



## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope and Secova, Maria (2018) Grammatical change in Paris French: in situ question words in embedded contexts. *Journal of French Language Studies* 28 (2), pp. 181-207. ISSN 0959-2695.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/22079/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

**Table (1): Distribution of speakers across age and gender**

<b>Age</b>	<b>10-14<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>15-16</b>	<b>17-19</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Gender</b>				
<b>Female</b>	9	23	9	41
<b>Male</b>	20	6	10	36
<b>TOTAL</b>	29	29	19	77

---

<sup>1</sup> The speakers were divided into age groups of a roughly similar size, and according to significant transitions in their life stage, i.e. the transition from *collège* to *lycée* and later into *seconde* (sixth form).

**Table (2): Ethnic origin of speakers' parents**

1 (French)	2 (Mixed heritage)	3 (Immigrant origin, same ethnicity)	Total
23	16	38	77

**Table (3): Distribution of speakers across the type of friendship network**

1 (least diverse)	2	3	4	5 (most diverse)	Total
6	13	22	11	25	77

**Table (4.1): Pre-verb forms**

A. Je sais pas ce que c'est	27.1% (N=45)
B. Je sais pas qui / comment / combien c'est	31.9% (N=53)
TOTAL pre-verb	59% (N= 98)

**Table (4.2): Post-verb (*in situ*) forms**

C. Je sais pas c'est quoi	19% (N=30)
D. Je sais pas c'est qui / comment / combien	19% (N=31)
TOTAL <i>in situ</i>	38% (N=61)
TOTAL all indirect questions	100% (N=159)

**Table (5): Distribution of variants across languages spoken at home**

<b>Language</b>	<b>Monolingual French</b>	<b>Passive bilingual</b>	<b>Active bilingual</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Variant</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	
<i>In situ</i>	7.9 (3)	27 (10)	57 (48)	61
<b>Pre-verb</b>	92.1 (35)	73 (27)	43 (36)	98
<b>Total</b>	100 (38)	100 (37)	100 (84)	159

$\chi^2 = 29.4576$ , p-value = < 0.00001.

**Table (6): Distribution of variants across ethnic origin**

<b>Origin</b>	<b>French</b>	<b>Mixed heritage</b>	<b>Immigrant</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Variant</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	
<i>In situ</i>	7.1 (2)	14.3 (4)	53.4 (55)	61
<b>Pre-verb</b>	92.9 (26)	85.7 (24)	46.6 (48)	98
<b>Total</b>	100 (28)	100 (28)	100 (103)	159

$\chi^2 = 28.2527$ , p-value = < 0.00001.

**Table (7): Distribution of variants across gender**

<b>Variant</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>F</b> <b>% (n)</b>	<b>M</b> <b>% (n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>In situ</i>		24.4 (19)	51.9 (42)	61
<b>Pre-verb</b>		75.6 (59)	48.1 (39)	98
<b>Total</b>		100 (78)	100 (81)	159

$\chi^2 = 12.7017$ , p-value = .000365.



**Table (8): Distribution of variants across network score**

<b>Network</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Variant</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	
<b><i>In situ</i></b>	0 (0)	0 (0)	17.2 (5)	36.1 (13)	60.6 (43)	61
<b>Pre-verb</b>	100 (8)	100 (15)	82.8 (24)	63.9 (23)	39.4 (28)	98
<b>Total</b>	100 (8)	100 (15)	100 (29)	100 (36)	100 (71)	159

$\chi^2 = 34.662$ , p-value =  $< 0.00001$ .

**Table (9): Distribution of variants across age**

<b>Age</b>	<b>10-14</b>	<b>15-16</b>	<b>17-19</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Variant</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>	
<b><i>In situ</i></b>	87.5 (14)	31.9 (36)	36.7 (11)	61
<b>Pre-verb</b>	12.5 (2)	68.1 (77)	63.3 (19)	98
<b>Total</b>	100 (16)	100 (113)	100 (30)	159

$\chi^2 = 18.3955$ , p-value = .000101.

**Table (10): Most frequent users of the *in situ* form<sup>1</sup>**

Speaker	Ethnicity	N. Score	Age	Sex	Tokens
Nizar	3	5	19	M	7
Abdel	3	5	14	M	7
Gabin	3	5	12	M	5
Aissata	3	5	16	F	5
Sami	3	5	14	M	3
Karim	3	5	13	M	3
Nader	3	4	14	M	3

---

<sup>1</sup> All names have been changed.

**Table (11): Contribution of factors to the probability of use of the *in-situ* variant**

<b>Fixed factors</b>			
Input		0.2	
Total N		156	
	FW <sup>1</sup>	%	<i>n</i>
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Immigrant origin	.81	53	55/103
Mixed heritage	.50	15	4/26
French origin	.19	7	2/27
<i>Range</i>	62		
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	.64	52	42/81
Female	.36	25	19/75
<i>Range</i>	28		
<b>Continuous factors</b>			
<b>Friendship network (1-5)</b>			
	+1	Log-odds: 1.091	
<b>Length of subordinate clause (2-9 syllables)</b>			
	+1	Log-odds: -1.071	

<sup>1</sup> A factor weight above 0.5 favours the application of the variable under investigation, while a factor weight below 0.5 disfavors it. The figures that are not significant are not presented.