a pure one-word-switch.

Another argument against the one-word-switch hypothesis is the fact that *so* is employed very frequently in French and bilingual utterances and that it is used by a large amount of speakers. A one-word-switch generally occurs randomly and irregularly. Most important, a one-word-switch generally is not used by a larger number of speakers in one set of corpus data (see Poplack & Sankoff 1984).

Therefore, it is possible to retain that *so* in the present corpus data cannot be seen as a one-word-switch but as a borrowing. Hence, it is important to see in which way the borrowing of *so*, and by extension the borrowing of pragmatic markers in general, is different from the borrowing of other linguistic material.

Poplack and Sankoff (1984) give a number of evidences, which they assume are the “key components of the mechanism of integration of foreign material into a recipient language” (Poplack & Sankoff 1984: 128). These key components include the following aspects:

1. the degree to which English designations (more than one type) are displacing Spanish designations for a concept;
2. the degree to which a SINGLE English word is displacing other designations of the concept (synonym displacement);
3. various aspects of phonological and morphological integration of the English-origin form;
4. consistency in its assignment to a gender;
5. the number of people who use a given designation. (Poplack & Sankoff 1984:128)

These components were designed for content words, such as nouns. Especially the points (3) and (4) do not account for pragmatic markers because they are never integrated morphologically and rarely phonologically into discourse and they cannot be assigned to a special gender. It is unclear if the lack of phonological integration is due to the phonological and morpho-syntactic character of *so*, or if it may even be an argument against *so* as a borrowing.

Furthermore it was shown earlier that *so* does not displace any French designations for a concept in its polyfunctionality but that it displaces *donc* and *alors* in its frequency. This is to say that the components of Poplack and Sankoff do not help to classify pragmatic markers according to their degree of integration in a recipient language. It appears that *so* in Franco-Manitoban discourse is neither integrated phonologically nor morphologically and that this is due to the general charac-
teristics of pragmatic markers. That is to say that its lack of integration into Franco-Manitoban discourse can be explained with its utterance-peripheral position and its lack to contribute to the propositional content of the utterance. Nevertheless, so is very frequent in Franco-Manitoban discourse and is used by a high number of speakers.

It is indeed plausible that so functions as a core borrowing in Franco-Manitoban spoken language but there is still a lack of answers concerning the reasons of this functioning. Therefore, it is important to ask the question why so is borrowed this frequently in bilingual and monolingual French discourse. In the course of this chapter, three possible reasons for the borrowing of so came up:

1. Social strategies
2. Cognitive strategies
3. Communicative/pragmatic strategies

The first reason for borrowing is socially motivated in that it is due to the degree of acculturation of a speaker to the dominant English language, regardless of the speakers’ degree of language proficiency (Mougeon & Beniak 1991; Lipski 2005).

This reasoning is very hard to prove scientifically because the degree of acculturation is difficult to measure. Furthermore, this reason cannot be supported in the present work because so occurs in bilingual discourse of very different speech communities that are not imperatively highly acculturated to the English language and culture.

As already mentioned, a cognitive metafilter does not seem to be the only reason for borrowing of so, in that this metafilter would only function for certain pragmatic markers. As seen in the previous analysis of comme, genre and like, in this specific case the English marker is not borrowed into French discourse. Therefore the question arises why, in the case of a cognitive metafilter, not all pragmatic markers would be especially suited for borrowing. Still, it is possible, while not proven scientifically until now, that some sort of cognitive filter plays a role in the borrowing of so in merely French discourse. Hlavac formulates this possibility as follows:

Habitual contact with the pragmatic norms of another language and its speech community may lead to a situation where speakers are unable to ‘deactivate’ discourse forms from one language even when in psycholinguistic terms it may not be the ‘selected’ language of a communicative situation. (...) Thus, bilinguals may universally employ forms from their ‘dominant language’ (in terms of pragmatics) when speaking either that language or another language. (Hlavac 2006:1871)

In this citation, Hlavac suggests that the cognitive filter is not the only reason for borrowing of a linguistic form but that habitualisation with the pragmatic conditions of another language may lead to the integration of the respective marker in the recipient language.
This means that so possibly is integrated in monolingual French discourse because of commu-
nativative/pragmatic strategies in the first place. One important point is that so is a very small
lexical item that consists of only one morpheme and does not contain any very language specific
phonological material that would hinder borrowing this lexical item into another language. An-
other point is that so as a pragmatic marker is syntactically very flexible and mostly peripheral
to the propositional content of an utterance. All these facts already favor the borrowing of so for
communicative reasons. Another possible reason is the fact that in the French language there are
at least two possible choices for the pragmatic marker so, that are donc and alors. As already men-
tioned earlier, these two markers are not completely interchangeable and differ in some func-
tions and meaning patterns. Instead of choosing the appropriate variant from these two lexical
items, a speaker might prefer the English variant where no choice is needed. This explanation is
generally interpreted by the speakers' request for a “cognitively lighter load” (Hlavac 2006:1871)
or the least mental e
ff
ort. From another perspective, this choice would also demand less mental
e
ff
ort from the hearer. From this point of view, the speaker would choose so instead of its French
counterparts to simplify the pragmatic content of its utterance.

In conclusion, it can be stated that so in the Franco-Manitoban corpus data is a case of bor-
rowing. Still, it differs from the borrowing of other lexical material in that it is not integrated
morphosyntactically and phonologically in the particular utterances. It seems to be a borrowing
that was integrated into the discourse of bilingual speakers by habitualisation (see Hlavac 2006).
This means that by the possible fact that so was first employed randomly as a one-word-switch,
it was made an acceptable choice for bilingual speakers. The choice is presumably made for
communicative reasons but in a second step the speakers may activate this choice even when
the English language is deactivated. It has to be pointed out that so surely is not used randomly
in French Manitoban discourse but that it is employed for goal-oriented communicative tasks
(Matras 2012: 20).

According to Grosjeans terminology, speakers were clearly in a bilingual language mode in all
parts of the FM Corpus (Grosjean 1984). This bilingual mode does definitely influence the use
of so in monolingual parts of the corpus data. Hence, the present data does not allow to make
any presumptions of the use of so in purely monolingual language contexts.

Still, it can be retained that so is an absolutely appropriate and frequent choice in Standard Fran-
co-Manitoban spoken discourse. Therefore it can be considered a borrowing in Franco-Mani-
toban. The influence of this borrowing on the representation of the respective markers in the
bilingual brain will be considered in chapter 5 and 6 of this work.
4.3 *Bon, ben* and *well*

The current analysis aims to focus on the use of the pragmatic marker pair *bon, ben* and *well* in the FM Corpus. In a first part, current research on the monolingual use of these markers will be presented. The pragmatic functions and semantic meanings of the markers are contrasted and exemplified by spoken discourse examples from the CoCa Corpus. In a second part, their use in Franco-Manitoban discourse will be analyzed.

In a concluding part, it will be questioned if the respective pragmatic markers underwent some processes of contact-induced language change.

4.3.1 Current research on *bon, ben* and *well*

4.3.1.1 *Well* in Standard English

The marker *well* is among the best-investigated markers of the English language and a large amount of studies examine this marker from a wide range of perspectives (e.g. Lakoff 1973; Svartvik 1980; Carlson 1984; Schourup 1985; Schiffrin 1987; Bolinger 1989; Finell 1989; Fraser 1990; Jucker 1993; Jucker 1997; Smith & Jucker 2000; Schourup 2001; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Cuenca 2008; Beeching 2011). This is mainly due to its frequency in English spoken discourse and to the grammaticalization pathways it underwent.

Jucker (1993) separates clearly the discourse marker *well* from its homographic manner adverb, degree particle, noun and verb (Jucker 1993: 436). In a later work, he traces the historical evolution of the pragmatic uses of *well* back to Old English *wel la*, that was historically used as an emphatic attention getting device that was used impersonally (Jucker 1997). In Middle English, *well* was employed to frame on a textual level. In Early Modern English, *well* took interpersonal uses again (ibid.). Another historical perspective is taken by Finell (1989). He claims that well as a pragmatic marker emerged through its use as a predicative adjective in the 16th century (Beeching 2011: 98). Beeching concludes that the emerging path of the pragmatic functions of *well* leads from “(partial) acceptance and concessionary contexts (…) to mitigating and pause filling usages” (Beeching 2011: 98). She furthermore contrasts this historical evolution of *well* with the English marker *I mean* and the French markers *bon* and *enfin*. The results are displayed in a semantic map:
This semantic map already indicates certain overlaps in the historical evolution of English *well* and French *bon*, which will be discussed in the upcoming parts of this chapter. In the subsequent review of the current research, the focus will be put on the pragmatic marker *well*.

In current research on English *well*, three main proposals have been discussed, that are Schiffirns coherence-based approach (1987), Jucker’s relevance-theoretic approach (1993) and Bolinger’s lexical approach (1989).

According to Schiffrin, *well* does not encode semantic content but has specific discourse functions. Thus, its main function is to accomplish coherence in conversation because “*well* anchors the speaker into a conversation precisely at those points where upcoming coherence is lacking” (Schiffrin 1987: 126).

Jucker (1993) bases his approach on relevance theory and also emphasizes the conversational functions of *well*. According to Smith and Jucker (2000), *well* mostly indicates a context shift or more precisely “introduces repairs to the common ground” (Smith & Jucker 2000: 209) of the conversation partners. In contrast to Schiffrin, Jucker pleads that *well* does not at all lack semantic content, but that one core meaning can be attributed to the uses of *well*.

Bolinger (1989) rejects the view that *well* does not contain any semantic meaning. According to his perspective, the other functions of the pragmatic marker *well* have to be regarded, whereup-
on the adverbial use functions as the core meaning. With regard to this core meaning, Bolinger introduces the notions of “conformity to a norm” (Bolinger 1989: 321). This is to say that the semantic content of the core meaning of *well* is brought up to a pragmatic level in the pragmatic marker *well*, but the underlying core meaning always rests the same (Bolinger 1989: 322).

These approaches highlight that there is still no accordance on the role of the semantic content of *well* in Standard English. The proposals range from viewing *well* as a highly polysemous item with an adverbial core meaning up to stating that *well* is lacking all kind of semantic content (for a detailed discussion on the polysemy and monosemy approach on pragmatic markers see chapter 1.1). Schourup (2001) even claims that it may be more reasonable “to view *well* as a quasi-linguistic vocal gesture” (Schourup 2001: 1058) that has to be interpreted “in ways more characteristic of gestual interjections” (ibd.). Before taking a closer look at the different pragmatic functions of *well* in monolingual speech, it has to be stressed that the marker *well* is interpreted in the current account according to the characteristics presented in chapter 1.1. That is to say that *well* is considered being a highly polysemous and polyfunctional lexical item.

As visible in the figure on the previous page, Beeching (2011) accords the pragmatic functions of repair, hesitation, face-threat mitigator and pause filler to the marker *well*. She relies on Jucker (1997), who assigns the four main functions to *well*: 1. Frame 2. Qualifier 3. Face-threat mitigator 4. Pause-filler. (Jucker 1997: 97 in Beeching 2011:98). According to Beeching, *well* as a face-threat mitigator has the functions of “dispreferred response initiator, demurral, good up to a point” (Beeching 2011: 100). Besides, *well* also contains some of its former functions, such as the concessionary uses and the flagging incoherence (Beeching 2011: 102).

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) agree with Carlson (1984) and Bolinger (1989) that *well* has an underlying core meaning of positive appraisal (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 1130). Relating to its core functions, they propose that *well* is used to “express the speaker’s heteroglossic stance, signaling awareness of heterogeneity, and more specifically counterexpectation” (ibd.). Here, they rely on the multifunctionality of *well*, which they classify in two groups:

1. Textual functions such as boundary marking, topic introducer, signaling elaboration and flagging conclusion
2. Interpersonal functions such as marking surprise, resignation, hesitation or intensifier (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 1155)

In contrast, Cuenca (2008) thinks of *well* in terms of a radial category, whose polysemy can be captured best in terms of a semantic map.
In this account, Cuenca differentiates between two main meanings that include different polysemous senses. These meanings are modal *well*, which ranges from partial agreement to contraposition and structural *well*, which introduces reformulations and topic shifts. These meanings are not mutually exclusive and they can be related to each other (Cuenca 2008: 1388). Furthermore, she establishes core features of *well*, namely continuity and downtowering.

To conclude, most researchers agree on the fact that *well* can, amongst others, embody some sort of positive value judgement (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003), conformity to a norm (Bolinger 1989) or acceptance (Carlson 1984). Some authors additionally point out that the pragmatic marker *well* has a wide range of meanings that vary from partial agreement to complete disagreement (Cuenca 2008). Possible bridging contexts are displayed in Figure 27. If the speaker aims to express (partial) disagreement, pragmatic *well* indeed functions as a face-threat mitigator in that it can introduce a dispreferred response or express demur (Beeching 2011). Here, the speaker indeed can mark concession, flag incoherence (Beeching 2011) or indicate a discrepancy between propositional attitudes of the speaker and the hearer (Smith & Jucker 2000). In this case, the speaker tries to reestablish common ground that was lacking before
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Well as a face-threat mitigator is mostly employed utterance-initially. This syntactic position is also used commonly to flag a conclusion or a partial conclusion. It is striking that well is mostly employed in utterance-initial positions while it occurs rarely in utterance-medial or utterance-final positions. As an item in utterance-final position, well is commonly used as a bracketing and hesitation device. On a discourse structuring level, called textual level by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen and structural level by Cuenca, well may function as a repair and hesitation device as well as a boundary marker and pause filler. These functions will not be considered in this part of the present work because the functioning of pragmatic markers as repair and hesitation device already has been discussed in on the example of the markers comme and like.

This leads to establishing a schematic overview of well in current research:

**Semantic patterns**: continuum ranging from positive evaluation (agreement) to complete disagreement

**Pragmatic functions**: face-threat mitigator, flag incoherence, mark concession or discrepancy between propositional attitudes, establish common ground

**Discourse-structuring device**: repair, hesitation, boundary marker, pause filler, introducing reported speech, structuring narratives

In accordance with Beeching (2011, see Figure 27) it is assumed that well first fulfilled the semantic meaning of positive evaluation before it experienced a shift towards partial and then complete disagreement. These uses of well in Standard English can be exemplified by means of examples from the CoCa Corpus. In the examples below, well introduces disagreement (186) and agreement (187):

186) MORGAN: Yes, I can imagine you handling that OK. But I’d imagine Michael probably freaked with that. JACKSON: Well no, he was driving and I’m the one that’s passing out the food. We got out of there though. But yes, that’s the only time we ever -- any sort of rejection. But -- -- CoCa, 2011 (110215)

187) TERRY-MORAN-1-ABC# (Off-camera) It is a challenge, and let’s turn to the health care summit. It looks like Republicans are ready to come and say, no, take that bill off the table. ARIANNA-HUFFINGTON# Well absolutely, they’ve made that very clear. Even Newt Gingrich at the CPAC convention yesterday, he said that we need to start from scratch.

Here, well mostly stands with other lexemes that express agreement or disagreement, such as no in example (186) and absolutely in example (187) In cases where well introduces partial (dis) agreement (188) or concession (189), it also functions as a face-threat mitigator:

188) RAY-SUAREZ: Ambassador Burns, it sounds like Fred Bergsten is a lot more optimistic than you are. NICHOLAS-BURNS: Well, I see two scenarios. CoCa, 2012 (120515)
In these examples, *well* as a face-threat mitigator also functions to introduce an answer of the conversation partner that might be undesired by the previous speaker. As shown above, *well* introducing a certain form of disagreement can also be used by the speaking to distance himself from what the previous speaker has uttered and to highlight a certain discrepancy between the propositional attitudes.

In other examples, *well* introduces surprise or demur. In this case, *well* is used trying to reestablish common ground because the speaker remarks a discrepancy in the propositional attitudes of the conversation partners:

Apart from the semantic patterns and the pragmatic functions of *well*, it can also function to structure discourse. In these cases, *well* surely is not exempt from semantic meaning. In most of the preceding examples, *well* also functions as a turn-opener. This function is particularly characteristic for *well* because it mainly appears in utterance-initial position. When appearing in utterance-initial position, *well* can also function introducing a correction of what the other speaker just uttered:

In utterance-medial position, *well* also functions to introduce a correction but in this case, the correction appears in form of a self-repair:
194) # She was hungry - **well**, she was tired, which always made her hungry - CoCa, Summer 2011

When appearing in utterance-medial position, **well** is commonly used to structure discourse, to fill pauses or to mark boundaries. In this context, **well** appears strikingly often to introduce a reported speech. It does not only occur in combination with the quotative *say* (195) but also in combination with other quotatives, such as *like* (195):

195) Ms-REBELLO:..I’m going to retire when I’m 50. I’m going to retire when I’m 50. I remember I used to say, **Well**, what if you don’t make it to 50? And I’m like, You’re missing the best part of your life. And he would always say, **Well**, I, you know, I have to work now so that when I’m 50, I can do what I want.’

196) UNIDENTIFIED-MALE: I got into my car and they took o

The combination with a quotative, as in (195), is not specific for the pragmatic marker *well*. Several other pragmatic markers from different languages may function to introduce reported speech. In the following part, the pragmatic functions and semantic senses of French *bon* and *ben* will be presented and contrasted with English *well*.

4.3.1.2  *Bon* and *ben* in European French

The pragmatic markers *bon* and *ben* are derived from the adjective *bon*, which emerged from Latin *bonum* and from the adjective and adverb *bien*, which resulted from Latin *bene* (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 222). Waltereit (2007: 91) traces *ben* as a pragmatic marker back to the 18th century and *bon* as a pragmatic marker even back to the 16th century (2007: 92).

According to Mosegaard Hansen, the marker *bon* has two main functions, that are its interjective use and its proper discourse marking use (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 225). The former includes utterance-initial *bon* that mostly is retroactive and indicates acceptance. In contrast, the latter use includes *bon* in non-utterance-initial positions. Here, *bon* can appear either in turn-final or turn-medial position or inside a sentential structure (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 234).

Jayez (2004) gives a more detailed overview over the different uses of *bon* in the current literature:

1. Metadiscursive
2. Discourse structuring
3. Punctuation and delimitation
4. Acceptation
5. Introduction of a formulation
6. Retro- and proactive uses

As to Jayez, he suggests an incorporating function of *bon* as a stage-marking device, which he calls ‘mot de la fin’ (Jayez 2004: 4).

This function of *bon* was adopted by Beeching (2011) and can be found in her semantic map (see Figure 27). Beeching ascribes the following functions and meanings to *bon*: ‘positive evaluation, acceptance, ‘mot de la fin’, provisional acceptance (stage-marking) and concession’ (Beeching 2011: 102). Here, provisional acceptance may mark conflicts of opinions of the speakers. Furthermore, she recognizes the functioning of *bon* as a face-threat mitigator and as a hesitation-and repair marker as well as pause filler.

In that, *bon* and *well* have many overlapping polysemous senses and pragmatic functions but they still differ in some uses. *Well* is, according to Beeching, used to utter demur and to flag incoherence. These uses are not found for *bon*. But *bon*, in contrast to *well*, can be used for stage-marking, as a ‘mot de la fin’. The most striking difference between these markers is certainly that *well* as a pragmatic marker, can mark complete disagreement while *bon* cannot. The current account adopts the functions and senses of *bon* and *well* established by Beeching (2011) for the present analysis. In the following, these functions and senses will be demonstrated by means of monolingual spoken French data from the C-Oral ROM Corpus.

It is well documented that *bon* in European French can mark a positive evaluation as well as agreement. As its English counterpart *well*, it can also be used to signal partial agreement (197) and partial disagreement (198).

197) *CHR: bon il y avait quand même une fille dans le lot$ <hein> //$
*SYL: <donc il y avait>$ ouais *bon* non // #$ trois mecs et une fille //$
et donc les trois mecs / on trouvait #$ _P2 jolie //$ donc il y avait une concurrence // #$ (C-Oral ROM, ffmaml03)

198) *CHR: je [/] ça se dit pas joli$ <pour un garçon> //$
*SYL: <ou beau comme>$ <tu veux *bon* moi je dis joli> //$ (C-Oral ROM, ffmcvl03)

From a pragmatic perspective, *bon* can fulfill functions as a face-threat mitigator, in that it can, for example, introduce a dispreferred response (199) or reestablish common ground when there is a discrepancy in the propositional content of the speakers (200):

199) *SOP: <et alors [/] et donc>$ toi tu y vas quel soir ? #$
*MAR: *bon* en général / c’ est &euh #$ le samedi / ou quand il y a des soirées spéciales quoi / #$ quand tu as des soirées gothiques / ou$ (C-Oral ROM, ffmcvl02)
The use of *bon* as a face-threat mitigator refers mostly to the preceding speaker and appears utterance-initially. Concerning its stage-marking use, it commonly appears in utterance-medial position. As a stage-marker, *bon* implies the interpretation of “good so far, but there is more to come” (Beeching 2011: 94). In this case, *bon* can structure discourse (201) but it can also signal the beginning of conversational sub-sequences such as reported attitude in combination with the marker *ben* (202) and reported speech (203):

201) SOP: donc mais ils sont plus dans le style rock gothique //$
   *ANT: <ouais [/] ouais> //$
   *SOP: <un peu métal> //$
   *ANT: <mh> // (C-Oral ROM,ffamcv02)

202) *CYR: non // ma is tu peux avoir une vie de couple /$ <et tuer les habitu-
   *CHA: <c' est pour ça que c’ est à toi> /$ de faire [/] voilà / de faire en
   *VAL: ouais // (C-Oral ROM,ffamdl03)

203) *CHR: &euh à l’appartement ? #& que au début / bon moi je venais de
   &euh Stéphane //$ donc j’avais dit &euh *bon* ça serait bien que # tu
   t’installes pas tout de suite //#$ (C-Oral ROM,ffamcv04)

A related but still distinct function of *bon* is its use as a concession marker. In these cases, *bon* still keeps a certain discourse-structuring function but it introduces an utterance that attenuates the propositional content of what has been mentioned beforehand:

204) *MAR: ben [/] ben d’ entrée c’ est vachement carré ordonné //$
   ce que tu disais quoi #$ le [/] c’ est les tombes les plus récents //$ mais plus
   tu vas vers le centre et le milieu / #$ plus on remonte dans le temps / #$
   et plus c’ est anarchique //$ c’ est [/] &euh # tu as des arbres // &euh$ c’
   est ultra vert //$ *bon* il y a toujours des grands monuments par contre //$
   (C-Oral ROM,ffamcv04)

According to Beeching (2011), *bon* acts as a hedging device when it appears as a concession marker. In this, the combination with *mais, parce que* and *puis* is especially striking because it seems to have increased by younger speakers in the past (Beeching 2011: 95):

205) *CHA: <à construire>$ un truc ensemble / c’ est ça en fait / si tu [/] #$ si tu
   as des rêves / tu vois / si &t [/] #$ si tu as des rêves en commun // #$ enfin
   tu [/] #$ tu te fais une image de [/] et puis voilà quoi //$ tu as [/] #$ puis tu
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aimes tellement la personne que [/] # que [/] parce que vivre avec quelqu’un / c’est quand même [/] c’est pas comme vivre seul // # bon // # donc des fois tu as des petites contraintes / quand même // # (C-Oral ROM, ffamcv01)

206) *SYL: puisque bon on s’aimait // on arrivait à s’aider &euh # comme les autres peuvent s’aimer quand ils sont [/] # enfin il y a rien qui les retient quoi // # et d’un autre côté / bé elle elle était quand même rattachée // donc elle savait que elle était pas libre // # et moi # &euh # psychologiquement / je me disais putain mais # tu es quand même le dernier des salauds quoi // # c’est hhh [/] c’était vraiment [/] tu [/] &euh # parce que bon je le voyais son copain /// ou des fois / je [/] j’allais [/] &euh # parce qu’elle me disait viens me [/] viens me récupérer à la maison // hhh$ (C-Oral ROM, ffamcv06)

For Beeching, this evolution of *bon* represents the kind of figure-ground shift mentioned in Walterteit (2006) and she points out that “the gradual shift of meaning in *bon* from an acceptance marker and ‘mot de la fin’ to a concessionary marker and hedge is indeed reflected in its translation by well.” (Beeching 2011: 95). Indeed, a parallel evolution can be found in the functions of *well*, with the only difference that *well* cannot act as a stage-marking device. Prior to contrasting the uses of well and bon in more detail, it is necessary to take a closer look at the functions and senses of *ben* in European French as well as at its reflections in current research.

According to Mosegaard Hansen, in contrast to *bon*, *ben* marks the un-acceptability and irrelevance of a discourse phenomenon (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 247). It can mark inaccuracy, lack of importance or the obvious and superfluous (ibd.). Furthermore, she states that “*ben* always functions on a level of utterance content” (Mosegaard Hansen 1998: 234).

Vicher and Sankoff (1989) attribute to *ben* “a distancing from the enunciative framework of the preceding speaker, implying that what he or she said is either irrelevant or too obvious” (Vicher & Sankoff 1989:92). Here, they act on the assumption that *ben* is primarily a concession marker that contains both, partial agreement and partial disagreement (ibd.).

Waters (2009) puts the focus on the discourse structuring functions of *ben*. For her, the main functions of *ben* are as an initial turn-opener and “at the boundary between two intonation units” (Waters 2009: 15). In these two positions, *ben* then fulfills diverse pragmatic functions that are all commenting on the preceding utterance of the preceding speaker or the current speaker itself (ibd.).

But data from the C-Oral ROM Corpus can document that *ben* is even more complex and that it can have various semantic meanings and pragmatic or discourse functions.

Mosegaard Hansen states that *ben* mostly marks unacceptability of a preceding utterance, as in:
207) *EST: et comment tu as fait ? #$ un charmant jeune homme est venu avec$ <ses pinces //>$  
*DEL: <non / mais oui>$ ben c’ est [/] je t’ ai pas [/] je t’ ai pas raconté //$  
*EST: <**ben non //>//$ (C-Oral ROM, ffamcv11)

But in combination with other markers *ben* can also introduce agreement, as in the example below:

208) CHA: <mais non // si tu aimes>$ c’ est pas une contrainte //$ <ah non ah non // sérieux> //$ *ALE: <oui tu ne le vis pas>$ comme une contrainte //$  
*CHA: <**ben voilà> //$(C-Oral ROM, ffamcv01)

In cases where *ben* is appearing without other pragmatic markers, it does not necessarily intro-duce complete disagreement but it can also introduce partial agreement that is agreement with demur:

209) *EST: c’ est le top / Cannes$ <xxx> //$
   *CHR: <**ben c’ est>$ tranquille hein // #$  
   *EST: <ouais //>$ *CHR: <c’ est pas [/]>$ c’ est pas trop bruyant //$ enfin il y a un peu des fous mais$  
   *EST: **ben il y a que des$ <vieux> //$(…) *EST: ça te plairait bien /$ <Cannes ?>$  
   *CHR: <**ben pour les [/]>$ *DEL: <c’ est-à-dire que [/]>$  
   *CHR: <pour les vacances //>$ (C-Oral ROM, ffamcv11)

In this conversation, the speakers agree that they like the city Cannes, but that they still have some constraints in their agreement. The speaker CHR first introduces a (partially) positive argument with *ben* but then attenuates this argument by saying that Cannes is only a good city for holidays and not for living.

In the cases where *ben* marks partial (dis)agreement, it can also function as face threat mitigator in that it can introduce a dispreferred response and mark concession:

210) *NAT: non j’ allais te dire que tu voyais l’ avenir de la Belgique assez [/] # de façon assez négative?$  
   *FRE: **ben &euh pff oui et non / # parce que &euh # à partir du moment où chacune des deux parties ( y ) met son intérêt propre avant l’ intérêt commun / #$ et il n’ y a pas vraiment de raison de [/] # de maintenir la gestion des intérêts communs /

As a face-threat mitigator, *ben* can also function to evade a question and to mark that a response would not be appropriate:

211) *JEA: elle veut pas la voir ?$ *STE: <non> //$
   *PER: <ouais> //$
   *JEA: pourquoi ?$
   *STE: et / &euh #$ **ben / parce que /$
In this example the speaker STE does not want to go into the details of why a certain girl does not want to see her mother. Either the speaker does not know about the exact reasons or the speaker does not want to talk about this possibly private subject.

Another role of *ben* as a face-threat mitigator is to mark a lack of importance or irrelevance, as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
212) & \text{ALE: } \textless \text{mais pourquoi ? tu y penses quand &euh}\text{?}\textgreater \\
& \text{*VAL: } \textless \text{donc il y a l'amour}\textgreater \\
& \text{*CHA: } \textless \text{ben quand tu veux}\textgreater // $(C-Oral ROM, ffamcv01)
\end{align*}
\]

In this context, *ben* can, as already mentioned above, also mark something that is obvious (213) or an inevitable consequence of the propositional content already uttered (214):

\[
\begin{align*}
213) & \text{*JUL: } \text{il en a rien à foutre de moi } // #$ \text{ouais mais quand même attends} \\
& \text{une voiture } / \text{on se déplace pas pour une voiture } / \text{quand même } // #$ \\
& \text{*MON: ah } \text{ben tu sais les hommes } // #$ hhh$
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
214) & \text{*DEL: } \text{une voiture } / \text{j'ai avais } / \text{il avait une bonne} \\
& \text{voiture } / \text{il ne l' a jamais entretenue } // #$ \text{ben elle a rendu l' âme … } #$ \\
&(C-Oral ROM, ffamcv11)
\end{align*}
\]

In the latter example, *ben* also fulfills clear discourse structuring functions. The marker *ben* can fulfill these discourse structuring functions in utterance-initial position, to structure a part of conversation (215), and in utterance-medial position, to structure a narrative (216):

\[
\begin{align*}
215) & \text{*CHA: vous } / \text{vous voilà avec deux chinchillas } // #$ \text{c' est un mâle } / \text{une} \\
& \text{femelle } ? #$
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
216) & \text{*CHA: putain j'en pouvais plus } // #$ \text{et &euh on est rentré le samedi soir } / \\
& \text{moi j'étais crevée } / \text{on a loué des cassettes } / \text{on a maté des films } // #$ \text{dimanche } / &euh j'ai repris le train } / \text{je suis revenue ici } // #$ \text{donc &euh } \text{ben hier} \\
& \text{&euh qu' est-ce qui s'est passé &euh } / #$ \text{ben rien je suis allée en cours } // #$ (C-Oral ROM, ffamdl01)
\end{align*}
\]

In utterance-medial position, *ben* can also function to introduce reported speech, as in (217) and a self repair, as in (217):
To conclude, the pragmatic marker *ben* in European French is a highly polysemous item that can fulfill various discourse and pragmatic functions. In utterance-initial positions, *ben* refers to the utterance of the preceding speaker and can signal a wide continuum from agreement over partial (dis)agreement to disagreement. Furthermore, it can mark lack of importance and irrelevance.

From a pragmatic perspective, *ben* can function as a face-threat mitigator and can signal concession and incoherence and can utter demur. As a discourse-structuring marker, *ben* fulfills function as turn-initiator, narrative-structuring marker, and introducing reported speech, hesitation and repair marker.

### 4.3.1.3 Preliminary conclusion

It has been demonstrated in the previous part of this chapter that *bon, ben* and *well* are highly polysemous and multifunctional items. While the French markers *bon* and *ben* both overlap to a certain extent in their functions and senses, they differ in others. Consequently, they overlap to varying degrees with their English counterpart *well*.

The aim of this preliminary conclusion is to provide a concluding overview concerning the functions of these three markers.

The pragmatic marker *well* has a range of polysemous senses, varying from full agreement and acceptance over partial (dis)agreement to strong disagreement and non-acceptance. While the French marker *ben* indeed can mark partial (dis)agreement and non-acceptance, it cannot signal full acceptance. This meaning is without doubt an older meaning of *ben*, which has been lost. However, this meaning pattern is part of the marker *bien*, from which the marker *ben* evolved. The marker *bien* was not part of the current analysis but it has to be mentioned that *bien* and *ben* are regarded here as two different markers with differing meaning patterns and functions. A meaning implying acceptance and agreement can only be achieved by combining the marker *ben* with other markers, such as in *ben voilà*, or with other lexemes that are positively connoted, such as *ben oui* or *ben bien sûr*. 
In comparison, it is striking that *bon* did not travel the whole path to non-acceptance, in that it always keeps implying a certain positive evaluation. This reveals especially strongly in cross-linguistic comparison with *well*, which can be translated by *bon* or *ben* according to the respective usage.

The same is true when comparing the pragmatic functions of the markers. *Well* often functions as a face-threat mitigator, it marks concession and demur, flags incoherence and discrepancy and it can, in certain discourse environments, fulfill hedging functions. In comparison, *bon* cannot mark demur and incoherence but can function as a stage-marking device, as a ‘mot de la fin’. This latter function cannot be attributed to English *well*. In contrast, *ben* can utter all the pragmatic functions that can be attributed to *well*.

Regarding the discourse-structuring functions of the markers, it can be stated that all of them can fulfill discourse-structuring function, appear as repair, hesitation and pause filling markers, marks turn-openings and utterance boundaries, structure narratives and introduce the beginning of reported speech. While all these markers can appear in utterance-initial, -medial and -final position, some preferences in position become visible in the monolingual corpus data.

While *well* appears mostly on utterance-initial position, *ben* occurs regularly in utterance-medial position. Both markers occur infrequently in utterance-final position, in contrast to *bon*, which acts regularly as a ‘mot de la fin’, frequently at the end of an utterance. In addition, *bon* appears more often in utterance-medial position than the other markers in question.

It can be concluded that the three markers are all partially equivalent and that English *well* can be translated by *ben* or *bon* according to the respective usage. It is self-evident that in different discourse environments *well* can also be translated by other French items, such as *enfin*, *bref* or *bien*, or by combinations of French markers, such as *enfin bref*, *bon ben*, *enfin bon* etc. Respectively, French *bon* and *ben* may be, depending on the discourse environment, translated by other markers, such as *I mean* and *so*. These cases are partly displayed in Figure 27, (for a more detailed overview see e.g. Beeching 2011).

The upcoming analysis aims to focus on *bon*, *ben* and *well* in French and English spoken in Manitoba and will not take into account other possible translation equivalents.

### 4.3.2. *Bon, ben and well* in Franco-Manitoban

This part of the chapter aims to verify if *bon*, *ben* and *well* occur in Franco-Manitoban discourse and which discourse-pragmatic functions they can fulfill in monolingual and bilingual speech of this variety of French.
The overall frequencies of the respective markers can give first insight into their usages in Manitoban French:

This figure shows that *ben* is by far the most frequent of these three markers in Franco-Manitoban speech. The marker *bon* is almost inexistant in the FM Corpus and the marker *well* appears regularly but not particularly frequently. This first impression can be confirmed by the overall speaker distribution of the markers:

This figure illustrates that one and the same speaker utters the rare occurrences of *bon*. In addition, *bon* never occurs in bilingual discourse or English utterances. Most of the speakers in the
FM Corpus use the marker *ben* in their discourse and only less than one third of the speakers use the marker *well*.

The fact that *ben* is by far more frequent than *well* is certainly partly due to the majority of French discourse in the FM Corpus. The marker *well* does not appear at all in monolingual French discourse and only 16% of its occurrences appear in bilingual utterances. As to the marker *ben*, it also mostly stands in monolingual French environments. Only in 8% of the cases, it is preceded or followed by English discourse.

In the following, the aim of this analysis is to contrast the functions and meaning patterns of the three markers in Franco-Manitoban. Here, the focus will lie on the question if the markers underwent processes of contact-induced language change and how these processes are represented in the corpus data.

### 4.3.2.1 *Well* in Franco-Manitoban

The pragmatic marker *well* is not a particularly frequent item in Franco-Manitoban spoken language. Still, a range of varying senses and functions that are attributed to the marker in Spoken Colloquial Canadian English can also be found in the FM Corpus data. As in the data from the CoCa Corpus in the previous section, *well* in the FM data can mark complete agreement only when it is combined with another item of positive evaluation:

219) WIL: yeah but I have the impact. so...so you know...if you want your money to have impact...tu l’investis au Francoconseil...tu le dépenses pas.
GR: c’est ça...you make them look good.
WIL: ya exactement...*well* oui...puis I wanna use that argument and I know it’s true I just need the backup.

In this example *well* stands in a French environment and it signals on the one hand positive agreement but on the other hand it fulfills discourse structuring functions. In the following example, *well* expresses partial agreement with the framework of the preceding speaker:

220) ME so you wanna go to...to Europe? NI eh...ya ((1s)) ya...*well* like
••I’ve been to France ((1.3s)) and I’ve been to London. I’d go back ’cause I didn’t spend very much time there...well especially London I spent like 6 hours there. so there’s no way that you...can do anything there

For speaker NI, it is important to establish common ground by saying that she does not only want to go to Europe but that she has already been there. Thereby, she first responds to the preceding question and then completes the lack of information of the preceding speaker ME.

In some cases, *well* expressing agreement can also contain the meaning pattern of accepting an unchangeable state, as in:
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221) CA c’est vrai elle s’en va à Ottawa hein?
ZA fucked up ((1s)) j’suis tellement triste.
ZA oh well. ya ya ya.
CA oh well • • • all things come to an end.

The speaker ZA is sad that his friend is moving to Ottawa and he expresses his powerlessness by *oh well*. The speaker CA seizes this expression and also utters *oh well* to express that she cannot do anything to change the situation.

In other cases, *well* expressing agreement can imply a certain lack of importance or interest concerning the information of the preceding speaker.

222) GER ya • • c’était awesome. • • oh ya c’était un de mes meilleurs cours en fait. (j’pense c’était le meilleur cours)
WIL oh ya? well’ ((laughs))

In this example, speaker GER talks about a class he took at university. Instead of replying, speaker WIL utters *well* to express that he does not want to add anything to this topic.

Concerning its pragmatic functions, *well* in the FM Corpus can mark concession (223) or can be used as a face-threat mitigator (224):

223) ME he died last year.
DM ya. • •well they’re pretty lucky they had/ they were pretty close to him so eh. ya. ya.ya.
GR hm.

224) ZA is any of it good? • • Who are these people? I’ve never heard of these’
WIL eehm…
ZA hm well ((1.2)) do these guys actually get to have careers? comme • est-ce qu’ils font de l’argent?

In the first example *well* marks concession in that it could be replaced by *but*. In the second example, the speaker ZA utters a question and does not get any immediate response from his conversation partner. Therefore he initiates a reformulation of the question by introducing it with *well*. Thereby, the speaker ZA aims to clear the discrepancy in conversation that was evoked by his preceding question. As a face-threat mitigator, *well* also appears in code-switching environments:

225) ME but do you think it’s possible here? (…)
GR on n’a pas un • / well it’s gonna take a while if it’s gonna happen

In this case, *well* does not only introduce a self-repair but it also initiates a dispreferred response and therefore acts as a face-threat mitigator.

It is striking that in most occurrences, *well* acts as a discourse-structuring device, such as for bracketing (226) and to introduce a reported speech (227).
226) GR they were gonna enact a law that made the province bilingual ((1.5s)) but (( )) la crise linguistique well there’s a huge backlash from the public within the party. ya I guess.

227) SA je commençais à enseigner and like • (après) comme trois ans j’avais comme • • • comme presque cent étudiants like/ like to myself and I was like «ah well I guess comme • je devrais peut-être (( )) l’enseignement».

In both examples, well stands in a bilingual discourse environment. In (226), the speaker introduces by well a bracket that contains a further explication of the situation. In (227), apart from introducing a reported speech, well, in combination with ah, utters surprise. In the FM Corpus, well also functions as a hesitation marker, such as in:

228) WIL donc d’envoyer un courriel • • t’sais «oui vous avez • • vous avez dit que vous avez appris mais vous utilisez ce que vous avez appris?» • •
GER ok.
WIL type of stuff • • juste/ uh • • ya well • •c’est j’ai/ j’ai…

In this example, well is part of uttering the monitoring and planning process of the speaker.

It can be stated that well is not used very frequently in Franco-Manitoban speech. In most cases, it expresses (partial) agreement, concession or discourse-structuring functions. The corpus data contains no example of well expressing disagreement. This does not mean that this function does not exist in Franco-Manitoban discourse; it shows rather that this function is relatively rare. In general, well does not occur in bilingual utterances very frequently and in these cases it mostly fulfills discourse-structuring functions.

4.3.2.2 Bon and ben in Franco-Manitoban

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, ben and bon have very differing appearances in the FM Corpus. While a wide range of speakers uses ben very frequently, only one speaker employs bon twice. In one occurrence bon introduces reported speech (229) and the other occurrence is a combination with ben to flag conclusion and to express monitoring and planning processes (230):

229) WIL: finalement la semaine passée j’appelles parce que j’ai envoyé • • • un courriel à ce temps là ((1.s)) basically disant «bon • • •Promo Musique vous allez pas couvrir ces coûts là vous allez couvrir ces coûts là au lieu • • (…)

230) WIL: oui c’est Ren/ c’est elle même qui les traite maintenant • • comme c’est Renée Remillard qui traite • la demande de Francochant directement • • oui • •WCMA• elle-même ((1s)) demande de programmation du Franco-conseil • elle-même • • • bon ben • •
In both examples bon fulfills mainly discourse-structuring functions. There is no evidence for the different semantic senses and pragmatic functions of bon in Franco-Manitoban. A preliminary explanation would suggest that the frequency of ben is at the expense of the frequency of bon. This explanation seems hard to be maintained concerning the coexistence of bon and ben in European French.

Hence, a closer look at the meaning patterns and functions of ben in Manitoban French is needed to gain further insight into this question.

In Franco-Manitoban speech, ben can contain a wide range of polysemous senses that vary from complete agreement (231) over partial agreement (232) to partial disagreement (233) and complete disagreement (234):

231) GER t’sais on met • • telle chose dans le budget puis là • a/ après ils nous disent «oh le maximum dans ce poste budgétaire là c’est mille» • comme pour réalisation.
WIL right. • • (( ) ben oui. ben oui
GER c’est comme • ben pourquoi elle nous a pas dit que c’était mille • • • là parce que là • • • on aurait mit • • l’argent qu’il faut qu’on paie • à (( )) • • • dans un autre poste comme arrangement ou quelque chose.
WIL ben oui.
GER c’est comme «ooh • • c’était ça le maximum? • • • ha • mettez une liste avec tous les maximums»
WIL ben oui • • c’est pas difficile • like what’ ((1.6s))

232) ZA ya • • t/ ya t’as pas le choix là? mais eeh…I wonder if you can peel off the sponsors ((laughing)) in fact just like/ • I like just… PJ ben il faut (quand même) connaître (( )) but…non c’est (( ))

233) FLO c’est combien…oui c’est co/ c’est combien de temps votre • • votre eeh sce…
CAR c’est comme vingt secondes.
FLO ah ok.
DAN ben trente secondes.

234) CAR ben on smash pour comme • •
ANT on dirait une minute.
DAN2 «on smash» ((laughs))
CAR ya peut-être une minute.
DAN2 non • (on smash pas les guitars pendant) (( ))
CAR ben non parce que faut qu’on • faut qu’on smash • • and then toi tu va chercher ta guitare • • • and then lui il va chercher sa guitare • and then (( )) le sien • • and then we kind of (gonna) start • • right?

When ben implies complete agreement it always needs to be complemented by an affirmative. When ben flags disagreement this often goes along with concession, such as in:
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In this example, *ben* introduces a disagreement with the utterance of the previous speaker but this disagreement has a limitation that is introduced by *but*. In its function to mark concession, *ben* mostly establishes common ground, as in:

236) **GR** (ça va être) plus facile de même. si t/ si t’as débranché ta basse sinon eeh • •
**DAN2** ya oh **ben** moi/ moi j’ai/ j’ai même pas besoin. (( )) of • • good to go. j’peux faire après. j’peux faire après.

Here, the speaker rejects the suggestion of the previous speaker **GR**. In his utterance, introduced by *ben*, he gives new information that is needed to establish common ground.

When marking concession, *ben* can also be used as a face-threat mitigator. In the following example, the speaker **GR** tries to attenuate his question that provoked consternation and a lack of understanding:

237) **GER** c’est qui Lady Gaga?
**ANT** what?
**FLO** you (gotta be) fucking kidding. ((laughs))
**ANT** are you kidding?
**GER** • • ah • • **ben** je sais qui c’est là *mais* • en fait je connais vraiment pas ses chansons.

Here, *ben* functions to introduce mitigation where the speaker **GR** clarifies his previous utterance and reestablishes common ground.

In contrast, *ben* can mark that something is obvious. Here, the speaker signals that the previous utterance was superfluous or not necessary for the current conversation:

238) **GR** in what sense? ((laughing))
**DM** *ben* • • in the fullest sense right?
**GR** ya. ya. ce serait awesome.

Besides, this example shows very clearly that *ben* is not restricted to one language environment and appears in purely English discourse as well.

When marking apparent facts, *ben* can also introduce something that should be common knowledge and is therefore obvious:

239) **DM** où est-ce que tu mets le trois si c’est racine cubique? tu mets ici right? • ya.
**GR** dans le pied.
DM ben c’est la racine carrée.
DR il me semblait c’était ça hein? quand c’est juste ça it’s like you assume • it’s racine carrée mais j’suis pas certain.

This function of ben can in some cases appear to mark an ironic statement. In the following example, the speaker GR tries to talk back to the speaker FLO. For this purpose, he introduces his utterance, which marks something obvious, by ben. This creates a certain irony and answers back on the disparaging comment of FLO:

240) CAR elle est vraiment comme la meilleure artiste de nos jours • •
DAN ya talent • talent suprême
FLO plus que toi.
GER oh ya? • • • ben elle fait plus d’argent que moi.

In all of the previous examples, ben is used utterance-initially. This is clearly the syntactic position in which ben appears most often in Franco-Manitoban discourse but it is in no way restricted to this syntactic environment. Especially when ben fulfills clear discourse structuring functions it is syntactically very flexible and can appear in different positions in an utterance.

In the previous examples, it becomes already apparent that ben is often used to introduce a certain part of speech or an utterance. In this function, ben appears often as a topic changer that either introduces a very new topic (241) or to backtrack on a pending topic (242):

241) CA ya. ok. ok. faut là qu’on trouve un temps.ok. • •awesome. on/ on va se repasser pour s… ya. ah right.
ZA cool right on… ya for sure for sure. ben j’étais ici pour parler à Pierre • un ’tit peu.

242) CAR non… on va… on on pensait que ça ser/ à faire (d’une façon) • • so (when) we walk and then les juste mettre en comme (t’sais une seconde).
FLO ok ok ok. • ben Inga ici • elle va • • •

When structuring discourse, ben can not only introduce new or pending topics, it can also mark the beginning of a subtopic or a bracket (243), introduce reported speech (244) or flag conclusion (245):

243) NI mais ça coupe pas les mauvais herbes • • so on avait • on avait une atten/ une entente avec/ • ben en plus ils chargent comme 30 dollars de l’heure so on veut pas que c’est/ on veut pas embaucher quelqu’n

244) WIL puis là dans un courriel elle dit «ben chose certaine • les CBL là seront eh seront couverts là ces coûts là seront couverts • • (…)»

245) DM ya il était comme «je suis fou de Winnipeg» eh ya.ç’est awesome! c’est comme • il est déjà franco-manitobain là you know (( ))) ben c’est ça.
The structuring function of *ben* is also visible in monitoring phenomena such as repair (246) and hesitation and reformulation (247):

246) DM c’est le fun il y avait québéque / *ben* une f • • une famille québécoise là ehm • • • qui était en westy • •

247) NI ya • quand/ quand on est arrivé il était habillé comme • • *ben* • il porte souvent juste comme pantalon t-shirt • mais il avait aussi avait comme une casquette (…)

In a preliminary conclusion it may be noted that *ben* is a very polysemous and multifunctional item in Franco-Manitoban just as in European French. It can fulfill all functions and meaning patterns that are known for *ben* in European French and occasionally it appears in English or bilingual discourse. Still, the occurrence of *ben* in Code-Switching or purely English utterances is relatively seldom, only 7% of the appearances of *ben* do not stand in French discourse environments.

In addition, it has to be mentioned that *ben* mostly occurs in Code-Switching or English discourse when it fulfills mere discourse-structuring functions, such as introducing a topic, flagging conclusion, pausing and hesitations or bracketing. In these cases, the marker is particularly detachable from the propositional content of the utterance and this encourages free syntactic movement.

4.3.3 A case of crosslinguistic influence?

The current chapter aimed to provide a detailed analysis of the markers *well*, *bon* and *ben* and their respective use in European French and accordingly American English in comparison to their functioning in the FM Corpus data.

At first sight, it seems as if no relevant cross-linguistic influence affects these three markers. They all appear primarily in monolingual contexts and did not emerge new functions or meanings due to the language contact situation.

However, it is remarkable that the markers *well* and *bon* seem to suffer a decrease in frequency in comparison with their uses in spoken European French respective Standard English corpus data. Despite its infrequency, *well* still fulfills a range of functions in Manitoban speech. Here, a decrease in frequency does not necessarily go along with a decrease in productivity. No occurrence of *well* marking disagreement has been found in the corpus data but due to the small size of the corpus this fact does not allow to draw general conclusions.

More strikingly, the marker *bon* is almost inexistent in the FM Corpus data and is only expressed by one speaker. However, the data does not provide unequivocal evidence that *bon* in Fran-
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co-Manitoban has lost certain of its pragmatic functions and meaning patterns. This is mainly due to the lack of large-scale data and diachronic corpora for Franco-Manitoban. But even in large-scale corpora, it is often not possible to differentiate adequately between a lack of frequency and a lack of productivity of a certain lexical item. It can only be stated free of doubt that *bon* is not the first lexical choice to fill the semantic and pragmatic gaps in which it technically could occur.

If *bon* intrinsically is no appropriate lexical choice for the speakers, this entails the question why.

Initially, it does not seem that the cross-linguistic influence may be the reason for the decrease of *bon* in Franco-Manitoban. In European French, *bon* is very frequent and coexists with *ben* and other markers such as *(en)fin* and *bref*. Beeching (2007) even evokes the co-occurrence of *bon* with the markers *c’est-à-dire*, *(en)fin*, *hein*, *quand même*, *quoi* and *si vous voulez*. When taking a closer look at the FM Corpus data, it becomes obvious that not only *bon* is very infrequent in Franco-Manitoban but that its partial equivalents *(en)fin*, *(en)fin* and *bref* do not exist either. All these markers do not appear at all and this may have two possible reasons: 1. they only emerged recently in European French and therefore are not present in Manitoban French or 2. they were excluded from Manitoban spoken discourse due to particular reasons.

Mosegaard Hansen documents that the pragmatic marker *(en)fin* appears in diachronic data since the middle of the 16th century (Mosegaard Hansen 2005: 47). Waltereit (2007) proves that the marker *bref* already occurs at the end of the 17th century in combination with the marker *(en)fin* (Waltereit 2007: 100). As mentioned before, *bon* and *ben* already evolved their pragmatic functioning earlier, *bon* in the 16th century and *ben* in the 18th century (Waltereit 2007: 91-92). This diachronic evidence suggests that the markers *(en)fin* and *bref* did not emerge recently in European French, but even before the marker *ben* and after the marker *bon*. The absence of these markers in Manitoban French does indeed seem to have other reasons than their date of emergence.

One possible reason for the frequency of *ben* in contrast to the other partial equivalent markers may indeed be the influence of language contact. When comparing the possible translation equivalents of *well*, it is evident that *ben* overlaps in all the functions and meaning patterns with its English counterpart. All the other markers have different constraints in the overlap with *well*. As already mentioned, *bon* cannot mark disagreement and frequently functions as a ‘mot de la fin’ whereas *ben* and *well* frequently mark disagreement and do not occur as stage-marking devices. In contrast, *well* does not overlap very much in its semantic meaning neither with *(en)fin* nor with *bref*, in that both cannot utter positive evaluation and they express (dis)agreement only to a certain degree and in combination with other lexemes. That would mean that *ben* is chosen most frequently in Manitoban French because it has the most important overlap in functions and meanings with the English counterpart *well*. 
While this reasoning seems quite plausible, it does not explain the fact why the markers do not co-occur in Franco-Manitoban.

The upcoming chapter aims to review the results of the corpus analysis of the current chapter and to explain the ongoing processes of language change in the discourse marking system in Manitoban French. The questions arise which processes of language change can be found in the bilingual pragmatic markers, which role language contact plays in these processes and how these processes can be explained by means of the models of the bilingual language processing, retrieval and selection, introduced in chapter 2.
Impacts of language contact and change of pragmatic markers on bilingual language processing

The previous chapter provided an in-depth analysis of three triples of bilingual pragmatic markers and their occurrences and distribution in Manitoban French. Before reviewing the exact processes of language change, it is important to once again raise the issue of why the markers in Manitoban French do not really co-occur. Co-occurrence of discourse features is very common; not only in French but also in English (Pichler & Levey 2010). As mentioned before, speakers of European French have a wide range of co-occurring markers at their disposal and these markers are used frequently in spoken language. Surprisingly, very frequent markers from European French, such as enfîn/fin, bref, tu vois, genre, quoi, do not occur at all in Manitoban French corpus data. Furthermore, even frequent markers that emerged in Quebec French, such as fait que and coudon, do not appear at all in the present data. In addition, it is striking that all markers analyzed in this chapter seem to have undergone changes in frequency and/or productivity. While the marker comme has experienced a huge increase in frequency that goes along with a broadening of productivity, other markers such as bon have seen an important decrease in frequency together with a possible, yet not unequivocally provable, decrease in productivity.

At this point it is important to mention that an increase of frequency of a certain phenomenon does not necessarily correlate with an increase of productivity of the same phenomenon and vice versa. This is demonstrated very clearly by Poplack (2001) on the basis of different grammatical phenomena. For instance, she proved via a variationist sociolinguistic approach that while the use of the subjunctive in Quebec French decreases the use of the verbs valoir and falloir with subjunctive increase (Poplack & Levey 2010). That is to say that only a small number of verbs are used with subjunctive in spoken Quebec French but that this small number of verbs are used significantly more often with subjunctive than before (ibid.).

In the use of pragmatic markers in Manitoban French, we see a somewhat similar but not comparable evolution. While a small amount of markers, such as like, comme, so and ben, are used very frequently, there is no comparable co-occurrence of markers.

There may be two explanations for the lack of variation in the discourse marking system in Manitoban French. Sankoff et al. (1997) observed in their corpus data from Anglophone L2 French speakers in Montreal that the speakers used significantly less pragmatic markers when speaking in their L2 than in their L1. In this case, the use of pragmatic markers increased in parallel to
the L2 language skills (Sankoff et al. 1997: 213). That is to say, native language skills may be one possible reason for the size of the discourse marking system in Manitoban French. Furthermore, Sankoff and colleagues have identified a correlation between the use of certain pragmatic markers and sociolinguist factors such as speaker’s childhood environment, gender and social class (Sankoff et al. 1997: 214).

An in-depth analysis of sociolinguistic factors of the speakers in the FM corpus is not possible within the framework of this study. Hence, the description of the corpus data in the previous chapter gives insight into the speakers’ sociolinguistic environment and their language skills (see chapter 4). All speakers of the FM corpus consider French as their L1, despite the strong influence of English in all situations of their everyday life. All speakers in the corpus experienced their education up to their high school diploma exclusively in French. Furthermore, all of the speakers live in the French quarter of Winnipeg, Saint Boniface, and take an active part in the social and cultural activities of their community (see chapter 4). All these facts do not provide unequivocal evidence that a lack in language skills may trigger a the lack of variation in the discourse marking system of Manitoban French. A certain influence of specific sociolinguistic factors cannot be ruled out but these factors do not seem to be the only reason for the evolution of pragmatic markers in Franco-Manitoban.

Before analyzing the possible reasons for the evolution of the Manitoban discourse marking system in detail, it is important to recall the different processes of language change found in the corpus analysis. In Manitoban French spoken discourse, three possible impacts of language contact on the evolution of pragmatic markers manifest themselves:

1. Emergence of new pragmatic functions and semantic meanings
2. Integration of lexical material from one language into another language
3. Increase in frequency of one translation equivalent, decrease/absence of the others

These three processes are unequivocally visible in the present corpus data, as well as the absence of frequent European French and Quebec French markers. This all raises the question: which role does language contact play in these three processes? A psycholinguistic approach can help to give more insight into the role of language contact in these processes of language change. This entails the question of how these processes can be explained by means of the models of the bilingual representations and processing (see chapter 2).

The focus of the following subchapters is on an answer to these questions by considering the three different processes of language change separately.
5.1 Contact-induced change in bilingual language processing

In the first process, called contact-promoted change in , language contact clearly plays an important role. It has been hypothesized that parallel activation of certain semantic representations is strengthened by semantic overlap of two partially equivalent lexical items. Consequently, new functions and meanings, which are already existent in the source language, may emerge in the target language. In this case, the partial overlap of the semantic representations of two lexical items from the source and the target language promotes the emergence of new functions and meanings in the target language. This implies that the contact-promoted change follows internal grammaticalization paths, inspired by semantic meaning patterns that exist in the source language. This is to say, the process as such is an internal process that is triggered by partial semantic and pragmatic overlap.

To account for this evolution from a psycholinguistic view, it is important to have recourse to current models of the bilingual lexicon presented in chapter 2. As mentioned in chapter 2, Finkbeiner et al. (2004) created the Sense Model on the basis of the Distributed Conceptual Feature Model (DCFM) by de Groot (1992). They relied on different experiments that gave important insights into the interconnection of semantic patterns in the bilingual brain (for a detailed review see chapter 2). Van Hell and de Groot showed that lexical items from different languages are processed faster when they share more semantic representations (van Hell, de Groot 1998). Rodd et al. demonstrated in monolingual lexical decision tasks that the response latencies of the participants are sensitive to the amount of semantic patterns of a lexical item (Rodd, Gaskell & Marslen-Wilson 2002). In their experiments, they also accounted for faster processing of polysemous items, having several interrelated meanings, and slower processing of homonymous items, having an overlap in form but no related meanings.

In the Sense Model (see Figure 9), Finkbeiner et al. assume that most words are polysemous and that the semantic senses of a word may vary across languages (Finkbeiner et al. 2004: 9). They refer to semantic senses as “bundles of features corresponding to distinct usages” (Finkbeiner et al. 2004: 8) and describe a word’s senses as “the way in which conceptual features are bound together” (ibid.). According to this definition, semantic senses do not only contain semantic information but also information about pragmatic functions that are called ‘distinct usages’ by Finkbeiner and colleagues.

This model can explain important peculiarities of semantic representations in the bilingual brain, including the cross-language asymmetry in semantic- and translation priming and the lack of this asymmetry in categorization tasks. Hence, this model may also be an appropriate tool to visualize the possible impacts of contact-promoted language change in the bilingual brain.
In many cases, ostensible translation equivalents only overlap in one or very few semantic senses. In this case, bilingual speakers have to deal with a discrepancy between conceptual and semantic representations, which Pavlenko calls *partial (non)equivalency* (Pavlenko 2009: 134). This partial (non)equivalency is especially critical for L2 learners but it can also influence the processing of very fluent bilinguals (see chapter 2). It is this partial (non)equivalency that seems to be the point of origin for contact-induced semantic change, respectively for the contact-promoted language change. In the present case, partial (non)equivalency triggered the emergence of new pragmatic functions and semantic meaning patterns of *comme* that were already present in the partial English translation equivalent *like*. This evolution has apparently been promoted by the strong increase in frequency and productivity of the marker *like* in monolingual English speech in the second half of the 20th century. The emergence of new patterns in English *like* may have evoked the need for an equivalent pattern in French of Francophone speakers in a contact situation with English. While in European French the partially equivalent form *genre* emerged, speakers of varieties of Canadian French took recourse to other mechanisms to create a French equivalent of English *like*.

According to the Sense Model, in francophone English learners and other bilingual speakers of these two languages, who are not living in a constant situation of language contact, the lexical forms *comme* and *like* may be represented as follows:

![Figure 31. The Sense Model (Finkbeiner et al. 2004) adapted for the lexical items comme and like in a non-contact variety](image)

In this adaptation of the Sense Model, *comme* and *like* overlap in their semantic representation to a certain degree. In contrast, in bilingual processing of speakers of Manitoban French and other varieties of Canadian French, *comme* and *like* seem to be represented in the following way:
This model presumes that the emergence of new meanings and functions of *comme* in Manitoban French has resulted in a stronger overlap of the semantic representations of the lexical forms *comme* and *like*. This hypothesis follows the definition of Finkbeiner et al. (2004) in that the semantic senses in the Sense Model also represent pragmatic functions of the respective lexemes.

The expansion of the semantic senses and pragmatic functions of *like* onto *comme* may be explained in more detail in context of bilingual lexical access. When considering that the respective speakers of Manitoban French frequently are in a bilingual mode, this triggers constant parallel activation of the partially overlapping semantic representations of *like* and *comme*. Due to the strong frequency of use of *like* and the lack of a French lexical equivalent for certain functions, activation of certain representations of *like* extended to *comme*. Over time, this created stronger activation of the lexical item *comme* for semantic representations that were formerly associated with *like*.

This shift in the strength of activation can be explained by means of different models of lexical access in speech production, presented in chapter 2. The weaker links model would explain this shift by a gradual formation of stronger links between the respective lexical item and the semantic representations. Competitive models would rely on the fact that the high frequency use of *like* in English triggered a higher activation of the newly emerging semantic representations for French *comme* on the semantic level. Still, on the lexical level the high frequency of *like* should lead to a stronger activation of *like* than of *comme*.

In addition it can be postulated that depending on the current language mode and the matrix language in the bilingual mode, the respective item is chosen in the lexical selection process. This would explain why in the FM Corpus data, there are only few occurrences of *like* in purely French discourse environments and of *comme* in purely English environments. To prove this hypothesis and to determine which model of lexical access is more appropriate to explain contact-promoted language change, it is necessary to resort to additional methods. In the upcoming chapter, psycholinguistic experiments are employed to account for the results of this analysis.
more precisely. The first experiment in the upcoming chapter compares the impact of the new pragmatic functions and semantic patterns of *comme* on speakers of the non-contact variety and the contact variety of French. The experimental design also considers whether the speakers of the non-contact variety have more problems to process the new pragmatic functions, that is to say whether the speakers of the contact variety can process the newly emerged functions in a better way. The present analysis is based on the corpus data and therefore on speech production. The following experiments will analyze the processing of the marker *comme* in speech perception. The choice to investigate the pragmatic markers in language perception is motivated by the fact that it is not possible to induce the use of these markers in speech production in a controlled experimental setting. Furthermore, these experiments allow a better comparison to other perception experiments, which were used to establish and test the Sense Model.

### 5.2 Borrowing in bilingual language processing

The second process that has been documented during the analysis of the FM Corpus data is the borrowing of the pragmatic marker *so* into Franco-Manitoban discourse. As explained in the respective subchapter, *so* most likely was first introduced as an one-word switch. According to Hlavac (2006), functional ‘versatility’ may be a reason to favor a pragmatic marker from one language over a marker from another language (Hlavac 2006: 1896). This preference to employ a certain marker from one language over other markers from another language may amplify by habitualisation (Hlavac 2006: 1872).

As pointed out by Matras, “the selection of structures by the speaker is not random, but defined by the linguistic task-schema that the speaker wishes to carry out” (Matras 2012: 20). According to him, all innovations in a language follow goal-oriented tasks. This is to say that *so* did not appear randomly in bilingual speech, but that it was first introduced for communicative reasons that have been explained in detail in the previous chapter of this work. While it is very plausible that speakers introduced *so* on purpose and for goal-oriented tasks, the question remains open how this borrowing affects the processing in the bilingual mental lexicon.

When in a bilingual mode, speakers activate both languages in the mental lexicon and both languages are equally accessible. It is however plausible that the matrix language of conversation is activated slightly more. Even in a bilingual mode, speakers control their languages precisely and are very aware of their choices (see chapter 2). Surely, the processing of code-switched words in the mental lexicon also depends on different extralinguistic variables such as language register, conversation partner and appropriateness of code switching in the respective situation. It can be concluded that code-switches do not appear in the language randomly and that the speakers can make use of some kind of control mechanism that regulates the output of speakers in bilingual
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conversation (see chapter 2). After being introduced as a one-word switch in Manitoban French, the marker so became an appropriate lexical choice even when French is clearly the matrix language of conversation. In the FM Corpus code-switches do generally occur in irregular intervals and the same code-switched word does not appear regularly. In contrast, the borrowing of so occurs regularly and frequently, mostly in purely French or bilingual contexts.

Still, it can be assumed that so is not perceived as a French lexeme by the Franco-Manitoban speakers. This is amongst others reflected in its phonological form and its lack of integration into the propositional content of non-English discourse. This adds to the conclusion that so is still a part of the English lexical representations of bilingual speakers. It has to be mentioned again that the present data only allow making clear presumptions about the use of this marker by speakers who currently are in a bilingual language mode.

To explain the process of borrowing lexical material from one language into another in speech production, it is essential to take recourse to models of bilingual lexical access, introduced in chapter 2. All these models make assumptions about how the process of lexical selection and retrieval may be described, but none of these models gives a clear indication of how changes in the lexical choices of speakers may be explained. Possible reasons for the use of so in French discourse are its phonological properties as well as its multifunctional and polysemous nature. While the speakers have only one appropriate choice in English, they have the choice between the partially equivalent items alors and donc in French. Therefore, so may have been introduced originally for a lighter cognitive load in lexical selection (Matras 1998: 321).

From the perspective of competitive models of lexical access, this would mean that the competitive pressure for the English item so is less strong than for the items donc and alors. Furthermore, so at a lexical level is connected to a wider range of semantic representations, and in extension pragmatic functionings than its partial French counterparts. Over time, or in Havlacs words by habitualisation, the activation of so during the lexical retrieval process may have amplified. This amplification of the lexical choice so can be explained by means of competitive models of lexical access just as via the weaker links model, presented in chapter 2. In view of the weaker links model, the increase in frequency of so, due to its use as a one-word switch, triggered stronger links of this item to the semantic level. In turn, these emerging stronger links to the semantic level then created a stronger activation of so as a lexical choice in retrieval. When considering the results from Gollan et al. (2011), there is evidence that language production is a particularly semantically sensitive process, while speech comprehension is to a greater extent frequency driven. More work on the correlation between frequency and semantics in lexical access and retrieval is needed to account for the exact role of these variables in language processing. Due to the lack of unequivocal experimental evidence, one can only venture the assumption that the increase of frequency of so as a one word switch triggered stronger semantic links by the bilingual hearers. These hearers in turn employed so more frequently due to the stronger semantic links. The exact
mutually dependency of frequency and stronger semantic activation in the process of borrowing remains indistinct and can only be resolved by means of more diachronic corpus data and additional experimental evidence.

Models of the bilingual lexicon, relying, at least partially, on competition can explain the borrowing of *so* by a stronger activation of this item compared to its French counterparts. This strengthening in activation may be due to the higher polyfunctional and polysemous character of *so* and its use as a one-word switch. While this explanation seems indeed plausible, one problem still rests unsolved. According to this view, the contact-induced language change in and the borrowing in the current chapter would underlie the same changes in lexical processing. So why do we have to deal with the emergence of new functions in the first case and with borrowing of lexical material in the latter? This question will be addressed in the concluding part of this chapter.

In the upcoming chapter, experimental evidence will be provided to clarify the lexical processing of *so* and its counterparts in bilingual speech comprehension.

### 5.3 Word frequency change in language contact

As already mentioned earlier, according to most current studies on bilingual language processing the semantic representations are shared between languages and that languages are interdependent yet separate at word level. It is generally accepted that both languages are always activated, even though the degrees of activation vary depending on e.g. the language mode, language dominance and the language the respective bilingual is currently speaking. In corpus-based studies, it has been shown that the frequency in the use of pragmatic markers varies when speakers talk in their L1 or L2 (Sankoff et al. 1997) and is largely dependent on the individual speaker (ibid.). Still, Poplack and Levey (2010) state “frequency is at the root of most inferences of change, whether manifested as raw rates of occurrence of a form or its diffusion across a community or linguistic system” (Poplack & Levey 2010: 410). While the present corpus data clearly does not provide enough material to conduct an unequivocal frequency analysis of the markers in Manitoban French, it gives a first insight into frequency distribution in comparison with large-scale monolingual corpus data.

In the present corpus analysis, an unbalance of frequency of certain pragmatic marker pairs has been detected and the question arose how this mismatch in frequency can be explained. Another related question is why there is an important decrease in co-occurrence of the pragmatic markers in the FM Corpus and if this lack of co-occurrence correlates with the lack of frequency.
The hypothesis for the current chapter hence is that this change in frequency and co-occurrence of the markers in the FM Corpus can be related to the language contact situation. This hypothesis implies more subtle influence of language contact that cannot be proven right or wrong only by means of corpus data. Therefore, it is important to take recourse to psycholinguistic studies on the phenomena of cross-linguistic influence in lexical access and its possible impacts on bilingual speech processing.

The different approaches of bilingual lexical access were presented in detail in chapter 2. As already mentioned, most current models suppose that bilingual language processing is, at least to some degree and on some representational levels, a competitive process. In this view, translation equivalents compete for lexical activation and selection (e.g. Levelt et al, 1999). When regarding lexical access as a competitive process, word frequency may be one important factor for bilinguals to manage this inference when they are in a bilingual mode. Gaskell and Marslen-Wilson (2002) conducted four cross-modal priming tasks with monolingual English speakers to determine the competition effect on lexical activation in speech perception. They performed one repetition-priming task and three semantic and associative priming tasks and examined the effects of cohort set size on lexical activation (Gaskell & Marslen-Wilson 2002: 227). They find evidence in all four experiments that priming is sensitive to low and high competition fragments. In consequence, they propose that parallel activation of more than one lexical representation in bilinguals leads to costs “in terms of reduced activation of the multiple lexical entries” (Gaskell, Marslen-Wilson 2001: 255). In this case, word frequency is one variable for bilinguals to manage lexical retrieval and selection and to reduce the costs in bilingual speech.

A second approach, presented in chapter 2, is the weaker links hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, bilinguals are disadvantaged in speech production to monolinguals because word frequency is subdivided into the two languages (e.g. Gollan & Silverberg, 2001; Gollan et al., 2002; Gollan et al. 2008). In this view, speakers do not use the translation equivalents of the two languages equally frequently. Hence, one lexical representation may be activated more frequently than the equivalent lexical representation of the other language. This distribution of frequency over the two languages then leads to weaker or stronger links between the lexical representation of the respective language and the conceptual level (Gollan et al. 2008). The SbP model by Schwieter and Sundermann (2008) does not only rely on frequency as a variable for lexical selection but explains the mechanisms of word retrieval with the term lexical robustness. In accordance with Costa et al. (2006), they propose “that lexical robustness involves the familiarity with and frequency of access that leads to greater automaticity of retrieval of lexical items” (Schwieter & Sundermann 2008: 216).

At this point it is clear that all approaches consider frequency as a more or less important factor in lexical access. But when facing word frequency change in language contact, it is necessary to approach the problem from a different perspective. While in current accounts of lexical ac-
cess, frequency is considered as a factor that explains differences in language processing; in the present case it is a variable that may change in a specific language contact situation. A potential starting point to this problem is the possible yet still unclear correlation between semantic constraints and frequency in lexical access, pointed out by Gollan and colleagues (2011). The possibility that speakers may rely to a stronger extent on semantic constraints in speech production indeed offers opportunities to explain the frequency shift in the use of pragmatic markers in Manitoban French. In most models of lexical access in speech production, it is assumed that semantic representations are accessed in an earlier stage than lexical word forms. This would mean that semantic constraints would have an earlier impact on word selection than frequency, which is coded at the lexical level (Gollan et al 2011). The exact interaction between these two levels of course depends on the prediction about top-down and bottom-up activation in the respective model.

In the case of the marker pair *ben, bon* and *well*, the shift in frequency may initially be due to the phonological and semantic nature of the respective items. The marker *well* contains very language-specific phonological information and therefore it may not be very suited for integration into French discourse. Comparing the markers *ben* and *bon*, *ben* shows more semantic and pragmatic overlap with English *well*. Hence this item may be rather suited for integration into bilingual speech. These two factors may be at the origin of a higher activation of *ben* in the discourse of Manitoban bilingual speakers. As a result this may have lead to a frequency shift.

### 5.4 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to propose a first psycholinguistic interpretation of the language changes of pragmatic markers on the basis of the findings in the FM Corpus data. It was demonstrated that the transformation of the markers in the speech production of bilingual Franco-Manitobans reconcile with current models of bilingual language processing. This chapter focused on speech production because the underlying corpus data does not allow any presumptions about the impact of these processes of language change in speech comprehension.

It is hence possible that processes of speech comprehension may have triggered the processes of language change in the speech production of the speakers. The high frequency of the English markers in English discourse may have led to a faster access of the semantic representations of the respective lexical items in speech production. The present corpus data do not allow drawing any conclusions on this point. Additional experimental evidence is necessary to make clear statements to validate this notion. Independently thereof, it remains unclear why all marker pairs, analyzed in the previous chapters, undergo such different processes of language change. While it is possible to detect the emergence of new functions and meaning patterns in French *comme,*
the other French markers *alors, donc, ben* and *bon* do not experience a parallel evolution. While the English marker *so* is borrowed into French discourse, the other English markers *like* and *well* almost exclusively occur in purely English discourse environments.

It is well known that lexical items may undergo different processes of language change, and Matras (2012) even establishes a continuum of contact-induced creativity and innovation:

![Contact-induced creativity and innovation](image)

This continuum ranges from non-conscious to conscious processes that imply a wide range of effects and still are all function-driven and goal-oriented (Matras 2012: 48). Nevertheless, it is striking that lexical items from one word class behave so differently in language contact.

A first starting point to an explanation of these differences may be the fact that *comme* and *like* emerged their purely pragmatic functions from hedging functions. When taking adaptor, rounder and quotative functions, they contribute to the propositional content of an utterance. In that point, *like* and *comme* differ from other pragmatic markers, which occur in the syntactic periphery of an utterance and do not modify its truth conditions. *Comme* and *like* are semantically and syntactically more integrated into discourse, when taking the above-named functions. This may have facilitated the mapping of functions from *like* onto *comme*.

In contrast, pragmatic *well* and *so* are generally not integrated into the syntax and semantics of an utterance and are easily detachable without modifying its truth-conditional meaning. As mentioned in chapter 1.2, the semantic, syntactic and even pragmatic detachability is an important factor to establish borrowability scales. The more a lexical item is detachable and flexible, the more it is suitable for borrowing. This fact explains why the marker *like* is not as suited for borrowing as the markers *well, ben, bon* and *so, donc, alors*. The possible reasons for the borrowing of *so* have already been studied in detail in the previous chapter. Still, it remains questionable why the pragmatic marker *well* does not undergo the same process. As pointed out in the corpus analysis, the marker *well* is not as frequent as the marker *so* and it is less suited for borrowing due to its phonological characteristics. In the FM Corpus, it seems more so that the French marker *ben* is more suited for borrowing, albeit in very small occurrences. Here, *ben* carries phonological characteristics that may facilitate the borrowing of this item. As a result, this explains the preference of speakers to use French *ben* and English *so* instead of other partially equivalent markers.
As stated earlier, parallel activation of lexical forms results in time costs (Gaskell, Marslen-Wilson (2001). To reduce these costs, and in consequence cognitive load, bilingual speakers may favor one pragmatic marker from one language over other markers. The preference of the respective marker then results in an increase of frequency and in a higher activation of the marker in lexical access.

On the basis of the underlying corpus data, it can be concluded that the different processes of language change are explainable by the differing phonological, semantic and pragmatic constitutions of the respective markers. The question remains open if these different processes of language change trigger a different processing of the markers in bilingual lexical access in speech perception. I suggest three questions to address this matter adequately:

1. Is the contact-promoted change of *comme* anchored in the bilingual language representations?
2. Does the frequent borrowing of *so* have an impact on its lexical processing and the interdependence with its partially equivalent markers?
3. Does the increase in frequency of *ben* and the decrease of its counterparts have an impact on bilingual lexical access?

In order to answer these questions, I performed two lexical decision tasks, whose results will be presented in the upcoming chapter. The first experiment, a monolingual French sentence-word verification task with lexical decision, aims to compare the impact of the markers *comme* and *genre* in the lexical processing of highly fluent Franco-Manitoban bilinguals who live in a constant language contact situation and less fluent bilingual speakers with English as a L2 who live in a French language environment.

The second experiment, a bilingual masked priming task with lexical decision, aims to give insights into the interdependence of the nine markers. The main question is, if the language changes, presented in this chapter, have an impact on priming effects in the above-named Franco-Manitoban speakers in comparison with the less fluent French-English speakers.

Furthermore, I will questioned on the basis of the results of the experiments if pragmatic markers are mapped onto conceptual representations or if they encode procedural meaning. I will discuss implications of the findings on the models of lexical access in a conclusive part of the next chapter.
Experimental Investigation

The present chapter aims to provide experimental support for the analysis of contact-induced language change of pragmatic markers in Manitoban French (see chapter and ). The special focus lies on an adequate answer to the three questions formulated on the previous page (5.4). In a first part, methodical considerations of the present psycholinguistic investigation will be outlined. Primarily, a state of the art of experimental investigations on pragmatic markers is provided. Furthermore, the choice of tasks as well as the choice of the experimental and control group will be explained. Subsequently, the data and the results of the experimental investigation will be presented and discussed.

6.1 Methodical considerations

For a long time, psycholinguistic research focused mainly on isolated word forms and especially on prototypical word types such as nouns (Pavlenko 2009, see 2.3). Therefore, the analysis of pragmatic markers in their semantic and pragmatic context is very important. Still, the experimental investigation of pragmatic markers demands specific methodical considerations. This is even more important when considering that pragmatic markers have only been analyzed experimentally in very few studies.

The major problems in the experimental analysis go along with the general problems in defining and limiting the class of pragmatic markers (see chapter 1). One important point concerns the fact that pragmatic markers are highly polysemous and polyfunctional items and that they generally emerged from already existent lexical items (see chapter 1 and 4). Another important problem applies to the experimental investigation of contact-induced change. As indicated in the above-named citation, Pavlenko criticizes that current psycholinguistic investigations try to avoid cross-linguistic differences. Cross-linguistic variation has become a matter of interest in recent research (e.g. in the Sense Model of Finkbeiner et al. 2004, see chapter 2). However, as far as it is known, contact-induced language change has not been examined experimentally at all.

Hence, to investigate the hypothesis of the present paper (see 5.4) from a psycholinguistic perspective, it is of major importance to first present the methodical background in detail.
Therefore, the present chapter aims to first give an overview of experimental investigations of pragmatic markers and related word types, such as connectives.

In the second part, the choice of the tasks will be explained in detail and with regard to the above-named problems. In the third part, the choice of participants, that is the experimental and the control group, will be defined in view of the choice of the tasks. At the end of this part, a brief description of the overall design of the present study is given.

6.1.1 Experimental Investigations on Pragmatic Markers: State of the Art

Only few studies focus on the role of non-prototypical word types in monolingual and bilingual speech processing.

An important problem in psycholinguistic research concerns the role of connectives, relational markers, pragmatic markers and hedges in sentence comprehension. These items are often referred to as encoding procedural meaning and/or not contributing to the truth-conditional content of an utterance (see chapter 1 and chapter 4). The main issue relates to their role in linking different parts of speech and establishing coherence in sentence comprehension. It is assumed that increasing coherence leads to increasing comprehension and in consequence to faster response latencies (Britton 1994; Britton & Gülgöz, 1991; Murray 1995). Three main assumptions have been made in current research on the effect of connectives and relational markers on sentence comprehension. First, they may have a facilitatory effect (Haberlandt 1982; Bestgen, Vonk, 1995; Sanders & Noordman 2000); second, they may have an interfering effect (Sanders 1992; Millis et al. 1993), or third, no effect at all (Meyer 1975; Sanders 1992). Most current experimental evidence on this topic focuses on different reading tasks in sentence and text processing (for an overview see Sanders & Noordman 2000).

The research on the role of pragmatic markers and hedges in conversation mostly focuses on speech production and the results are mainly based on the analysis of spoken language corpus data (see chapter 1 and 4). Until today, only few studies center on the processing of pragmatic markers and hedges and their effect on speech comprehension (Fox Tree 1995; Fox Tree & Schrock 1999; Holtgraves 2000; Blankenship & Holtgraves 2005; Fox Tree 2006; Liu & Fox Tree 2012). Fox Tree (1995) observed the influence of the pragmatic marker *and* on the processing of false starts that occur at the beginning of an utterance (beginning false starts) or in the middle of an utterance or respectively after a pragmatic marker (middle false starts). Participants showed slower response latencies in English and Dutch word monitoring tasks when the false starts were preceded by *and* than without the lexeme *and*. Her findings suggest that *and* prefacing a false start changes a beginning false start into a middle false start in the hearers’ perception. In the relevant study on the marker *oh*, Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) performed two
word monitoring tasks and three semantic verification tasks in order to determine the role of *oh* in sentence comprehension. To compare the impact of *oh* on sentence comprehension, they aimed to compare parts of speech containing *oh* with the same parts of speech with *oh* digitally spliced out (pause). In the word monitoring tasks (adapted from Marslen-Wilson, Tyler 1980), participants listened to an excerpt of speech and pressed a button when they heard a particular word that was defined beforehand. One word-monitoring task (Experiment 1) included a pause; the second word-monitoring task (Experiment 2) was performed without pause. In the semantic verification tasks, the participants saw a visual target word while listening to the speech and they had to press a respective button depending on whether the word occurred in the auditory speech or not. In the first semantic verification task (Experiment 3), *oh* was replaced by a pause, in Experiment 4, it was excised entirely. In experiment 5, participants pressed no key when the respective word did not occur in the discourse. Fox Tree and Schrock found facilitatory effects for speech comprehension in word monitoring and semantic verification tasks after the marker *oh* compared to conditions were the *oh* was replaced by a pause or left out completely (Fox Tree & Schrock 1999: 293).

Still, their design includes several problematic issues, such as the length of the stimuli, varying from 41 to 247 words, and the differing placement of *oh* in the stimulus messages (Fox Tree & Schrock 1999: 285). Furthermore, the stimuli selection is not entirely clear. They state that the same stimuli are selected for experiment 1-4. The initial stimuli are used in experiment 1 and 3, but in experiment 2 and 4, “several long trials were shortened to reduce the likelihood of participants’ forgetting the target words while listening to the trials and more prominent target words were selected” (Fox Tree & Schrock, 1999: 288). Experiment 5 contains partly the same stimuli as experiment 4, partly completely new stimuli. The reason for this procedure and the resulting differences in the effects remain unclear. These inaccuracies in the design and procedure do not allow assigning the effects and the results unequivocally to the experimental variable.

In a judgement experiment with question-reply exchange, Holtgraves (2000) examined the speed and judgement of face-threatening interpretation of the pragmatic marker *well*. His results suggest that participants were significantly faster at verifying a face-threatening interpretation when the utterance contained *well*. These results were confirmed in a second experiment that measured sentence verification response latencies.

All studies on the processing of pragmatic markers vary in the concrete object of research, the applied methodology and the design and procedure of the respective experimental studies. Furthermore, there is no general agreement on the concrete interpretation of the results and their implications for theorizing and modeling. This may be partly due to the generally controversial role and classification of pragmatic markers and their strong polyfunctionality (see chapter 1). Still, all studies presented here agree on the point that pragmatic markers play some role in establishing discourse coherence and may help the hearers’ segmentation of speech.
As pointed out in chapter and , hedges differ from other discourse-pragmatic devices in several points. They may attenuate the semantic value or the illocutionary force of an utterance and may contribute to the propositional content. Therefore, it is important to differentiate between hedging functions of pragmatic markers and other purely pragmatic, and often syntactic peripheral, functions.

Several recent studies on hedging and related phenomena, such as tag questions, build on the differentiation between powerful and powerless speech (Haleta 1996; Hosman 1989, 1997; Hosman, Huebner, Siltanen 2002; Blankenship & Holtgraves 2005; for a review see Hosman 2002). According to Blankenship and Holtgraves (2005), “powerless language refers to the presence of one or more linguistic features such as tag questions, hesitations, disclaimers, hedges, polite forms, and so on. Powerful language refers to the absence of these features” (Blankenship & Holtgraves 2005: 4). That is to say, these researchers regard powerless speech as a kind of discourse that includes a high amount of attenuation, mitigation, hesitation and monitoring, etc. They assume, amongst others, that speakers evaluate low-power speech, including hedges, pragmatic markers, tag questions etc., less positively than high-power speech. Therefore, some recent studies on hedging, implying psycholinguistic approaches, deal with the exact nature of powerless and powerful speech and its impact on the hearer.

Hosman and Siltanen (2006) investigated the effect of markers of powerful and powerless speech on speaker evaluation, control of self and control of others attributions, cognitive responses and message memorability on monolingual English speakers. Participants read a high-power message or one of three low-power messages, containing either hedges, tag questions or intensifiers (Hosman & Siltanen 2006: 37). Afterwards, they completed a cognitive-response questionnaire, a questionnaire measuring the speaker’s intellectual competence, and a questionnaire on self-control and control of others. Two days later, they performed a recognition memory task (ibid.). According to the researchers, these results support the hypothesis that hedges are perceived as lower in intellectual competence and “exhibiting the least control of self and control of others” (Hosman & Siltanen 2006: 42).

Blankenship and Holtgraves (2005) examined the role of hedges and hesitations on the perception of powerless and powerful speech. English speaking participants listened to messages containing either hedges or hesitations or powerful speech and rated the messages according to different criteria such as attitude towards the message, speaker and message perception (Blankenship & Holtgraves 2005: 9). As a result, they found out that messages containing hedges and hesitations led to a more negative attitude of the participants towards the message. They argue, “these markers are distracting and hence lessen the overall impact of strong arguments” (Blankenship & Holtgraves 2005: 19).
In a very recent study, Lui and Fox Tree (2012) investigated the effect of hedges and the pragmatic marker *like* in speech perception of monolingual English speakers. They differentiate *like* from other hedges, because they also consider non-hedging functions of this marker. In a first task, they recorded speakers retelling their own story (production task) and speakers retelling others’ stories (perception task). Experiment 1 showed that participants did, in most cases, not retell hedge-marked information. Lui and Fox Tree interpret this result as evidence that listeners may overlook hedge-marked information. In a second experiment, participants listened to an audio recording, containing hedge-marked, *like*-marked and unmarked quantities. Afterwards the participants performed a memory task. In contrary, the results of the second experiment suggest that hedged information was remembered more accurately in the memory task than non-hedged information whereas *like* did not have any effect on the memory task. Lui and Fox Tree conclude from their results that hedges “provide pragmatic cues about what information is reliable enough to repeat to somebody else in a conversational context, but they do not prevent people from remembering that information” (Lui & Fox Tree 2012: 6).

All of these studies try to gain new insights into the processing of pragmatic markers and hedges. But they differ strongly in their concrete objects of investigation and in their experimental methods. While some studies aim to study the hearers’ attitude towards markers and hedges, other studies focus on the effect of markers and hedges on memorization or on the interpretation of face-threatening acts. Only Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) measured response latencies of participants to examine the role of a respective marker in sentence comprehension. Even though Fox Tree and Schrock have reported facilitatory effects of *oh* in spontaneous speech comprehension, the question of the exact effect of other pragmatic markers and hedges still rests unsolved. This is not only due to the inaccuracies in their experimental design and procedure, but also due to the role of the lexical item *oh* that was not defined clearly. Therefore, it is not possible to apply their results to the present investigation.

### 6.1.2 Choice of tasks

The choice of tasks is very important to assure a reliable investigation of the underlying hypothesis (see chapter 5). Due to the lack of substantive experimental studies on the processing of bilingual pragmatic markers, it was not possible to base the present study completely on already existent experimental designs. As mentioned in the introductory part of this chapter, two main problems had to be dealt with in the present investigation. That is (1) how to investigate pragmatic markers experimentally, and (2) how to investigate contact-induced change experimentally.
Furthermore, two choices had to be made concerning the tasks of the present investigation. That is (1) the choice of the languages of the tasks and (2) the choice of the investigation of pragmatic markers in sentence context or as isolated lexemes. To ensure a preferably broad perspective on the processing of pragmatic markers in language contact, I decided to perform two very differing tasks. The process of decision-making as well as the methodical background of each task will be explained in detail in the following.

6.1.2.1 Sentence-Word Verification Task

I designed a first task, a monolingual sentence verification task with lexical decision, to investigate the role of pragmatic markers and their newly emerged functions and meanings in language contact in sentence context. The present task only focuses on the functions and meaning patterns of the two partially equivalent markers comme and genre. In particular, the present study aims to investigate the question if the contact-promoted change of comme is anchored in bilingual language representations. To analyze this question adequately, the respective markers have to be investigated in sentence context.

Since pragmatic markers are very polysemous items with a large range of functions and meanings, the sentence context plays an important role in assigning a specific function to the respective marker. Still, the processing of sentences includes additional problems, such as the integration of semantic and pragmatic information in the sentence context and the syntactic relations between words. A short introduction to current approaches and issues in research on sentence processing has been given in chapter 2.3. The present experiment does not rely on concrete mechanisms of sentence processing, but rather on the response latencies on the visual target word in lexical decision. Therefore, it is beyond the scope of the present work to formulate a complete state of the art of current research on sentence processing (for an overview see e.g. van Gompel 2013).

The role of specific grammatical constructions and word types constitutes an important part in psycholinguistic research on sentence processing. Still, as mentioned in 6.1.1, only few studies investigate the role of pragmatic markers in sentence context. As far as it is known, the only study that deals with the measure of response latencies of pragmatic markers in sentence context is Fox Tree and Schrock (1999). In their 5 experiments, they investigate the role of the marker oh in English speech comprehension, but the design includes several seriously problematic issues (see 6.1.1). Therefore only the outline of the methodology will be adopted in the present study. The present sentence-word verification is loosely based on the word-monitoring task (Experiment 1 and 2) of Fox Tree and Schrock (1999). It also includes multi-modal stimulus presentation but in the present task, first a spoken sentence is presented to the participants, who then perform a lexical decision on a visual stimulus word. The choice of a lexical decision task is motivated by the fact that this task allows to control for confounding variables in the stimuli sentences.
and to measure concrete response latencies on a respective target word. In lexical decision tasks, participants have to decide whether a visually presented letter string is a word or not. The decision is generally made by pressing a respective Yes- or No-key on a keyboard or a joystick. It is assumed that several factors, such as frequency, orthography or the semantic nature of the word, influence the recognition of the respective word and consequently the response latencies of the participants. For instance, in psycholinguistic research, there is consent that high frequent words trigger faster response latencies than low frequent words. Participants also show faster response latencies to words, which are semantically or orthographically related to previous shown words.

In the present investigation, I assume that an auditorily presented sentence has an impact on the response latencies of the participants decision on a respective related or unrelated visual stimulus word or non-word. Response latencies of participants are measured from the beginning of the presentation of the target word until the lexical decision. It further assume that words that are semantically related to the stimuli sentences trigger faster response latencies than semantically unrelated words. However, the present investigation attaches great importance to controlling for confounding variables, such as word frequency, length of the stimuli sentences and the exact function and placement of the respective marker in the stimuli sentences. It is very important to exclude these confounding variables as far as possible to assure that the effects are really based on the experimental variables. It is also for this reason that I decided to exclude the confounding variable language and to design a monolingual French task. The variable language is not necessary to account for the analysis of the newly emerged functions and meanings of comme and genre in sentence context. The concrete experimental design of the task will be explained in 6.2.

6.1.2.2 Cross-Language Masked Priming Task

As a second task, I designed a cross-language masked priming task with lexical decision to investigate the interconnection of the three marker pairs (see chapter 5) in the bilingual brain. The choice to investigate the respective markers as isolated items in the present task will be explained in the following. The cross-language masked priming paradigm is widely approved and accepted. This has the advantage that results, concerning the semantic overlap of translation equivalents, can be compared to previous studies with this paradigm (e.g. Grainger & Frenck-Mestre 1998; Jiang & Forster, 2001; Finkbeiner et al. 2004; Basnight-Brown & Altarriba 2007). Furthermore, I chose this paradigm to establish and test the Sense Model by Finkbeiner et al. (2004), which will also serves as underlying model for the present experiment.

The masked priming paradigm has provoked much attention and discussions in psycholinguistic research in the last 30 years (for an overview see Forster 1998; Kinoshita & Lupker 2003; Kouider & Dehaene 2007). Especially in the beginning research with the masked priming paradigm, opinions on its usefulness and the interpretation of the results were particularly divided.
Some researchers argued that the masked priming paradigm constitutes a purer form of priming in that it allows unconscious word comprehension (e.g. Forster 1993; Forster & Davis 1984). Others stressed that the masked priming paradigm implies certain effects that cannot be clearly assigned to specific controlled variables (e.g. Holender 1986). Controversial debate on masked priming includes the questions if subliminal primes are processed prelexically or lexically, if subliminal processes are processed non-representationally or representationally and if non-conscious processes are limited in depth of processing (for a historical overview of these questions see Kouider & Dehaene 2007).

In order to get detailed answers to these questions, methodical aspects of the paradigm had to be investigated and optimized. It was found out that masked primes are perceived as invisible below a presentation time of 50 ms and therefore do not yield effects (e.g. Perea & Gotor 1997; Rastle et al. 2000). Furthermore, the differences between morphological, orthographical, phonological and semantic priming had to be specified. While orthographical and morphological masked priming yield effects at very low presentation times, the effect of phonological priming is still controversial (e.g. Rastle & Brysbaert 2006).

According to Forster, Mohan, Hector (2003), studies using the masked priming paradigm can be classified into five different types. The identity or repetition priming, involving the same prime, generally represented in italics, and target word, represented in small caps (house - house), triggers the strongest effects due to the complete overlap of the prime and target stimulus at the orthographical, phonological, morphological and semantic level. The form priming involves a similar form of the prime and the target, which only differ in one letter. Thus, the prime can be a form-related word or non-word (mouse - HOUSE; fouse - HOUSE). In a varying design of the form priming paradigm, the letter transposition, one letter of the target word is modified (huose - house). In addition, Forster, Mohan, Hector (2003) mention morphological priming effects (break - BROKE), semantic priming effects (nurse - DOCTOR) and translation priming effects (maison - HOUSE) (Forster, Mohan, Hector 2003: 3). The distinction between the different mechanisms and methodological aspects have helped to establish masked priming as a widely approved and accepted paradigm in psycholinguistic research. Moreover, current brain imagining techniques gave further evidence for effects in masked priming (e.g. Dehaene et al. 2001; Devlin et al. 2004).

As the present study focuses on semantic and translation priming, the further overview of the masked priming paradigm will be limited to this specific priming mechanism.

Semantic overlap generally does not trigger as strong facilitation effects as orthographic overlap or even identity priming (Kouider & Dehaene 2007: 862). Still, semantic priming effects have been attested for associative-semantic pairs (e.g. boat-WATER) as well as for synonymous pairs (e.g. boat - SHIP) (for an overview see Bueno & Frenck-Mestre 2008). Bueno and Frenck-Mestre
(2008) performed eight tasks to investigate the effects of prime exposure (28, 43, 71, 199 ms), lexical relationship (associative-semantic pairs, semantic-feature pairs) and task (lexical decision task, semantic categorization task) on masked semantic priming. They found faster response latencies for semantic-feature pairs than for associative-semantic pairs, which only show an effect at longer presentation times. Furthermore, they found earlier priming effects for semantic categorization than for lexical decision (Bueno & Frenck-Mestre 2008: 892 f.). These results suggest that masked semantic priming is very sensitive to methodical considerations and that stimulus pairs, tasks and design have to be selected very cautiously. Other factors that have to be considered in semantic priming include concreteness (de Groot 1992) and word ambiguity (Rodd et al., 2002).

The above-named considerations on masked semantic priming mostly rely on monolingual experiments. However, it has been proven extensively that masked priming also yields effects in cross-language studies (Kirsner et al. 1984; Schwanenflugel, Rey 1986; Frenck & Pynte 1987; Grainger & Beauvillain 1988; De Groot & Nas 1991; Gollan, Forster, Frost 1997; Grainger & Frenck-Mestre 1998; Jiang 1999; Jiang & Forster 2001; Finkbeiner et al. 2004; Basnight-Brown & Altarriba 2007; Perea, Dunabeitia, Carreiras 2008; Wang & Forster 2010). A facilitation effect in cross-language masked priming has not only been found for associative-semantic pairs, but also for translation equivalents (e.g. Cristoﬁanini, Kirsner, Milech 1986; Jin 1990; de Groot & Nas 1991; Altarriba 1992; Keatley & de Gelder 1992; Sanchez-Casas, Davis, Garcia-Albea 1992; Williams 1994). Overall, the results of these studies indicate that translation equivalents yield faster response times than cross-language associative pairs. All these results give evidence for the fact that semantic information of one language activates semantic representations from the other language.

Still, interesting observations have been made concerning the respective priming direction in masked priming with cross-language translation equivalents. When the masked prime was presented in the L1 of the participants, response latencies were faster, which means that word perception of the target word was facilitated (de Groot & Nas 1991; Gollan et al. 1997; Jiang 1999; Jiang & Forster 2001). In contrast, the priming effect was not consistent when the masked prime was presented in the respective L2 (Gollan et al., 1997; Grainger & Frenck-Mestre 1998; Jiang 1999; Jiang & Forster 2001). This phenomenon commonly referred to as priming asymmetry, provoked a lot of discussion amongst psycholinguists. Language proficiency of the participants may indeed be one reason for the varying results, in that masked primes in the non-dominant language may trigger weaker effects than primes in the dominant language. But there is also evidence for a different explanation. Grainger and Frenck-Mestre (1998) performed masked priming tasks including semantic categorization and lexical decision with non-cognate translation equivalents on highly proficient French-English bilinguals. Although they used the same stimuli for the semantic categorization and the lexical decision task, they obtained differing results. The
L2-L1 priming effects were significantly stronger in the semantic categorization than in the lexical decision task. These results suggest that task differences may be one reason for the priming asymmetry. Similar task differences were found by Jiang and Forster (2001) and by Finkbeiner et al. (2004). On the basis of these findings, Finkbeiner et al. (2004) established the Sense Model, which has been described in detail in chapters . To explain the task difference and hence the priming asymmetry in masked priming, they highlight that most words are highly polysemous and that most translation equivalents do not share all of their polysemous senses. While bilingual speakers commonly are more proficient in their L1 than in their L2, they know more polysemous senses of the L1 translation equivalent than of the L2 translation equivalent. In lexical decision, the priming from L1 to L2 is stronger because the L1 prime activates a larger amount of L2 senses. Conversely, priming from the L2 to the L1 is weaker, because the L2 prime cannot prime all polysemous senses of the L1 target. In contrast, in semantic categorization only one category, that is mostly the dominant sense, is primed. Given that both translation equivalents overlap equally in that dominant sense, priming occurs to the same degree from the L1 to the L2 and vice versa (see Finkbeiner et al. 2004; Wang, Forster 2010). A schematic representation of the priming asymmetry due to task differences is visualized in Figure 35.

The present experimental investigation relies on the findings of Finkbeiner et al. (2004) and the resulting Sense Model as well as on the findings of Rodd et al. (2002). As explained in chapter ,
Rodd et al. (2002) performed three monolingual unmasked lexical decision tasks with ambiguous words with related senses (polysemy), ambiguous words with unrelated senses (homonymy) and unambiguous words. They found out that homonymous words evoke slower response latencies while polysemous words yield faster response latencies than unambiguous words. These results, in combination with the results of Finkbeiner et al. (2004) suggest that response latencies in priming tasks with lexical decision are sensitive to the amount of polysemous senses of a given stimulus word.

These findings are of major importance for the hypothesis of the present experiment. As explained extensively in the previous chapters, the pragmatic marker pairs comme, like, genre; alors, so, donc and ben, well, bon underwent interesting changes in the Manitoban variety of Canadian French, which seem to be due to language contact. Particularly the marker comme emerged new polysemous senses and pragmatic functions, compared to its European French counterpart.

At first sight it does not seem plausible to investigate pragmatic markers in a masked priming task with lexical decision because in this case the markers are presented as isolated word forms and detached from their pragmatic function in the sentence context. The choice of task appears very unusual, since pragmatic markers achieve their respective function and meaning primarily through their concrete placement in the sentence. Still, a masked priming task may give important insights into the interdependence of the nine pragmatic markers. This choice can be explained by two reasons. First, it has been pointed out by Altarriba (2000) that word type may play an important role in language processing. However, most current masked priming tasks are limited to the analysis of nouns or adjectives.

The investigation of non-prototypical word classes, such as pragmatic markers, could shed new light on the processing of lexical items in the bilingual lexicon. Furthermore, this investigation could give further evidence for the Sense Model and the underlying theoretical considerations.

Second, a masked priming task with pragmatic markers can clarify the effect of the contact-induced changes that have been pointed out in the corpus analysis of this work. If this task is really sensitive to polysemous senses of a word then it can help to answer the question if the newly emerged functions and meanings of pragmatic markers are integrated in the bilingual lexicon.

### 6.1.3 Choice of participants

As outlined in the previous chapter, the present experiments aim to investigate the processing of pragmatic markers as well as the impacts of contact-induced language change on the representation and the processing of the respective markers. While the underlying corpus analysis is based on corpus data of spoken Manitoban French and includes speakers between 17 and 30
years, it was decided to recruit a comparable group of speakers within the same age range as the experimental group. To ensure a preferably homogenous experimental group, it was assured that all selected participants were born and raised in a Franco-Manitoban environment, that is in the French quarter of Winnipeg, St. Boniface, or neighboring districts and suburbs. To assure a homogenous degree of bilingualism, all participants of the experimental group completed a sociolinguistic questionnaire, established by Raymond Mougeon et al. (2005). This questionnaire and the complete results are annexed to the present work. The results of each participant are summarized in the figure on the next page. The results contain all answers that include a personal judgment on language usage. Answers varied from (0) exclusively in English, (1) mostly in English, (2) equally in English and French, (3) mostly in French up to (4) exclusively in French. Consequently, an overall score of 0 indicates complete monolingual English language usages, whereas a score of 100 indicates overall monolingual French language usages. A score of 50 specifies a completely balanced use of both languages. It is important to highlight that these scores do not indicate language proficiency but only language usage in different everyday situations. Furthermore, all results only indicate self-assessed answers, which may vary from the actual use of both languages in the everyday life of the participants.

Apart from the degree of bilingualism, displayed in Figure 36, the sociolinguistic questionnaire also gives information about the specific use of both languages in Manitoban French speakers.

Selected answers from this questionnaire are displayed in Table 2. All Franco-Manitoban participants indicated French as their mother tongue, but English as the language to which they are more often exposed. This is due to the sociolinguistic situation in Manitoba (see chapter ).

Results in Table 2 summarize the language distribution in the selected MF participants. The majority speaks French with their parents but languages vary importantly when speaking to
their siblings. With their friends, participants commonly speak as much French as English with a slight tendency to French. This is also shown in the code-switching habits of the speakers of the FM Corpus data (see chapter 3.2). Due to the sociolinguistic environment in Manitoba, all participants commonly speak English when they go out shopping and when they use media, such as TV, radio, Internet and books.

Still, all participants attach strong importance to their francophone identity and cultural background. 63% of the participants attach a very high importance to French in their present life, 32% still specify that French is important in their present life (question 59 in the annexed questionnaire). Furthermore, 59% of the participants state that French plays a very important role in their future plans, for 36% it still plays an important role (question 60).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Always English</th>
<th>More often English</th>
<th>As much French as English</th>
<th>More often French</th>
<th>Always French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With your parents? (17-20)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your siblings? (22-23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your friends? (24-28)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When going out shopping? (30)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your part-time job? (29)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When using media? (32-43)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Selected answers from the questionnaire (in percent). The numbers behind the questions indicate the respective numbers in the annexed questionnaire.

Since the present psycholinguistic investigation has the aim to compare the linguistic behavior of Manitoban French speakers with European French speakers, the choice of the control group was of major significance. Given that the experimental group consisted of early and highly proficient bilinguals, the first choice was to search for a control group of early and highly fluent bilinguals that live in a European French language environment. To test this possible control group, a pre-test was conducted with early bilinguals at the Laboratoire Parole et Langage (LPL, Université de Provence and CNRS) in Aix-en-Provence and the International Bilingual School (IBS) in Luynes in November 2011. Results of the pre-test confirmed that it was not possible to establish a homogenous group of early bilingual participants. This was mainly due to their differing sociolinguistic background, their mother tongues and those of their parents, their entry into France and the time span they already spent in France. Therefore, it was decided to establish a control group with late bilinguals that have European French as their mother tongue and learned English in school and university. This choice can be explained by the fact that most current psy-
cholinguistic investigations work with similar participants. Thus, the choice of a control group with late bilinguals contributes to the comparability of the results of the present investigation with other current psycholinguistic experiments. Besides, the homogenous nature of the control group is of important significance and is assured by this choice.

It was not considered necessary to let the EF participants complete the sociolinguistic questionnaire of Raymond Mougeon and colleagues (2005) because these participants live in a monolingual environment and only use French in their everyday life. Still, it was assured that all participants learned English in school from a similar age on and were commonly exposed to English in their academic education.

It is self-evident that both groups of participants are only comparable without problems in the monolingual task (experiment 1). In the bilingual task (experiment 2), both groups are not clearly comparable, due to the differences in language processing in early/balanced and late/unbalanced bilinguals. In current research it is commonly accepted that language proficiency plays an important role in bilingual lexical access and that processes of language and lexical selection may vary according to the proficiency level (see chapter for a detailed discussion). As proposed by Schwieter and Sundermann (2008), early and late bilinguals may not only differ in the mechanism of language selection but also in the level of language selection (see chapter ). These factors are very important for bilingual lexical access and therefore the choice of the control group does not allow comparing both groups without limitation.

6.1.4 Overall design of the experimental investigation

The present experimental study consists of two different tasks that are (1) a monolingual sentence verification task (SVT) and (2) a cross-language masked priming task (MPT). The respective design and procedure of the tasks will be explained prior to each task. The two groups of participants, presented in 6.1.3, serve as experimental and control group in both experiments. All participants from both groups received the same stimuli in pseudorandomized order, which was determined by the experimental software Presentation (Neurobehavioral Systems Inc.). All participants took part in both tasks and received the same instructions. Solely the sociolinguistic questionnaire by Mougeon et al. (2005) was only completed by the Manitoban French (MF) experimental group and not by the European French (EF) control group.

Error rates and response latencies are the dependent variables in both experiments. Language group (MF and EF) is included as an independent variable as a between-subjects and within-items factor. The other independent variables are task-specific and are described in the respective method part of the experiments. The statistic analysis of both experiments consists of analyses of variance by participants (F1) and by items (F2).
6.2 Experiment 1: Monolingual Sentence Verification Task

The present research concerns the impact of the partially equivalent pragmatic markers *comme* and *genre* on the auditory speech perception of speakers of Manitoban French and speakers of European French. As far as it is known, no psycholinguistic research on hedges and pragmatic markers takes into account non-standard varieties of the respective language and possible peculiarities due to language contact. Furthermore, no known study from this field considers the effect of bilingualism or long-term language contact on the processing of pragmatic markers and hedges. As shown in the previous chapters (and), long-term language contact and bilingualism may indeed have an impact on the evolution of new functions and meanings of a lexical item. Consequently, the present experimental investigation aims to examine the following two aspects of sentence processing:

1. The impact of the partial equivalent markers *comme* and *genre* on sentence processing
2. The impact of contact-induced change of *comme* on sentence processing

Predictions

As far as (1) is concerned, the presence of the markers *comme* and *genre*, which have been described and analyzed extensively in chapter and , may have three different effects on sentence processing. First, they may have a facilitatory effect, that is, they may trigger significantly faster response latencies. Second, they may have an interfering effect, which may show in significantly slower response latencies. Third, they may have no effect at all, that is to say sentences containing a marker may not trigger significantly faster or slower response latencies than sentences without a marker. Relating to (2), the contact-induced change of *comme* may have different effects on its role in sentence processing when compared to its European French counterpart *genre*. Either, it may have a facilitatory effect, that is faster response latencies, for speakers of the contact variety and consequently an interfering effect, that is slower response latencies, for speakers of European French or it may have the same effect for speakers of both varieties of French, resulting in comparatively similar response latencies. A control variable, containing no pragmatic marker, serves to compare the processing of the markers to a baseline condition.

In the present investigation, I hypothesize that the markers *comme* and *genre* show different effects on sentence processing depending on their function and semantic meaning in the respective sentence context and on the two different groups. That is to say, I expect faster response latencies for the marker *comme* in newly emerged functions for Manitoban French participants than for European French participants. A reverse effect is expected for the marker *genre*. 
Further, I hypothesize that the emergence of new functions and meanings in combination with the increase of frequency of *comme* in Manitoban French leads to a facilitatory effect of this item in sentence processing of Franco-Manitoban speakers in comparison to European French speakers.

To test these predictions, I adopted the design of the word-monitoring task (Experiment 1 and 2) of Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) in a strongly modified version (see 6.1.2). A spoken sentence was presented to the participants, followed by a semantically related or unrelated visual target word. The participants then performed a lexical decision task on the visual target word.

### 6.2.1 Participants

Twenty-four undergraduate students and staff from the Université de Saint-Boniface (Winnipeg, Canada) participated in the experiment in exchange for payment as the Franco-Manitoban experimental group. Twenty-four undergraduate and graduate students from the Université de Strasbourg (Strasbourg, France) participated in the experiment in exchange for payment as the European French control group. All participants were aged between 18 and 30 years (for a detailed overview of the different groups, see 6.1.3).

I carried out a pre-test of the experiment with 24 students from the International Bilingual School (IBS) (Luynes, France) and undergraduate students from the Université de Provence (Aix-en-Provence, France) (see chapter 6.1.3).

### 6.2.2. Material

70 monolingual French sentences were taken from the transcriptions of natural speech data of the FM Corpus, the C-Oral Rom Corpus and the Corpus de la Parole. The original sentences already contained the markers *comme* and *genre* in different functions. All sentences were matched in approximate length, varying from 5-10 words. The sentences were arranged in four sets, depending on whether they contained the quotative and rounder function of *comme* restricted to Canadian French (*comme1*), the adaptor use of *comme* accepted in European French (*comme2*), the marker *genre* in quotative, rounder and adaptor functions (*genre*) or no marker at all (control). A female French native speaker recorded all sentences in a quiet room with an Olympus voice recorder. A semantically related and a semantically non-related French target word was created for each sentence using Wordgen stimulus creation software (Duyck et al. 2004). The variable relatedness was included in the design as a control variable. Target words were matched as closely as possible in frequency and length. They were assigned to the respective
stimuli sentences by means of the variable semantic relatedness. A set containing 70 Filler sentences and Filler words and non-words was created according to the same criteria as the experimental stimuli. Filler words were all matched in frequency, respectively bigram frequency. Filler words and non-words were randomly assigned to the respective Filler sentences. The experiment was programmed using the experimental software *Presentation* (Neurobehavioral Systems Inc.). The sentences were presented auditorily on a Mac Os X, the target words were presented on a 13” screen. Two keys on the keyboard were used for button responses.

### 6.2.3 Design

The variables marker (comme1, comme2, genre, control) and relatedness (related, unrelated) were varied within participants. Each participant received 35 sentences with unrelated target words and 35 sentences with related target words as well as 70 Filler sentences with target words. The combination of the stimuli sentences and the target words is displayed in detail in Annexe A. The combination of the variables marker and relatedness was counterbalanced within and between groups. All stimuli and sets of stimuli were pseudo-randomized using *Presentation* software and appeared in different order for each participant. A short practice trial including three sentences and target words was presented to all participants at the beginning of the experiment.

### 6.2.4 Procedure

Participants were first introduced to the consent form and the experimental procedure in French. Thereby, it was assured that all participants were in a monolingual mode. Furthermore, all participants were informed to listen carefully to the stimuli sentences in order to complete a short memory task at the end of the experiment (see Annex A). The visual memory task included 5 of the stimuli sentences and 5 sentences that were not part of the experiment. The participants had to decide if they heard the respective sentences in the experiment or not. They did so by checking a Yes- or a No-box on a a sheet. Each trial started with the auditory presentation of a sentence, followed by the visual target word (see Figure 36). For each trial, participants performed a lexical decision by pressing a key on the keyboard, that is, they decided if the presented target word was a real word or a non-word.
6.2.5 Results

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Statistics (IBM). Statistical analyses were only performed on the stimuli trials. All trials including Filler sentences as well as non-words were excluded from the analyses. Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were run on subject and item means, including group (European French = EF, Manitoban French = MF) as a between-subject and within-items variable and the variables marker (comme1, comme2, genre, control) and relatedness (related, unrelated) as within-subjects and between-items variables. Response errors (Overall 1.2%) and response time deviations slower or shorter than 2.5 standard deviations from the participant mean (Overall 2.5%) were excluded from the analysis.

Error Rates

The overall error rate for this experiment was 1.9%. Error rates were higher for the MF group (2.7%) than for the EF group (1.1%). As a result, a main effect was found for the variable group in the by-participants analysis ($F_1 (1, 46) = 4.38$, $p < .05$). In the item analysis, no main effect was found for the variable group ($F_2 (1, 72) = 1.24$, $p > .1$). Error rates are displayed in Figure 37. The analysis of error rates revealed higher error rates for the unrelated condition (2.2%) than for the related-condition (1.4%). This is reflected in a significant effect in relatedness for MF participants ($F_1 (1, 23) = 4.59$, $p < .05$). In contrast, no significant effect in the relatedness condition is found for EF participants. The control-condition yielded lower error rates (1.5%) than the overall of the other conditions (1.9%). Furthermore, error rates varied importantly for the MF group in the related- and unrelated-condition.
Figure 37. Mean error rates in percent (participants means). Error bars represent one standard error.

Response Latencies

Average response latencies are displayed in Figure 38. Results from the overall statistical analysis are displayed in Table 3 for the by-participants analysis and for the by-items analysis. Except in the comme1-condition in the related-condition, EF participants showed overall faster response latencies than MF participants. Overall means of response times were 22.5 ms faster for the control condition than for conditions including a pragmatic marker (mean control-condition = 574ms; mean other conditions = 596.5). That is to say, participants of both groups were faster in the control condition. Given that response latencies varied importantly, a significant effect was found for the marker condition in the by-participants analysis ($F_1 (3, 138) = 4.00, p < .01$) that was not significant in the by-items analysis ($F_2 (3, 104) = 2.31, p = .08$). Furthermore, a significant effect was found for the interaction between marker and relatedness in the by-participants analysis ($F_1 (3, 138) = 3.1, p < .05$), which was not significant in the item analysis ($F_2 (3, 104) = 2, p = .11$).

EF participants showed overall faster response latencies, which shows in a significant effect for group in the by-items analysis ($F_2 (1, 104) = 3.9, p < .05$) that was not significant in the by-subjects analysis ($F_1 (1, 46) = .05, p = .83$). No significant effect was found for the variable relatedness. The non-significance of the variable relatedness seems to be motivated by the varying nature of the comme1-condition in both groups. In a separate ANOVA, in which the comme1-condition was eliminated from the by-subjects analysis, response latencies were faster.
for the related condition than for the unrelated condition. Consequently, a significant effect was found for marker (F1 (2, 92) = 4.58, p = .01; F2 (2, 78) = 3.36, p < .05) as well as for relatedness (F1 (1, 46) = 11.25, p < .01; F2 (1, 78) = 5.6, p < .05).

To compare the comme1-condition to the other conditions, an exemplary ANOVA of the comme1- and comme2-condition was run. This analysis of variance showed inverse effects for comme1 in the interaction of marker and relatedness in comparison to the other condition. That is to say, comme1 showed slower response latencies in the related-condition than in the unrelated-condition. All other marker conditions showed faster response for the related than for the unrelated condition. As a consequence, the analysis revealed a near-significant effect for the interaction of marker and relatedness in the participant analysis (F1 (1, 46) = 3.75, p = .059), which approached significance in the item analysis (F2 (1, 52) = 3.1, p = .08). While EF participants were overall faster than MF participants, an inverse effect is found for the related-comme1-condition. This provoked a near-significant effect for the interaction of marker and group in the participant analysis (F1 (1, 46) = 3.94, p = .053), which was not significant in the item analysis (F2 (1, 52) = 1.8, p = .19).

![Figure 38. Mean reaction times (participants means) by group and marker. Error bars represent one standard error.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>df1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marker</td>
<td>4 **</td>
<td>3, 138</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatedness</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatedness*group</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marker*relatedness</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>3, 138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marker*group</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3, 138</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marker<em>relatedness</em>group</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3, 138</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Overall results from the statistical by-participants (F1) and by-items (F2) analysis. In the by-items analysis, the df2 = 104. Levels of significance are displayed with the F1 and F2 (*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05).
6.2.6 Discussion

EF participants showed overall faster response latencies than MF participants. This may be due to the fact that EF participants were possibly more in a monolingual mode than MF speakers due to their monolingual language environment. This is to say; MF participants are equally exposed to English and French in their everyday life, whereas EF participants lead their everyday life exclusively in French. Therefore, MF participants may have more problems to get into a purely monolingual mode than EF speakers. This is also mirrored in the differing error rates.

The present experiment aimed to investigate two underlying aspects of sentence processing that are (1) the impact of the partial equivalent markers *comme* and *genre* on sentence processing and (2) the impact of contact-induced change of *comme* on sentence processing. In the following, the results of the experiment will be discussed with regard to the above-named questions. Considering the first question, the results indicate a main effect in the marker-condition. This impact and the comparison of the overall means show that the sentences containing a pragmatic marker are processed more slowly than the control condition. This is the case for all conditions; regardless of whether they contained pure hedging functions (condition comme2) or a mix of hedging and pragmatic functions (conditions comme1 and genre). This result is extremely important with regard to the concrete impact of pragmatic markers and hedges on sentence processing. Despite the very differing nature, objective and respective languages of the tasks, the present results contradict the results of Lui and Fox Tree (2012) to some extent. Lui and Fox Tree (2012) conclude that *like* does not have an effect at all on memory tasks and that listeners may overlook hedge-marked information. The present results indicate that hedges and pragmatic markers may indeed have an effect on sentence processing in that sentences containing a pragmatic marker or a hedge are processed more slowly than sentences without a marker. This effect may have different reasons. First, the approximative nature of hedges triggers a loose reading (adaptor and quotative function) or an approximation on a scale (rounder function). Thus, this modification in the illocutionary force of the utterance may cause that the hearer needs more processing time. In other words, the attenuation of the illocutionary force of the utterance may allow the hearer a larger scope of interpretation, which leads to higher costs in sentence processing.

A second possible interpretation of the results concerns the role of pragmatic markers and hedges in spoken language. These lexemes are still very restricted to informal speech and may be connected to a more negative attitude of the hearers towards the message (Blankenship, Holtgraves 2005; Hosman, Siltanen 2006). Sentences containing very informal speech may be perceived as rather inappropriate in a formal setting. Therefore, the comparatively formal experimental setting may have influenced the motivation of the participants and in consequence the response latencies. While the first explanation appears to be very plausible with regard to the results of the present experiment, this alternative possibility cannot be ruled out unequivocally.
The second underlying question of the present experiment concerns the impact of contact-induced language change on the processing of the marker *comme*. In this context, it is very striking that no main effect in the relatedness-condition is found in an overall by-participants analysis, but that a main effect is found when excluding condition comme1 from analysis. These results indicate that all participants were faster in the related than in the unrelated-condition for the marker conditions comme2, genre and control, but that a diverging effect is found for comme1.

In the comme1-condition, the related-condition provoked slower response latencies than the unrelated-condition and this tendency is particularly strong for the EF group. For a further explanation of this effect, it has to be highlighted again that it was generally assumed that the related-condition would motivate faster response latencies due to the semantic relatedness of the stimuli sentences and the target words. Opposed to this assumption, the results indicate a reverse effect for the EF group in the comme1-condition. This effect may indeed be explained by means of the impact of contact-induced language change and its related consequences. The functions of *comme*, included in the comme1-condition, are not attested in spoken European French. Therefore, three possible explanations can be provided for the results of the present experiment. First, the functions of *comme* in the comme1-condition are by far more frequent in Manitoban French than in European French. This may lead to a certain frequency effect, in that European French participants process these infrequent functions more slowly in the related-condition. Second, the diverging results mentioned above may be due to productivity. The functions of *comme* in the comme1-condition are not productive in European French, which may have hindered the overall processing of the respective sentences. A third explanation considers sentence processing as such, and more precisely sentence parsing. If sentence processing is an incremental process, then the comme1-condition may have triggered a certain garden path-effect in EF participants. This effect may be particularly strong in EF participants because the sentences of the comme1-condition may be perceived as semantically incorrect or even ungrammatical. Therefore, EF participants were possibly misled by the functions of *comme* in the comme1-condition and had to reinterpret the overall sentence meaning during processing. This effect may be particularly strong in the related-condition due to the semantic relatedness of the stimulus sentence and the respective target word.

The results of the present analysis do not allow ruling out unequivocally one of the above-named explanations. Still, it is very striking that a similar effect is not found for the genre-condition, which included the pragmatic marker *genre* that is absent in Manitoban French. This may be due to the fact that the pragmatic marker *genre* is a very new item in informal spoken European French and is still clearly restricted to youth language.

A further discussion of the results of the present experiment, with regard to the results of the upcoming experiment, will be provided in the concluding part of this chapter.
6.3 Experiment 2: Cross-Language Masked Priming Task

As already outlined in 6.1.2, the aim of the present experiment is to investigate the effects of the language change of three pairs of markers (comme, like, genre; alors, so, donc; bien, well, bon) on their representations and processing in the bilingual mental lexicon. Specifically, the present experiment aims to examine the following three aspects of word processing:

1. The impact of the emergence of new functions and senses of comme in Manitoban French.
2. The impact of the decreasing use of donc, alors and bon in Manitoban French.
3. The impact of the increasing use of so and ben in Manitoban French.

Predictions

If the newly emerged functions and meanings of comme in Manitoban French are integrated in the semantic representations of this item then this marker would contain more polysemous senses than its European French counterpart. Consequently, Manitoban French comme would have more semantic overlap with its English translation equivalent like. As illustrated in chapter and 6.1.1.1, there is experimental evidence that more semantic overlap of partial translation equivalents leads to faster response latencies (see the experimental evidence for the Sense Model in chapter and 6.1.1.1). According to this view, comme should yield stronger priming effects in Manitoban French speakers than in European French speakers. In contrast, I assume a reverse effect for the pragmatic marker genre.

I expect a different result for the marker pair alors, donc and so. The marker so is borrowed on a frequent basis into French discourse. If language change is unidirectional, the decrease in frequency should not lead to a decrease of the semantic and pragmatic productivity of the items. Thus, I expect no difference in the priming effects of European French and Manitoban French speakers. However, frequency may play a role in masked priming and consequently frequency effects may occur, particularly for English so in Manitoban French speakers.

I assume a similar result for the third marker triple bon, well and bien. While the pragmatic marker ben is an item that commonly occurs in spoken discourse and can only be hardly recognized in a decontextualized setting, I decided to use the pragmatic marker bien instead. Ben and bien are by far not equivalent in their pragmatic functions and meanings but the combination bon, bien, well can also give first insights into the processing of these partial translation equivalents. I assume that European French speakers may process L1-L2 primes faster in this case due to the high frequency of bon and bien in European French. However, I do not expect a semantic
priming difference between EF and MF speakers because all of these markers maintained their full range of semantic senses and pragmatic meanings in Manitoban French.

6.3.1 Participants

The same European French (control group) and Manitoban French (experimental group) participants as in Experiment 1 took part in the present experiment.

6.3.2 Material

The three triples of pragmatic markers, analyzed in detail in the preceding chapters, were taken as experimental stimuli. The markers comme, like, genre and alors, so, donc stayed without modification. The marker triple ben, well, bon was modified in that ben was replaced by the marker bien. This choice is motivated by the fact that ben is not fully lexicalized as an isolated item and therefore was seen as a source for possible errors in the masked priming task. In parallel, a set of three pairs of nouns was created to serve as control items. The set of nouns includes the pairs heure, temps, time; devoir, work, travail; and peuple, monde, homme. The choice of these noun triples was motivated by their high frequency and their respective length. I tried to match the set of markers and the set of nouns as closely as possible in length and frequency using Wordgen stimulus creation software (Duyck et al. 2004). This was not satisfactorily possible, due to the extremely high frequency of the marker pairs, which may be explained by their strong polysemy. Nevertheless, the control variable allows to a certain extent to compare the processing of the set of markers to nouns, which are commonly used in masked priming tasks. To achieve a greater comparability within and between the sets, each prime was presented with an identical target (id), two related targets (rel) and three unrelated targets (unrel). The related targets consist of the other stimuli of the respective marker pair, that is the translation equivalent as well as the Standard respectively Manitoban counterpart. Markers/nouns from the respective other pairs of markers/nouns served as unrelated target words. Each set contained 9 identical primes, 18 related primes and 27 unrelated primes. The combination of prime and target words is displayed in detail in Annex A.

Analogous to this, a set of filler markers and a set of filler nouns were created, each also containing 54 trials of pragmatic markers or nouns. Parallel to the four sets including words, four sets of non-words were developed using Wordgen stimulus creation software. The non-words were matched in bigram frequency and length. The combination of filler markers and nouns as well as of non-words was analogous to the combination of the experimental stimuli (see Annex A). The experiment design was created using the experimental software Presentation (Neurobehavioral...
Systems Inc.). All stimuli were presented visually on a Mac Os X with a 13” screen. Two keys on the keyboard were used for button responses.

6.3.3 Design

The variables word (pragmatic marker, noun) and relatedness (identical, related, unrelated) were varied within participants. Each participant received all trials, that is 216 words (4 sets with 54 words) and 216 non-words (4 sets with 54 non-words). The distribution of language direction in priming was the same for all participants (in the related condition: 6x L2-L1, 6x L1-L2, 6x L1-L1; in the unrelated condition: 3x L2-L2, 6x L1-L2, 6x L2-L1, 12x L1-L1). All trials of words and non-words are displayed in detail in Annex A.

All stimuli and sets of stimuli were pseudo-randomized using Presentation software and appeared in different order for each participant. A short practice trial including three prime and target words was presented to all participants at the beginning of the experiment.

After finishing the experiment, all Franco-Manitoban participants completed a sociolinguistic questionnaire designed by Mougeon (2005) with the aim to measure their degree of bilingualism (see Annex B). The questionnaire contained 60 questions about the participants’ bilingual language acquisition, skills and usages. Its objective was ensuring a preferably homogenous experimental group (for an analysis of the results of the questionnaire see introductory part of this chapter).

6.3.4 Procedure

Participants were first introduced to the consent form and the experimental procedure. This introduction as well as additional conversation was conducted in French and in English to assure that all participants were in a bilingual mode.

Each trial started with a 500 ms forward mask, followed by the 50 ms presentation of the prime, a 500 ms backward mask and the target word (see Figure 38). For each trial, participants performed a lexical decision on the target word by pressing a key on the keyboard. After the task, participants completed the sociolinguistic questionnaire.
6.3.5 Results

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Statistics (IBM). Statistical analyses were only performed on the experimental stimuli marker and noun trials. Filler prime and target words as well as non-words were excluded from the analyses. Analyses of variance were run on participant and item means, including group (European French = EF, Manitoban French = MF) as a between-participants and within-items variable and the variables word (pragmatic marker, noun) and relatedness (identical, related, unrelated) as within-participants and between-items variables. Response errors (overall 1.63%) and response time deviations slower or faster than 2.5 standard deviations from the participant mean (overall 2.5%) were excluded from the analysis.

Error Rates

The overall error rate for this experiment was 1.63%. Error rates were slightly higher for the MF group (1.75%) than for the EF group (1.5%). Error rates broken down by the variables group, word and relatedness are displayed in Figure 39. The analysis of the means of the error rates revealed higher error rates for pragmatic marker (1.98%) than for nouns (1.26%). The related primes yielded lower error rates (1.25%) than the identity primes (1.8%) and the unrelated primes (1.8%).

Analyses of variance on error rates revealed significantly higher overall error rates for MF participants than for EF participants. This is presented in a significant effect in the variable group (F1 (1,94) = 50.6, p < .01; F2 (1, 139) = 60194, p < .01). Furthermore, a significant effect occurs in the item analysis for the word condition (F2 (2, 139) = 3.6, p < .05) and the relatedness condi-
tion (F2 (1, 139) = 81.9, p < .01), which are both not significant in the by-participants analysis (F1 (1, 94) = 2.4, p = .12 and F1 (1, 94) = .15, p = .703).

An especially remarkable difference is found between both groups in the related-condition. This results in a significant effect in the interaction of relatedness and group (F1 (1,188) = 4.1; p < .01; F2 (1,138) = 8.1; p < .01). Furthermore, the by-participants analysis revealed a significant effect for the interaction of the word and the relatedness condition (F1 (2, 188) = .407; p < .01) that was not significant in the by-items analysis.

![Figure 40](image)

Figure 40. Mean error rates in percent (participants' means) by group, word and relation. Error bars represent one standard error.

**Response Latencies**

Average response latencies are displayed in Figure 40. Results from the overall statistical analysis are displayed in Table 4. MF participants showed faster overall response latencies than EF participants (MF overall means = 553 ms; EF overall means = 563 ms). Overall means of response times were faster for nouns (554 ms) than for pragmatic markers (562 ms). Identity primes (overall means = 516 ms) yielded faster response latencies than related primes (581 ms) and unrelated primes (577 ms).
As would be expected, identity primes showed much faster response latencies than the other relatedness-conditions. Furthermore, MF participants showed slower response latencies for markers than for nouns. EF participants also processed nouns faster than markers, except for the related-condition. Consequently, a significant effect was found for the word condition (F1 (1, 46) = 6.76, p < .05) in the by-participants analysis that was near-significant in the by-items analysis (F2 (1, 49) = 3.6, p = .063). A highly significant effect was found in the relatedness condition (F1 (2, 92) = 152.89, p < .01; F2 (2, 49) = 67.5, p < .01). Given that EF participants and MF participants show diverging response latencies in the related-condition, a significant effect of the interaction between relatedness and group is found (F1 (2, 92) = 6.59, p < .05; F2 (2, 49) = 64.34, p < .01).

In separate by-participants analyses the related-condition has been analyzed in detail to determine the exact interaction of the respective marker and the respective noun. A separate by-items analysis was not necessary because single items were compared in this analysis. Average response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>condition</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>df1, df2</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>df1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relatedness</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>2, 92</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatedness*word</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2, 92</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group*relatedness</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2, 92</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group*word</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1, 46</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group<em>relatedness</em>word</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2, 92</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Results from the statistical by-participants (F1) and by-items (F2) analysis. In the by-items analysis, the df2 = 49. Levels of significance are displayed with the F1 and F2 (*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05).
latencies of the pairs in the related condition are displayed in the three figures below. Analogous ANOVAs of the three respective noun triples did not show any significant priming effect.

The analysis of the markers *comme, like, genre* shows slower response latencies for EF participants, especially when *comme* is the prime and when *genre* is the target. This leads to a significant effect in the prime*target*group interaction (F1 (2, 92) = 2.85, p < .01).

In the analysis of the pair *alors, so, donc* participants of both groups were much faster when *so* was the prime. Consequently a significant prime effect was found (F1 (2, 92) = 4.21, p < .05). The analysis of the pair *bon, well, bien* yielded no significant effects.
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**Figure 42.** Mean reaction times (participants means) by group for the marker pair *comme, like, genre*. Error bars represent one standard error.
6.3.6 Discussion

MF participants showed overall faster response times than EF participants. This may be explained in analogy to the results of experiment 1. MF participants were possibly more in a bilingual mode due to their constant exposure to both languages. EF participants had more problems...
getting in a bilingual mode due to their generally monolingual environment. Still, this fact did not have any impact on the error rates.

The present experiment aimed to investigate three different aspects of bilingual language processing, which are the three contact-induced changes of the three marker pairs, analyzed in the previous chapters. To get results that are as comparable as possible to preceding studies, two additional conditions were included in the experiment, that are the set of nouns and the fact that all stimuli were presented in an identical, related and unrelated condition. The latter control condition aimed to confirm that the semantic relationship of prime and target has an effect on the response latencies. As expected, a significant effect was found in this condition. As supposed, identity primes yielded the fastest response latencies. Related and unrelated primes provoked very similar reaction times, in which unrelated primes were treated slightly faster.

The other control variable, the inclusion of a set of nouns, aimed to provide an initial comparison of the two word types. While it was not possible to match both sets perfectly in length, frequency and polysemous senses, results cannot give unequivocal evidence of the processing of both word types.

A significant effect was found in this condition in the by-participants analysis. Results indicate that the set of nouns triggered overall faster response latencies than the set of pragmatic markers. This result is surprising in that the set of pragmatic markers contained words with a higher frequency and a stronger polysemy than the set of nouns. One possible explanation of the result may be that nouns are easier to be recognized as isolated word forms than pragmatic markers.

For the analysis of the interaction of the marker pairs and the effect of their contact-induced changes, the related-condition was analyzed in detail. It is very striking that the three pairs of markers yielded three different effects. While the pair comme, like, genre produced a significant effect in the interaction of prime, target and group, the marker pair alors, so, donc yielded a significant priming effect. In contrast, the marker pair bon, well, bien as well as the analogous noun pairs did not show any significant effect at all.

In the following, the results of each analysis will be discussed in more detail and placed into a larger perspective and context.

As displayed in Figure 41, the analysis of the markers comme, like, genre showed a mixed effect. MF speakers show significantly faster response latencies than EF speakers in the L1-L2 priming direction, but very differing results are found in the L2-L1 direction. This is not surprising and is consistent with the priming asymmetry in masked priming with lexical decision (see 6.1.1.2). The faster response latencies of MF speakers in the L1-L2 direction may be due to the fact that they are highly fluent and balanced bilinguals, while EF speakers are not. But this does not seem to be the only reason because this effect does not occur for the other marker pairs or for the
noun pairs. Consequently, this effect may also be explained by a larger semantic overlap of the respective marker pairs in their mental representations.

It can be observed that *comme* in Manitoban French primes *like* significantly stronger than in European French and vice versa. A similar priming effect is visible for *genre* priming *like* but this effect cannot be confirmed for *like* priming *genre*. This leads to the result that the pair *comme-like* yields faster response latencies for MF speakers in both priming directions.

As shown in Figure 42, the analysis of the markers *alors, so, donc* yielded a significant priming effect. At a first sight, this priming effect seems to be very plausible, but a look at the respective figure shows striking results. In the present case, L2-L1 priming shows significantly faster response latencies in both groups than L1-L2 or L1-L1 priming. This result does not only conflict with the priming asymmetry hypothesis but also with the results of the analysis of the marker pair *comme, like, genre*. Still, it does not seem plausible to explain this result with the borrowing of *so* in Manitoban French because a similar effect is also found for European French participants. A possible explanation concerns the phonological and morphological structure of *so*. *So* is a one-syllabic lexical item that does not carry any too language-specific phonological or orthographical characteristics. This peculiarity may lead to a stronger effect on the respective target words.

In contrast to the other markers, the triple *bon, well, bien* does not yield any significant effect at all (see Figure 43). As displayed in the figure on the previous page, results are very uniform and do not show important peculiarities. It can therefore be inferred that the decrease in frequency of *bon* and *bien* in Manitoban French does not have any strong influence on their processing. This result may have two reasons. First, compatible with the unidirectionality hypothesis (see chapter 1.2), a decrease in frequency may not lead to a decrease in semantic meanings and senses. Second, the isolated presentation of the respective items may not have triggered the pragmatic functions of the markers but rather their more dominant senses. The first explication does seem more plausible; because a masked priming task with lexical decision is generally able to activate all senses of a respective target word (see 6.1.1.2).

In a preliminary conclusion, it is intended to put the results of this analysis in the context of the underlying hypothesis. The hypothesis that the contact-promoted language change of *comme* in Manitoban French has an impact on the processing of this item and the translation equivalent *like*, cannot be confirmed unequivocally. A similar facilitation effect can also be found for the *genre-like* priming, which contradicts the initial hypothesis. Further experimental evidence is needed to clarify this specific effect. As a second underlying hypothesis, it was supposed that the frequent borrowing of *so* has an effect on its processing. Results indicate that a surprising facilitation effect is found for L2-L1 primes. The current hypothesis still cannot be confirmed because the same effect is also present in EF speakers. This result leads to the hypothesis that an increase
of frequency, without an increase in semantic senses, does not yield any facilitation effects. This hypothesis is supported by the results of the third marker pair, where the decrease in frequency does not produce any significant differences in the processing of the respective markers.

In an overall conclusion, it can be stated that it is very striking that the three pairs of markers yield different facilitation effects, while the three pairs of nouns all trigger no effect at all. Only in the results from the marker pair *comme, like, genre*, a significant difference between the groups is found, in form of a significant interaction of prime, target and group. While the results cannot give unequivocal evidence about the processing of these markers and the impact of language contact, it is still possible to derive certain tendencies. Results from the present experiment allow the assumption that the variation in frequency between two language groups (in this case MF and EF) does not have an important impact on the processing of the respective items. In contrast, findings suggest that the variation of polysemous senses indeed may have an impact on the processing and the relationship of the respective items and their translation equivalents.

A further discussion of the results, with special regard to the results of experiment 1, will be the subject of the upcoming and conclusive part of this chapter.

### 6.4 General discussion

In the present chapter, two experiments have been performed to gain further insights into the processing of pragmatic markers in bilingual lexical access. These two tasks were designed to analyze the results of the corpus analysis in chapter 4 from a psycholinguistic perspective. The corpus analysis gave evidence that pragmatic markers may indeed behave very differently in language contact. The aim of the experiments was to identify the role of pragmatic markers in sentence processing and to determine the impact of contact-induced language change on the processing of pragmatic markers in the bilingual brain.

A first task aimed to investigate the role of pragmatic markers and hedges in monolingual sentence processing. A second task examined the influence of contact-induced change of pragmatic markers on word processing in masked priming.

The results of Experiment 1, the sentence word verification task, allow two interesting assumptions. First, hedges and pragmatic markers seem indeed to have an impact on sentence processing, in that they yield overall slower response latencies. This leads to the assumption, that hedges and pragmatic markers, in the functions and meanings displayed in Experiment 1, hinder sentence processing. This result may be explained by the fact that the functions and meanings, employed in Experiment 1, all trigger a loose reading or an approximation on a scale. This ‘impreciseness’ may lead to more scope of interpretation in the hearer, which leads to slower processing times.
As already mentioned in 6.1.1, only few psycholinguistic studies considered response latencies of pragmatic markers in sentence context. Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) found facilitatory effects for sentences containing the marker *oh* but these results cannot be compared directly to the present investigation, because of the problematic experiment design. Furthermore, the marker *oh* cannot be compared in its semantic, pragmatic and syntactic characteristics with the markers *comme* and *genre*.

Even if they cannot give unequivocal evidence, the results of Experiment 1 have indeed implications for research on pragmatic markers. The results show that, at least for the markers under investigation and for sentence comprehension, the pragmatic markers had an influence on the response latencies of the participants. This leads to the assumption that the markers were, speaking in terms of pragmatic research on these markers (see chapter 1) not perceived procedurally but rather conceptually. This assumption can be supported by the findings of Fox Tree (2012) (see 6.1.1). This may be due to the fact that the markers under investigation mainly occur in hedging functions, which indeed may affect the propositional content. Therefore, this assumption is not necessarily valid for other pragmatic markers in other discourse-pragmatic functions.

To confirm the results of the present experiment, it is necessary to perform additional experimental investigations with measurement of response latencies on pragmatic markers. It would be of particular importance to perform further investigations on the differing role of hedges and pragmatic markers in sentence comprehension. Furthermore, it would be suited to compare the processing of different kinds of hedges and pragmatic markers.

The second result from Experiment 1 indicates that the emergence of new functions of *comme* has an impact on the processing of these functions. Here, *comme* in newly emerged pragmatic functions yielded slower response latencies for EF speakers than for MF speakers. It has been pointed out that this effect may have different reasons. It cannot be stated unequivocally if the slower response latencies depend on frequency, productivity or even a certain garden path effect for EF speakers. This is due to the fact that in language change, frequency and productivity are not always clearly separable. It is not always possible to determine by means of diachronic data if a shift in productivity determined an increase in frequency or vice versa.

Still, it was possible to prove that EF speakers and MF speakers process the marker *comme* in newly emerged functions very differently. It seems very likely to explain this effect with the contact-promoted language change of *comme*.

The results of Experiment 2 allow complementing this assumption to some degree. The results of the masked priming task indicate that the variation of polysemous senses and the semantic overlap of translation equivalents may play an important role in priming. In contrast, the variation of frequency does not seem to have a similar influence on processing. This is not even the case for the marker *so*, which has not only undergone an increase in frequency, but is also borrowed
frequently into French discourse. The borrowing of *so* does not seem to have any effect on bilingual language processing in masked semantic priming. The priming effect, found for *so* in both groups, rather seems to be motivated by the phonological and morphological characteristics of this item.

The results from Experiment 2 confirm the result from Experiment 1, in that the evolution of *comme* in Manitoban French and its interrelation to English *like* may be represented in the bilingual mental lexicon of Manitoban French speakers. That is to say, results from both experiments indicate that the emergence of new pragmatic functions and semantic meanings may have an impact on lexical access.

It has been discussed in detail in 6.1.1.2 that polysemy is a factor that influences response latencies in masked semantic priming (e.g. Wang, Forster 2010; Finkbeiner et al. 2004). The results from the present investigation give support for the Sense Model, which states that semantic overlap of two translation equivalents has an impact on their processing (see 2.1; 5.1 and 6.1.1.2). If two lexical items overlap to a high degree in their semantic senses, this yields a stronger priming effect. This effect is especially strong in the markers *comme-like* in both directions in Experiment 2. Support for the Sense Model also comes from the other results in Experiment 2. The markers *comme-like-genre* yield a group effect, explainable by the emergence of new senses of *comme* in the Manitoban language contact situation. This effect is found neither in the detailed analysis of the control nouns, which yielded no effect at all, nor in the detailed analysis of the other markers *alors-so-donc* and *bon-well-bien*. This may be due to the fact that only the marker *comme* experienced the emergence of new functions and meanings, while the other markers only experienced a frequency shift.

In conclusion, the present results support the Sense Model. But they also suggest that the Sense Model is not a static model and that semantic overlap of lexical items may change due to factors such as language change.

Consequently, these results indicate that frequency shifts, without a change in the semantic and pragmatic status of a lexeme, do not yield effects in masked semantic priming. That does not mean that frequency is not at all important in the representation of language change in the mental lexicon. Frequency plays an important role in models of the bilingual brain (see chapter 2) and in the design of experimental investigations (see e.g. Schwieter & Sunderman 2008; Gollan et al. 2008). But in the present case, the difference in frequency of the respective pragmatic markers did not yield a significant effect between the experimental and the control group. This missing effect may have several reasons. First, the other senses of the isolated lexical items, e.g. their adverbial use, were more dominant in the semantic masked priming task and therefore the frequency difference had a weaker impact on the response latencies. Second, the decrease in frequency did not yield a decrease in semantic senses in the respective lexical items. This has already
been pointed out in chapter 5.3 and may be an evidence of the unidirectionality of language change (see chapter 1.2). The unidirectionality hypothesis does not allow a development of the respective lexical items in the inverse direction, which consequently is an argument against the loss of pragmatic functions and semantic senses. The semantic masked priming task may therefore not have triggered a significant difference between the MF and the EF group, because in both cases the same semantic representations have been activated.

As stated before, the present experimental investigation does not allow to draw unequivocal conclusions but rather to indicate new evidence for further investigations. Additional experiments should investigate the question if different processes of language change have different effects on language processing. This question is crucial to analyze in more detail the impacts of language contact and language change on the representations in the bilingual brain. Here, it would be particularly interesting to analyze if the frequent borrowing of items has the same effect on psycholinguistic tasks than other types of frequency shift. Furthermore, it would be important to investigate the role and the interdependence of frequency and productivity in more detail. This question is of high importance when analyzing in detail the outcomes of language change in contact situations and their possible implications on language processing.

From a monolingual perspective, it would be important to investigate in more detail the concrete role of different pragmatic markers and hedges in sentence processing. Here, it is crucial to examine if different markers and hedges have the same impact on sentence processing or if they behave differently by reason of their characteristics. Furthermore, it would be interesting to examine in more detail in which way prototypical word classes, such as nouns and adjectives, behave differently in language processing than pragmatic markers.

It goes without saying that the research field on pragmatic markers and the research field of language contact could benefit strongly from further experimental investigations on this topic.
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Conclusion

The present study aimed to investigate processes of language change of pragmatic markers in language contact as well as their impacts on the processing of pragmatic markers in the bilingual brain. The main findings of the present work indicate that pragmatic markers may undergo very different processes of language change in the same language contact situation and that these changes affect bilingual language processing to different degrees.

In previous studies on pragmatic markers, it has been stated that these items may undergo different processes in language contact (e.g. Mougeon & Beniak 1991; Torres & Potowski 2008). These studies claimed that pragmatic markers are very suited for borrowing in language contact but that similar markers from two languages may also acquire different meanings or even be replaced by one item from one language. It has even been suggested that two sets of pragmatic markers may coexist or that all markers from one language may replace all markers from the other language (e.g. Brody 1987; Goss & Salmons 2000).

The present study aimed to investigate the processes and outcomes of language change in contact situations by means of an own corpus of bilingual Franco-Manitoban discourse. The analysis of the corpus data revealed several interesting results. First, it has been analyzed that only very small set of pragmatic markers occurs in the FM Corpus data and that frequent European French markers such as *enfin/fin*, *bref, tu vois, t'sais* and *quoi* do not appear at all. Furthermore, the very frequent Quebec French marker *ça fait quel/qué que* does not occur neither in the FM Corpus data. For a more detailed analysis of specific pragmatic markers, the French partially equivalent markers *comme-genre, alors-donc* and *bon-ben* have been chosen for frequency reasons, as well as their translation equivalents *like, so and well*.

The analysis of the markers *comme, like, genre* revealed that *genre*, a very new pragmatic marker in spoken European French is not present in the corpus data. The marker *comme* developed new meanings and functions, such as its use as quotative, shield and rounder that appear to be replicated from English *like*. In a more detailed analysis, it became apparent that *comme* followed similar grammaticalization paths and bridging contexts to *like* in Manitoban French. Still, it is not possible to term this process unequivocally as contact-induced language change. Similar processes have been reported in other Romance languages and therefore it is not clear if language contact was only a factor that accelerated the process of language change. Therefore, the emergence of new meaning patterns and functions of *comme* has been termed contact-promoted language change in the present work.
In the corpus-based analysis of the markers *alors, so, donc* it has been reported that the markers *alors* and *donc* appear on a low frequency basis, while the marker *so* occurs very frequently, especially in bilingual contexts and monolingual French discourse. Still, *alors* and *donc* did not lose any of their semantic meanings or pragmatic functions, which are attested in spoken European French. Despite its increase in frequency and its use in bilingual and French discourse, *so* did not develop new functions or new meaning patterns. The results from the corpus analysis and previous research on the marker *so* in other contact varieties indicate that *so* is indeed a case of borrowing from English (e.g. Mougeon, Beniak 1991; Torres, Potowski 2008).

The corpus-based analysis of the markers *bon, well, ben* demonstrated that the markers *bon* and *well* only occur infrequently and only in monolingual contexts in the FM Corpus data. In contrast, the marker *ben* appears particularly frequent in the corpus data but it did not undergo any other changes in its semantic meaning patterns or its discourse-pragmatic functions. Furthermore, it is striking that *ben* generally occurs in monolingual contexts and cannot be considered a case of borrowing. It can be speculated that the marker *ben* is preferred over other partially equivalent markers such as *bon, (en)fin or bref* because of its strong semantic overlap with English *well*. Still, it is not clear why the markers *ben* and *well* do not coexist to the same degree in the FM Corpus data. More large-scale corpus data is needed to investigate this phenomenon more closely.

This corpus analysis revealed that pragmatic markers in a contact situation might indeed undergo different processes of language change. The present analysis demonstrated three processes, that are the contact-promoted change of the marker *comme*, the borrowing of the marker *so* and the decline in frequency, particularly of the markers *donc* and *bon*.

These findings support previous research results on pragmatic markers in language contact (e.g. Torres & Potowski 2008; Hlavac 2006). Furthermore, this study highlights the necessity of cross-language analyses of pragmatic markers to determine their functioning and meaning patterns more precisely.

The second part of the present work aimed to investigate if the processes of language change revealed in the corpus analysis have an impact on bilingual language processing. I supposed that the emergence of new functions and meaning patterns of *comme* in Manitoban French and the resulting stronger overlap of meaning patterns of *comme* and *like* has an impact on these markers in masked semantic priming. This assumption was supported by the results of Experiment 2, which are explainable by means of the Sense Model (Finkbeiner et al. 2004). These results give additional support for the role of polysemy in bilingual language processing and for masked semantic priming studies based on the Sense Model (e.g. Wang, Forster 2010). Furthermore, the results of Experiment 2 indicate that the Sense Model is not a static model and that the semantic overlap of partial translation equivalents may change due to factors such as language contact.
Further evidence for the Sense Model comes from the results of Experiment 1, which suggest that the new meaning patterns and functions of comme were processed slower by the European French control group. It could not be determined unequivocally if this result is due to frequency, productivity or the garden path effect. Still, overall results from Experiment 1 indicate that the markers under investigation hinder sentence processing. This may be explained by the frequent hedging functions in the experimental design, which yield a loose or approximative interpretation and therefore leaves room for interpretation.

The role of pragmatic markers in sentence processing is still unclear. Further research on different pragmatic markers and hedges is particularly needed to test the results from the present experiment.

In contrast, results from Experiments 2 also showed that the borrowing of so and the resulting increase in frequency and use of the item in bilingual and monolingual French contexts does not have an impact on response latencies in bilingual masked semantic priming. The priming effect of so, found in the experimental and in the control group, can be explained by means of the semantic and phonetic characteristics of the marker so. The same result was found for a shift in frequency in the markers well and bon in Manitoban French, which did not yield any significant effect. It has been shown in previous research that frequency does indeed play a role in masked priming tasks. Still, it is possible that the shift in frequency, only found in spoken corpus data, was not important enough to yield significant group effects. This may be due to the presence of other meaning patterns of the respective markers.

Further experimental investigations are necessary to examine the impact of language change on bilingual language processing more precisely. Here, the role of frequency, polysemy and productivity of lexical items in language change as well as the impacts on language processing have to be investigated in more detail.

In conclusion, it can be stated that pragmatic markers may undergo processes of language change in contact situations. The processes may affect the semantic meaning patterns, the discourse-pragmatic functioning and the frequency of pragmatic markers. The emergence of new meaning patterns of comme, following similar grammaticalization paths as like, results in a stronger semantic overlap with the respective translation equivalent, which has an impact on bilingual language processing. These results give additional support for the Sense Model. The borrowing of the marker so only influences the frequency of this item and its respective French translation equivalents but not their semantic and pragmatic functioning. Therefore, this borrowing has no impact on masked semantic priming. The frequency shift of bon, ben and well does not affect their semantic and pragmatic functioning as well as their processing in masked semantic priming, which supports the unidirectionality hypothesis in grammaticalization theory.
Overall results of the present study indicate that the semantic meanings and pragmatic functions of pragmatic markers play indeed an important role in language change and in language processing. They are much more than just meaningless filler words that only serve to bridge pauses. Further analyses of these items are absolutely worthwhile to gain new insights into their role in language change and in sentence processing.
Pragmatische Marker sind stark polyseme lexikalische Einheiten, die sich durch ihre Multifunktionalität auf pragmatischer Ebene auszeichnen. Frühere Studien haben gezeigt, dass pragmatische Marker durch Prozesse der Grammatikalisierung oder Pragmatikalisierung (das Wort scheint es nicht zu geben) entstehen und neue pragmatische Funktionen und semantische Bedeutungsmuster entwickeln können. Insbesondere in Sprachkontaktsituationen sind sie aufgrund ihrer speziellen semantischen, pragmatischen und morphosyntaktischen Eigenschaften sehr anfällig für Sprachwandel. Der kontaktbedingte Sprachwandel von pragmatischen Markern ist, insbesondere aus psycholinguistischer Perspektive, noch unzureichend erforscht.


In einem abschließenden Teil des Kapitels stelle ich unterschiedliche kontaktbedingte Sprachwandelphänomene von pragmatischen Markern vor und diskutiere sie in Bezug auf methodische Herangehensweisen zum Vergleich pragmatischer Marker in verschiedenen Sprachen.


Die Analyse der Marker *ben*, *well* und *bon* führt zu dem Ergebnis, dass alle Marker im FM Korpus in allen pragmatischen Funktionen und semantischen Bedeutungen verwendet werden. Der Marker *ben* tritt häufig in den Korpusdaten auf, die Marker *well* und *bon* kommen im Gegensatz dazu nur sehr selten vor. Die lexikalische Entscheidung für *ben* hat möglicherweise Gründe, die
aus dem Sprachkontakt resultieren. Der Marker *ben* überlappt in all seinen Funktionen und Bedeutungen mit dem englischen Marker *well* und wird daher *bon* vorgezogen. Eine weitere Ursache für die frequente Verwendung des Markers *ben* ist seine phonologische Beschaffenheit. Zusammenfassend hat die Korpusanalyse ergeben, dass pragmatische Marker im Sprachkontakt durchaus unterschiedliche Sprachwandelprozesse unterlaufen.

Im vorliegenden Sprachkorpus handelt es sich um die Prozesse des kontaktbegünstigten Transfers, der Entlehnung und des Frequenzwandels der jeweiligen Marker.


In der empirischen Untersuchung in Kapitel 6 überprüfe ich die Annahmen aus Kapitel 5. Zum einen untersuche ich welchen Einfluss die Marker *comme* und *genre* auf die monolinguale Satzverarbeitung des Französischen haben. Hierbei liegt der Fokus auf der Frage, ob der kontaktbegünstigte Transfer des Markers *comme* Auswirkungen auf die Satzverarbeitung hat. Zum


Experiment 2 bestand aus einer sprachübergreifenden maskierten Priming-Aufgabe, in der den Probanden ein maskierter Prime - bestehend aus einem Substantiv oder einem pragmatischen Marker - ein identisches, relatiertes oder unrelatiertes Targetwort aus derselben Wortart dargeboten wurde. Die Probanden vollzogen eine lexikalische Entscheidungsaufgabe auf der Grundlage des Targetwortes. Beide Probandengruppen zeigten schnellere Reaktionszeiten für identische Prime-Target Kombinationen sowie für die Substantive. In einer separaten Analyse der relatierten Prime-Target Kombinationen zeigten sich für die neun untersuchten pragmatischen Marker drei verschiedene Ergebnisse:

1. Die Analyse der Marker *comme*, *like* und *genre* führte zu einer Interaktion von Prime, Target und Probandengruppe,
2. die Analyse der Marker *alors*, *so* und *donc* zeigte einen signifikanten Primingeffekt,
3. die Analyse der Marker *ben*, *well* und *bon* führte zu keinem signifikanten Ergebnis.

Eine analoge Analyse der Substantive zeigte ebenfalls keinen signifikanten Effekt.

Die Ergebnisse der beiden Experimente zeigen, dass sich der kontaktbegünstigte Bedeutungstransfer und die dadurch entstandene stärkere Überlappung von Bedeutungsmustern von *comme* und *like* durchaus auf die bilinguale Sprachverarbeitung auswirken. Dieses Ergebnis legt die Befunde und Aussagen des *Sense Models* von Finkbeiner et al. (2004). Erstaunlicherweise scheinen die Entlehnung von *so* und der Frequenzwandel anderer Marker keinen Einfluss auf die bilinguale Sprachverarbeitung zu haben. Eine mögliche Ursache hierfür ist, dass der Frequen-
zwandel nur in der gesprochenen Sprache vorkommt und dadurch keine Frequenzeffekte im visuellen maskierten Priming erzeugt werden.

Des Weiteren unterstützt Experiment 1 die Annahme, dass pragmatische Marker die Sprachverarbeitung verzögern. Dieses Ergebnis bezieht sich allerdings nur auf die pragmatischen Marker *comme* und *genre* in speziellen pragmatischen Funktionen und kann nicht ohne Weiteres auf andere pragmatische Marker übertragen werden. Weiterführende Untersuchungen sind notwendig, um den genauen Einfluss von pragmatischen Markern auf die monolinguale Satzverarbeitung und die Auswirkung von Sprachkontaktprozessen auf die bilinguale Sprachverarbeitung zu überprüfen.
References


Bolly, C., & Degand, L. (2009). Quelle(s) fonction(s) pour donc en français oral ?: Du connecteur conséquentiel au marqueur de structuration du discours. Linguisticae Investigationes, 32(1), 1–32.

Bonin, P., & Méot, A. (2002). Do identical priming and word frequency truly interact in picture naming when a neutral baseline is used? current psychology letters, (7), 51–70.


Corpus CLAPI (Corpus des LAngues Parlées en Interaction). available online on http://clapi.univ-lyon2.fr/

Corpus de la Parole. available online on http://corpusdelaparole.in2p3.fr/

Corpus ELICOP (Etude LInguistique de la COmmunication Parlée). available online on http://bach.arts.kuleuven.be/elicop/


Grant, A. P. (2012). Contact, convergence, and conjunctions: a cross-linguistic study of borrowing correlations among certain kinds of discourse, phrasal, adverbial, and dependent clause markers. In C. Chamoreau & I. Léglise (Eds.), Dynamics of contact-induced language change (pp. 311–358), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.


References


Heine, B. (2012). On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact. In C. Chamoreau & I. Léglise (Eds.), Dynamics of contact-induced language change (pp. 125–166). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.


La Société Franco-Manitobaine. available online on http://www.sfm.mb.ca/communaute/histoire_du_manitoba_francais/

La Société Historique de Saint-Boniface. available online on http://shsb.mb.ca/Au_pays_de_Riel/Chronologies/Manitoba_francais


Old English Dictionary. Available online on www.oed.com


## Appendix A

### A.1 Stimuli used in Experiment 1  
*(Sentence-Word Verification Task)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Target related</th>
<th>Target unrelated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comme1</strong></td>
<td>Il est comme « touche pas ta face »</td>
<td>figure</td>
<td>fête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le gars est comme „c’est beau ça”</td>
<td>charme</td>
<td>pomme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le monde est comme „oh mon dieu”</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>chemise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’étais comme „je n’ai pas de l’argent“</td>
<td>monnaie</td>
<td>soirée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’est comme „ouï j’ai vu ça“</td>
<td>regard</td>
<td>toit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elle était comme „là je ne sais pas“</td>
<td>conscience</td>
<td>cuisine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La guitare va comme „cling cling cling”</td>
<td>bruit</td>
<td>quartier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le père a comme 35 ans</td>
<td>parent</td>
<td>oreille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’ai fini dans comme vingt secondes</td>
<td>minute</td>
<td>copain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je l’ai fait en comme trois mois</td>
<td>année</td>
<td>épaule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ça fait comme cinq fois qu’elle t’appelle</td>
<td>téléphone</td>
<td>boîte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il va chanter comme un couple de chansons</td>
<td>artiste</td>
<td>colère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On a eu comme 3 semaines de pratique</td>
<td>exercice</td>
<td>chien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On a comme vingt mille pièces</td>
<td>argent</td>
<td>manteau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comme2</strong></td>
<td>C’est comme une édition spéciale</td>
<td>numéro</td>
<td>doigt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il nous donne comme ses informations</td>
<td>avis</td>
<td>jardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il faut qu’on achète comme un ordinateur</td>
<td>machine</td>
<td>sommeil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elle a préparé comme la table</td>
<td>diner</td>
<td>retard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il y a comme une tisane de camomille</td>
<td>herbe</td>
<td>meuble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je vais faire comme un Dvd du concert</td>
<td>spectacle</td>
<td>oiseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On cherche comme un caméraman pour filmer</td>
<td>réalisation</td>
<td>mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il portait comme une casquette</td>
<td>chapeau</td>
<td>chaîne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’ai étudié comme sciences politiques</td>
<td>faculté</td>
<td>chaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On fait comme une petite pause</td>
<td>repos</td>
<td>jeunesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca va se passer comme en novembre</td>
<td>hiver</td>
<td>parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils veulent enlever comme les critères</td>
<td>règle</td>
<td>montagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils cherchent quelqu’un pour faire comme le design</td>
<td>annonce</td>
<td>sentiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elle me faisait comme un dîner</td>
<td>déjeuner</td>
<td>bateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
<td>Elle téléphone genre 10 fois par jour</td>
<td>appareil</td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Au lieu de lui dire genre tu me manques toi</td>
<td>amour</td>
<td>escalier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toute la famille y passe genre vingt bisous</td>
<td>amitié</td>
<td>lendemain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’était à genre un quart d’heure de la fac</td>
<td>collège</td>
<td>début</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Target related</td>
<td>Target unrelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Une petite rencontre genre dix quinze personnes</td>
<td>réunion</td>
<td>effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des émissions de débat genre ça se discute les choses</td>
<td>programme</td>
<td>docteur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il y a un silence de mort genre fais nous rire</td>
<td>calme</td>
<td>résultat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’ai entendu un bruit de camion genre poubelle</td>
<td>voiture</td>
<td>sentiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’est une nouvelle forme de consommation genre biscuits</td>
<td>repas</td>
<td>vitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’est genre là où les gens ils viennent</td>
<td>rencontre</td>
<td>événement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elle pose des questions genre un peu différentes</td>
<td>réponse</td>
<td>beauté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils veulent plutôt genre petites agences</td>
<td>bureau</td>
<td>pont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’est un sketch genre télévision</td>
<td>comédie</td>
<td>forêt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C’est l’éclairage avec des lanternes genre moyen Âge</td>
<td>lampe</td>
<td>ennemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>J’aime bien la première chanson</td>
<td>musique</td>
<td>endroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il fait un lancement de disque</td>
<td>vente</td>
<td>espace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On cherche un nouveau guitariste</td>
<td>membre</td>
<td>verte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu peux y aller réparer ton vélo</td>
<td>véhicule</td>
<td>couloir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je travaille à produire le document</td>
<td>papier</td>
<td>bonheur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il connaît un couple de personnes</td>
<td>individu</td>
<td>lune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On revient le vingt cinq août</td>
<td>retour</td>
<td>ventre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On faisait treize heures en voiture</td>
<td>voyage</td>
<td>feuille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Là-bas le service est mille fois mieux</td>
<td>aide</td>
<td>campagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il m’a donné cinq timbres</td>
<td>lettre</td>
<td>docteur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils chargent 30 dollars de l’heure</td>
<td>frais</td>
<td>paysan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dans la vie elle a douze employés</td>
<td>ouvrier</td>
<td>faute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>À l’école il y a 150 élèves</td>
<td>étudiant</td>
<td>champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je dois dépenser 400 pièces</td>
<td>prix</td>
<td>hiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler</td>
<td>Les cours avaient fini au mois de mai</td>
<td>culce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On fait beaucoup de travail avec le Québec</td>
<td>manuban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je t’ai demandé l’autre jour</td>
<td>qaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils ne savent pas ce que je fais</td>
<td>niolé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu changes tous tes plans</td>
<td>trorbin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’ai écrit une lettre aujourd’hui</td>
<td>nindre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je reste en ville jusqu’à jeudi soir</td>
<td>meivupir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenant il faut vendre les billets</td>
<td>aacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On ne dormait pas beaucoup la semaine passée</td>
<td>raifiba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cette histoire est vraiment ridicule</td>
<td>pizard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je fais toute sorte de projets</td>
<td>itigrul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ils vont jouer avec nous en concert</td>
<td>pyscie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nous voulons enregistrer un album cette année</td>
<td>domria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Nonword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ils font beaucoup d'argent</td>
<td>nexuam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est le temps de manger maintenant</td>
<td>peuterin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je vais vous parler un petit peu</td>
<td>alpilsop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cette semaine je suis allé au café</td>
<td>clorndupe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J'aime les endroit qui sont à la mode</td>
<td>tumeuisse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deux copains à moi organisent des soirées</td>
<td>cairle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est un milieu un peu particulier</td>
<td>jentur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J'ai fait ma fiche de lecture ce weekend</td>
<td>gonse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu es un peu stressé aujourd'hui</td>
<td>manyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon père revient dans son village nata</td>
<td>boanrer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j'espère que je ne me suis pas trompée</td>
<td>donnobau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elle essayait de faire changer les papiers</td>
<td>urmaier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma mère parlait l'allemand avec ses parents</td>
<td>ryrement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On va se faire un petit repas ce soir</td>
<td>lasafie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma copine a fini son stage</td>
<td>oujebote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il y a des petites boutiques sympas là-bas</td>
<td>poscin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes parents habitent à cinq minutes de la plage</td>
<td>bomyol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes grands-parents m'ont laissés leur voiture</td>
<td>nadelé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu m'as demandé une faveur</td>
<td>pobis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le mercredi, tu m'as appelé pour parler</td>
<td>gulule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'est elle qui décide combien d'argent est dépensé</td>
<td>tolbena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quand ça lui plait elle fait ses propres règles</td>
<td>syemsmur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle est habituée à faire des conneries</td>
<td>oryrtta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tout le monde demande les mêmes questions</td>
<td>binumvode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ils sont venus à l'heure de dîner</td>
<td>poitet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il a des problèmes d'apprentissage</td>
<td>caggeur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux réussir à les convaincre</td>
<td>mordye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On travaille en partenariat avec cette entreprise</td>
<td>ulan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tous les deux ans il fait une collection de mode</td>
<td>sarecoel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il fait de la broderie traditionnelle</td>
<td>inal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je ne les ai jamais vu travailler</td>
<td>bume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je pars en vacances cette semaine</td>
<td>piteur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ils sont partis chaque fin de semaine</td>
<td>miaupulil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le serveur au bistro est italien</td>
<td>allmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On parlait de la grammaire de la langue française</td>
<td>atoeir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon arrière-grand-père est né en Italie</td>
<td>plipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma copine a une soeur et deux frères</td>
<td>surerive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon nom du milieu est Vincent</td>
<td>cradul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il veut toujours faire quelque chose d'autre</td>
<td>vaxiceleur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dans neuf mois je vais avoir 25 ans</td>
<td>gecasout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J'aime pas trop cette histoire</td>
<td>liotem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>À la fac j'ai fait un peu de sociologie</td>
<td>paubair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il y a des gens qui aimaient m'embaucher</td>
<td>niteau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J'ai commencé à enseigner il y a deux ans</td>
<td>priquel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Nonword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je suis retourné à l’école cette année</td>
<td>irbepes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J’ai vu des photos de cette maison</td>
<td>hijer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je suis rentrée en train à La Rochelle</td>
<td>laoeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On s’est promené un petit peu à la plage</td>
<td>muxumpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il va amener la voiture à un garage</td>
<td>turphille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on va aller boire un petit coup</td>
<td>reau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c’est avec mon frère que je tiens le magasin</td>
<td>amep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on est capable de payer toutes ces charges</td>
<td>quyir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c’est mieux de s’adresser directement à une personne</td>
<td>sedien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>il a l’impression qu’on s’occupe de lui</td>
<td>blunce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c’est un magasin avec une ambiance particulière</td>
<td>nichation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>je me fais plus d’illusions sur la politique</td>
<td>esolac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>je ne suis jamais allé à la mer</td>
<td>vicojon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on a fait une belle croisière</td>
<td>azarme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on devait monter à Paris pour prendre l’avion</td>
<td>anilgre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sur le bateau ils vendent pas d’alcool</td>
<td>nirmence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ce sont des morceaux de musique classique</td>
<td>oeul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Il a dormi toute la nuit</td>
<td>efim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tâche de mémoire**

Svp, décidez si vous avez entendu les phrases suivantes dans la tâche précédente ou pas. Svp, faites votre choix aussi vite et précis que possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pierre habite à Paris et Marie à Strasbourg.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Les enfants jouent aux cartes.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Le père a comme 35 ans.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Il connaît un couple de personnes.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>On passe les vacances en Italie.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>C’était à genre un quart d’heure de la fac.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tu peux y aller réparer ton vélo.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Il aimerait vivre près de la mer.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chaque soir, elle fait ses devoirs.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ils chargent 30 dollars de l’heure.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.2 Stimuli used in Experiment 2
(Masked Semantic Priming Task)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Prime Marker</th>
<th>Target Marker</th>
<th>Prime Noun</th>
<th>Target Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identical</strong></td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>devoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>travail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related</strong></td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>travail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>devoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>travail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>devoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrelated</strong></td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>devoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>travail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>genre</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>heure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Prime Marker</td>
<td>Target Marker</td>
<td>Prime Noun</td>
<td>Target Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alors</td>
<td>comme</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donc</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bien</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>donc</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>monde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bien</td>
<td>alors</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td>homme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bon</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comme</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genre</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>travail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comme</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>devoir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genre</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>heure</td>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Filler**

**Filler**

**Identical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voici</th>
<th>voici</th>
<th>tête</th>
<th>tête</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mais</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>visage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>là</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puis</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fille**

**Related**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voici</th>
<th>mais</th>
<th>tête</th>
<th>head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voici</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>tête</td>
<td>visage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mais</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mais</td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>là</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>là</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puis</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puis</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Filler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Prime Marker</th>
<th>Target Marker</th>
<th>Prime Noun</th>
<th>Target Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrelated</strong></td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>tête</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>now</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>là</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>then</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>visage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>là</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>visage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>then</td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>then</td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>visage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>là</td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>tête</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>âge</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still</td>
<td>puis</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>âge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bien</td>
<td>là</td>
<td>rue</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>chemin</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>tête</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>now</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>now</td>
<td>quoi</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voici</td>
<td>enfin</td>
<td>tête</td>
<td>chemin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mais</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>visage</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonwords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>crond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>bous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>thear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>sarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>tonish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>sarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>tonish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sege</td>
<td>thear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>viec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>pume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>chabre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sege</td>
<td>viec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>chabre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>pume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>rond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>bous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>crouce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>os</td>
<td>tonish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sege</td>
<td>thear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>sarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>chabre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>pume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>vicc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ege</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sege</td>
<td>gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>sleek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>adiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>adiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>sleek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>orand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>naque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>orand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>orand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>naque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sege</td>
<td>gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rell</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nogrit</td>
<td>diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terves</td>
<td>sleek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>len</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonk</td>
<td>gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chone</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceria</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>leak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>adiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>adiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>sleek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>naque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>naque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>orand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>rane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>guste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>tivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>adiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>sleek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>morsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>orand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>moture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>naque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>crel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>nogrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>sege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>nogrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>sege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>rell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>terves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>terves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>chone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>ceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>sonk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>ceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>sonk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>chone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>sonk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>chone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>ceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>sege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ous</td>
<td>rell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saiv</td>
<td>nogrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blant</td>
<td>terves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abis</td>
<td>len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan</td>
<td>rell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beut</td>
<td>nogrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubre</td>
<td>sege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autuste</td>
<td>nogrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chabre</td>
<td>sege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viec</td>
<td>rell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pume</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pume</td>
<td>len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chabre</td>
<td>terves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viec</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crous</td>
<td>terves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crond</td>
<td>len</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bous</td>
<td>ceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bous</td>
<td>chone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crouce</td>
<td>sonk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crond</td>
<td>ceria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonish</td>
<td>sonk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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rane       autuste
adiary    beut
morsh     lubre
sleak     ous
sleak     saiv
adiary    blant
morsh     bis
rane       el
guste     nan
tivet     beut
adiary    lubre
sleak     utuste
mosh      bous
orand     crouce
moture    crond
naque     crouce
rane       crond
rane       bous
guste     thear
guste     arly
ivet      tonish
tivet     sarly
adiary    tonish
adiary    thear
sleak     pume
sleak     viec
morsh     chabre
morsh     viec
orand     chabre
orand     pume
moture    chabre
moture    pume
naque     viec
naque     crond
rane       bous
guste     crous
tivet     tonish
adiary    thear
sleak     arly
morsh     crouce
orand     bous
moture    rond
naque     crous
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Sociolinguistic questionnaires adapted from Mougeon et al. (2005)

Questionnaire écrit - Niveau secondaire

Nom de l’étudiant(e): ________________________________

1. Nom de l’école et année scolaire/Name of school and grade: ________________________________

2. Sexe/Sex: F M

3. Date de naissance/Date of birth: jour/day ________________ mois/month ________________ année/year ________________

4. Ton lieu de naissance/Your place of birth:
   Manitoba
   Nom de la ville/Name of city: ________________________________
   Québec
   Nom de la ville/Name of city: ________________________________
   Autre province/Other province
   Nom de la province/Name of province ________________________________
   Autre pays/Other country
   Nom du pays/Name of country ________________________________

5. J’habite à/I have lived in ________________________________ Depuis combien de temps?/For how many years?
   8 ans ou plus/8 years or more o moins de 8 ans/fewer than 8 years o

6. Si tu n’es pas né(e) au Manitoba, en quelle année es-tu arrivé(e) au Manitoba?/If you were not born in Manitoba, in what year did you arrive in Manitoba:
   19 _____ ou/or 200 _____
7. Quelle est la première langue que tu as apprise À LA MAISON AVANT D’ALLER À L’ÉCOLE? Si tu as appris plus d’une langue À LA MAISON encercle le numéro qui indique leur fréquence d’utilisation (1 = très souvent; 2 = aussi souvent; 3 = peu souvent)./What is the first language that you learned at HOME BEFORE STARTING SCHOOL? If you learned more than one language AT HOME circle the number that indicates how frequently you use them
(1 = very often; 2 = equally often; 3 = occasionally):

a) ____________________________ 1 2 3  
b) ____________________________ 1 2 3  
c) ____________________________ 1 2 3  

S’il y a eu un changement dans la fréquence d’utilisation de ces langues quand tu étais à l’école élémentaire, indique le ci-dessous. If this order of frequency changed when you were in elementary school, indicate it below:
Pas de changement/No change  
a) ____________________________ 1 2 3  
b) ____________________________ 1 2 3  
c) ____________________________ 1 2 3  

8. Lieu de naissance de ton père/tuteur/Your father’s/guardian’s place of birth:
Manitoba Nom de la ville/Name of city: ____________________________  
Québec Nom de la ville/Name of city: ____________________________  
Autre province/Other province Nom de la province/Name of province ____________________________  
Autre pays/Other country Nom du pays/Name of country ____________________________  

9. Quelle(s) langue(s) est-ce que ton père/tuteur parlait durant son enfance?/What language(s) did your father/guardian speak when he was a child?

10. Si ton père/tuteur n’est pas né au Manitoba, en quelle année est-il venu s’établir au Manitoba?/If your father/guardian was born outside of the province of Manitoba, in what year did he come here?
11. Lieu de naissance de ta mère/tutrice/Your mother’s/guardian’s place of birth:
   Manitoba Nom de la ville/Name of city:
   Québec Nom de la ville/Name of city:
   Autre province/Other province Nom de la province/Name of province
   Autre pays/Other country Nom du pays/Name of country

12. Quelle(s) langue(s) est-ce que ton mère/tutrice parlait durant son enfance?/What language(s) did your mother/guardian speak when she was a child?

13. Si ta mère/tutrice n’est pas née au Manitoba, en quelle année est-elle venu s’établir au Manitoba?/If your mother/guardian was born outside of the province of Manitoba, in what year did she come here?

14. Le niveau d’études et l’occupation de ton père/tuteur (SVP. Sois aussi précis que possible)/Your father’s/guardian’s level of education and his occupation (Please be as precise as possible):
   a) N’a pas terminé le secondaire/ o secondaire/highschool o collège ou BA/college or BA o études graduées/graduate degree o
   b) Genre de travail/Type of employment
   c) Lieu du travail/Place of work:
   d) Autre (Préciser)/Other (Specify):

15. Le niveau d’études et l’occupation de ta mère/tutrice (SVP. Sois aussi précis que possible)/Your mother’s/guardian’s level of education and her occupation (Please be as precise as possible):
   a) N’a pas terminé le secondaire/ o secondaire/highschool o collège ou BA/college or BA o études graduées/graduate degree o
   b) Genre de travail/Type of employment
   c) Lieu du travail/Place of work:
### 16. What schools you have attended and in what language(s) were you taught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school and city</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seulement français/Only French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. In which language do you speak to your father/guardian?

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/ More often in French than in English</td>
<td>Autant en français qu'en anglais/ As much French as English</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/ More often in English than in French</td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc. Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.

### 18. In which language do you speak to your mother/guardian?

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/ More often in French than in English</td>
<td>Autant en français qu'en anglais/ As much in French as in English</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/ More often in English than in French</td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc./Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.

19. **Dans quelle langue est-ce que ton père/tuteur te parle?**/ **In which language does your father/guardian speak to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/ More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu'en anglais/ As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/ More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc./Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.

20. **Dans quelle langue est-ce que ta mère/tutrice te parle?**/ **In which language does your mother/guardian speak to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/ More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu'en anglais/ As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/ More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc./Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.

20. **Dans quelle langue est-ce que ta mère/tutrice te parle?**/ **In which language does your mother/guardian speak to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/ More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu'en anglais/ As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/ More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc./Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser): Voici des exemples de réponses possibles: i) toujours en italien; ii) souvent en japonais et parfois en français; iii) souvent en anglais, parfois en français, parfois en polonais, etc./Other language choice (Specify): Here are examples of possible answers: i) always in Italian; ii) often in Japanese and sometimes in French; iii) often in English, sometimes in French and sometimes in Polish, etc.

### 21. Dans quelle langue est-ce que tes parents se parlent entre eux?/In which language do your parents speak to each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ne s’applique pas o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

### 22. À la maison, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à ton/tes frère(s) et/ou ta/tes sœur(s)?/At home, in which language do you speak to your brother(s) and/or sister(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Ne s’applique pas o</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>French Options</th>
<th>English Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. En dehors de la maison, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à ton/tes frère(s) et/ou ta/tes sœur(s)?/Outside the home, in which language do you speak to your brother(s) and/or sister(s)?</td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas / zero.oldstyle / Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/ More often in French than in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autant en français qu’en anglais/ As much in French as in English</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/ More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. À la maison, dans quelle langue parles-tu à tes ami(e)s?/At home, in which language do you speak to your friends?</td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas / zero.oldstyle / Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/ More often in French than in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autant en français qu’en anglais/ As much in French as in English</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/ More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Dans la cour d’école, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à tes ami(e)s?/In the schoolyard, in which language do you speak to your friends?</td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas / zero.oldstyle / Tout le temps en français/ Always in French</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/ More often in French than in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autant en français qu’en anglais/ As much in French as in English</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/ More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/ Always in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>À l’école dans les corridors, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à tes ami(e)s?</td>
<td>At school in the hallways, in which language do you speak to your friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>À l’école dans la salle de classe, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à tes ami(e)s?</th>
<th>At school in the classroom, in which language do you speak to your friends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>En dehors de la maison et de l’école, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles à tes ami(e)s?</th>
<th>Outside of your home and outside of school, in which language do you speak to your friends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ne s’applique pas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 29. Si tu as un emploi à temps partiel, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu parles au travail?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):**

### 30. Quand tu sors magasiner, dans quelle langue est-ce que tu communiques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):**
31. Tu regardes la télévision/You watch television

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Tu regardes la télévision/You watch television

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

33. Quels sont les programmes de télévision que tu regardes en français?/What television programs do you watch in French?

34. Tu écoutes la radio/You listen to the radio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Tu écoutes la radio/You listen to the radio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Tu lis des livres durant ton temps libre/You read books in your spare time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Souvent/Often</td>
<td>Assez souvent/Fairly often</td>
<td>Des fois/Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarement/Rarely</td>
<td>Jamais/Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tu lis des livres durant ton temps libre/You read books in your spare time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ne s'applique pas</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Tu écoutes de la musique enregistrée (ex. DCs, MP3s)/You listen to recorded music (eg. CDs, MP3s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Souvent/Often</td>
<td>Assez souvent/Fairly often</td>
<td>Des fois/Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarement/Rarely</td>
<td>Jamais/Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Tu lis des livres durant ton temps libre/You read books in your spare time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ne s'applique pas</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40.</th>
<th>Tu joues à des jeux sur ordinateur/You play games on the computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souvent/Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41.</th>
<th>Tu joues à des jeux sur ordinateur/You play games on the computer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42.</th>
<th>Tu joues à des jeux électroniques (ex. Gameboy, X-Box)/You play electronic games (eg. Gameboy, X-Box)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souvent/Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43.</th>
<th>Tu joues à des jeux électroniques (ex. Gameboy, X-Box)/You play electronic games (eg. Gameboy, X-Box)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Joues-tu à d'autres jeux en français (ex. jeux de société, jeux de cartes)?/Do you play other games in French (eg. boardgames, card games) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tu utilisles les salons de clavardage (chat) sur Internet/You use Internet chat rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. **Tu utilisles les salons de clavardage (chat) sur Internet/You use Internet chat rooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu'en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify):

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. Tu vas chercher des informations sur Internet/You look for information on the Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tu vas chercher des informations sur Internet/You look for information on the Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souvent/Often</th>
<th>Assez souvent/Fairly often</th>
<th>Des fois/Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarement/Rarely</th>
<th>Jamais/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. Tu vas chercher des informations sur Internet/You look for information on the Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue de recherche</th>
<th>En français</th>
<th>En anglais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tout le temps</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always in French</td>
<td>More often in French than in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne s'applique pas</td>
<td>Autant en français qu'en anglais</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As much in French as in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais</td>
<td>Always in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autre choix de langues (Préciser)/Other language choice (Specify): 

49. Dans quel genre de ville aimerais-tu vivre dans l’avenir? Dans une ville où on parle:/If you had the choice in the future in what type of town would you like to live? In a town where people speak:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue des habitants</th>
<th>En français</th>
<th>En anglais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tout le temps</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always in French</td>
<td>More often in French than in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne s'applique pas</td>
<td>Autant en français qu'en anglais</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As much in French as in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais</td>
<td>Always in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Si tu as l’intention d’avoir des enfants, dans quelle langue aimerais-tu les élever?/If you intend to have children in which language would you like to raise them?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue de l’éducation</th>
<th>En français</th>
<th>En anglais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tout le temps</td>
<td>Plus souvent en français</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always in French</td>
<td>More often in French than in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne s'applique pas</td>
<td>Autant en français qu'en anglais</td>
<td>Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As much in French as in English</td>
<td>More often in English than in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tout le temps en anglais</td>
<td>Always in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. Si tu as l'intention d'avoir des enfants, dans quelle langue aimerais-tu qu'ils fassent leurs études?/If you intend to have children in which language would you like them to be schooled?

- Ne s'applique pas
- Tout le temps en français/Always in French
- Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/More often in French than in English
- Autant en français qu'en anglais/As much in French as in English
- Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/More often in English than in French
- Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English

52. Prévois-tu poursuivre tes études dans un collège ou une université après avoir terminé le secondaire?/Do you plan on going to college or university after finishing high school?

- Oui/yes
- Non/No

53. Si oui dans quelle langue PRÉFÉRERAIS-TU étudier?/If yes in which language would you PREFER to study?

- Ne s'applique pas
- Tout le temps en français/Always in French
- Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/More often in French than in English
- Autant en français qu'en anglais/As much in French as in English
- Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/More often in English than in French
- Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English

54. Si oui dans quelle langue PRÉVOIS-TU étudier?/If yes in which language are you LIKELY to study?

- Ne s'applique pas
- Tout le temps en français/Always in French
- Plus souvent en français qu'en anglais/More often in French than in English
- Autant en français qu'en anglais/As much in French as in English
- Plus souvent en anglais qu'en français/More often in English than in French
- Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English

55. Donne la liste de trois établissements post-secondaires pour lesquels tu aimerais poser ta candidature/List three post-secondary institutions to which you would like to apply

a) Ne s'applique pas
b) Ne sais pas/Don't know
c)
56. Indique le(s) sujet(s) dans le(s)quel(s) tu aimerais te spécialiser/Indicate the subject(s) in which you would like to major  Ne s’applique pas  o
Sujet(s) de spécialisation/Major(s):  Ne sais pas/Don’t know  o

57. Après avoir terminé tes études, quel genre de poste prévois-tu obtenir/Ater having finished school, what type of position do you foresee holding?

58. Dans ce poste, en quelle langue prévois-tu travailler?/In your future position in which language do you think you will be working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tout le temps en français/Always in French</th>
<th>Plus souvent en français qu’en anglais/More often in French than in English</th>
<th>Autant en français qu’en anglais/As much in French as in English</th>
<th>Plus souvent en anglais qu’en français/More often in English than in French</th>
<th>Tout le temps en anglais/Always in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. Quelle importance attaches-tu au français dans ta vie actuelle?/What importance do you attach to French at present in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très important/Very important</th>
<th>Important/Important</th>
<th>Assez important/Fairly important</th>
<th>Très peu important/Not very important</th>
<th>Pas important/Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Quelle importance attaches-tu au français dans l’élaboration de tes plans futurs?/What importance do you attach to French in planning your future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très important/Very important</th>
<th>Important/Important</th>
<th>Assez important/Fairly important</th>
<th>Très peu important/Not very important</th>
<th>Pas important/Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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