

Ok Francis lis l'autre strophe mon grand: Teachers' in-class use of nominal address forms with their students

Katherine Rehner, Raymond Mougeon et Françoise Mougeon

Numéro 17, 2023

Perspectives sociolinguistiques variationnistes du français en situation de contact des langues

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1107302ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

University of Guelph, School of Languages and Literatures

ISSN

2292-2261 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Rehner, K., Mougeon, R. & Mougeon, F. (2023). Ok Francis lis l'autre strophe mon grand: Teachers' in-class use of nominal address forms with their students. *Nouvelle Revue Synergies Canada*, (17), 1–11.

Résumé de l'article

Cette étude examine les variations dans les formes d'adresse que les enseignants utilisent en classe avec leurs élèves. Elle s'appuie sur un corpus collecté dans les écoles secondaires de langue française de l'Ontario, au Canada. L'étude fournit une taxonomie des formes d'adresses nominales utilisées, ainsi que les décomptes de fréquence et les taux de dispersion. Cela inclut les formulaires utilisés pour s'adresser : i) à la classe entière (par exemple, tout le monde « tout le monde », les gars et les élèves « étudiants ») ; ii) un groupe d'étudiants (ex. : ceux-celles/les gens, etc. + qui « ceux/les gens, etc. + who », les filles « filles » et les gars « garçons ») ; et iii) des étudiants individuels (par exemple, prénoms, prénom et nom, Monsieur « Monsieur », Madame « Ma'am », Mademoiselle « Miss », ma belle « ma chère », mon grand « grand gars »). L'étude examine les fonctions discursives associées à ces formes d'adresse (par exemple, les fonctions relationnelles positives comme « féliciter » et « encourager » sont associées à des termes d'affection). L'étude conclut en soulignant la contribution de ses conclusions aux appels de Francols (2010) à des recherches plus approfondies sur le sujet.

© Katherine Rehner, Raymond Mougeon, Françoise Mougeon, 2023



Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

Ok Francis lis l'autre strophe mon grand : Teachers' in-class use of nominal address forms with their students

Katherine Rehner

University of Toronto Mississauga
Canada

Raymond Mougeon

Glendon College, York University
Canada

Françoise Mougeon

Glendon College, York University
Canada

Introduction

Address forms in most languages can be divided into two categories, pronominal (e.g., *you*) and nominal (e.g., *Mrs. Smith*). In many European languages, pronominal address forms consist of two or more forms referring to the same person. For example, *vous* and *tu* ('you') in French can be used to refer to the same person but with greater or lesser social distance, respectively. Nominal address forms may be divided into a number of categories, such as names (e.g., first name, last name), titles (e.g., *Monsieur* 'Sir', *Madame* 'Ma'am'), professional titles (e.g., *Maitresse* 'Teacher'), and terms of endearment (e.g., *ma belle* 'my dear', *mon grand* 'big guy'). The use of address forms helps identify interlocutors, and they are indexical of the speakers' characteristics and their relationship with the interlocutors. In addition, these forms can be associated with a variety of discourse functions, including, for example, softening a face-threatening act or reinforcing a face-flattering act.

Most studies of French address forms have focused on the *tu/vous* alternation (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002; Dewaele, 2004; Edmonds & Guesle-Coquelet, 2015; Lyster & Rebuffot, 2002; Morford, 1997; Williams & van Compernelle, 2009). However, a few studies have enlarged the scope to include both pronominal and nominal address forms (e.g., Kerbrat-Orecchioni's edited collections, 2010, 2014). While these latter studies have investigated a variety of situations, settings, and institutions, only a few draw on data collected in the classroom. Among these, some have examined learners' understanding of such forms (e.g., Liddicoat, 2006) or how they can best be taught to learners (e.g., Guesle-Coquelet, 2010). The current chapter expands this scope by presenting the results of a study of the in-class use of nominal address forms by 59 teachers who recorded themselves while teaching in the French-medium secondary schools of four localities in Ontario, Canada.

Previous Research

Two bodies of studies are addressed in this review. The first body includes research that examines the use of sociolinguistic variants by teachers in the classroom. Such studies provide a wider framework for the specific issues that are considered in the present chapter. The second body captures research focused on teachers' use of French nominal address forms in the classroom, which is the specific focus of the present study.

Teachers' in-class use of sociolinguistic variants

The present study is informed by research that has documented the impact of the classroom context and teachers' socio-professional characteristics on their in-class use of sociolinguistic variants. First, teachers' in-class speech has been found to differ from that outside of the classroom by more frequent use of formal variants (e.g., Biber's 2006 study of American university instructors in lectures vs. office hours; Li's 2010 examination of Mandarin-as-a-second-language teachers' in-class vs. interview speech). Second, research contrasting French Language Arts teachers with teachers of other subjects has found that the former use formal variants in the classroom more frequently than do the latter, for example, studies of future Québécois teachers (Gervais, Ostiguy, Hopper, Lebrun, & Préfontaine, 2000; Ostiguy, Champagne, Gervais & Lebrun, 2005) and the study of

teachers in Franco-Ontarian high schools (Mougeon & Rehner, 2019). More recently, the impact of the subject on sociolinguistic variant selection has been further refined to show that, in comparison to French Language Arts teachers and teachers of all remaining subjects, those who teach interactive subjects such as music, visual arts, and physical education have the lowest rates of formal variant use in the classroom (e.g., Mougeon, Mougeon & Rehner, 2022). Third, the communicative functions performed by teachers in the classroom have also been found to be associated with variant choice, with teaching and/or providing instructions to the whole class featuring more frequent use of formal variants than speech directed to individual students (e.g., Biber, 2006; Mougeon & Rehner, 2019; Starr, 2017). Finally, teachers' gender has been shown to impact their in-class use of sociolinguistic variants, with female teachers being generally more inclined to use formal variants (e.g., Gervais, Ostiguy, Hopper, Lebrun, & Préfontaine, 2000; Mougeon & Rehner, 2019). Mougeon and Rehner (2019) also examined the impact of age but found this parameter did not reveal meaningful associations with teachers' in-class variant choices.

Teachers' in-class use of French nominal address forms

Only a handful of studies have focused on French nominal address forms used by teachers in the classroom. Some have examined teachers of adult learners (e.g., Lahmar, 2009), while others have focused on teachers of younger French-speaking students (e.g., Barbu, 2014; Francols, 2010). First, Lahmar (2009) examined nominal address forms used by native and non-native French-speaking (first language Arabic) instructors at a university in Algeria. Drawing on data collected in classes and tutorials in French-as-a-foreign-language, Psychology, Sociology, and English, Lahmar (2009) found that the instructors used students' first names, and the titles *Mademoiselle* 'Miss' and *Monsieur* 'Mister', and employed the following terms of endearment to lessen the distance with the students: *benti* (which is the Arabic word for 'my daughter'), *ma fille* (the French equivalent of *benti*), and *mon fils* (French for 'my son').

Second, Barbu (2014) analyzed data collected in French Language Arts classes for 7-8 year-olds in France. The author distinguished between forms directed to individual students, groups of students, and the whole class. Save for one, all instances addressing individual students were first names. The one exception was the term of endearment *mon grand* 'big guy', which was used in a special circumstance to comfort a crying student. To address a group of students, the teachers used forms such as *les garçons* 'the boys', *les autres* 'the others', and *ceux qui* 'those who' + relative clause (e.g., *ceux qui ont fini* 'those who have finished'). To address the whole class, the teachers used forms such as *les enfants* 'children', *tout le monde* 'everybody', and *les CE1* 'CE1 students (where CE1 is their grade)'.

Finally, Francols (2010) examined data gathered in four primary school classes in France, among 5-6 and 10-12-year-olds. The author also used the ternary distinction between individual students, small groups of students, and the whole class. She found that with individual students, the teachers used first names 90% of the time with the younger students and 100% with the older ones. First names were used mostly for turn management (i.e., to indicate who should respond to the teacher's question or who had the floor to speak) and occasionally to discipline students, to accompany a request, or to create a positive relation. In addition to first names, with the younger students the teachers used: i) *Monsieur/Mademoiselle* + first name when praising and requesting (e.g., making a strong request, or requesting a student's attention) and ii) terms of endearment (e.g., *ma belle*, *mon ami* 'my friend', *mon petit coco* 'my little chick') when mitigating a criticism, reproach, or strong request or when emphasizing a positive relational message. For small groups, the teachers used the generic term *les copains* 'friends' and more specific terms to identify groups according to their roles (e.g., *les responsables de X* 'those responsible for doing X'), according to their location in the classroom (e.g., *ces enfants-là* 'these children here'), or according to their group name in an activity (e.g., *les dinosaures* 'the dinosaurs'). When addressing the whole class, the teachers exclusively used *les enfants* in the younger classes and *tout le monde* in the older classes. Francols (2020) concluded by outlining a number of interesting avenues for future research, including:

- the evolution of nominal address form use from kindergarten to university classrooms,
- cultural similarities and differences between countries,
- the influence of different subjects taught (e.g., math vs. physical education), and

- how the use of nominal address forms impacts the distance versus closeness of the teacher-student relationship.

Research goals of the present study

The present study has three main goals. First, we produce a taxonomy of nominal address forms used by the 59 teachers in our database when addressing the whole class vs. small groups of students vs. individual students. We provide information on the frequency and dispersion of these forms. Second, we gauge the impact of several aspects of the teachers' socio-professional characteristics (i.e., age, gender, subject taught) that have been considered in our previous research on sociolinguistic variants, to determine if these characteristics impact in the same way on the teachers' selection of nominal address forms. To achieve this, we focus on the forms that are used to address individual students, a focus which reflects, in part, the space restrictions of this article and, in part, the abundance of such forms in our corpus. Finally, in line with previous research, we document the main discursive functions associated with the forms used to address individual students.

Methods

Our study draws on a corpus of roughly 80 hours of classroom speech produced by 59 teachers who recorded themselves in 2005 while teaching Grade 9-12 classes (students 14-17 years of age) in the French-medium secondary schools in the cities of Hawkesbury, Cornwall, North Bay, and Pembroke, in Ontario, Canada, where Francophones originating primarily from Quebec, but also from Canada's Maritime provinces, settled during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹ The 59 teachers are distributed fairly evenly according to community of residence (Hawkesbury=14; Cornwall=16; North Bay=16 and Pembroke=13). However, it should be pointed out that many of the teachers were not born in nor are long-term residents of these communities. This reflects the geographic mobility of Franco-Ontarian educators as a result of variable job availability. For this reason, in our previous research on the teachers' use of sociolinguistic variants, and in the present study, community of residence is not considered in the analysis. The distribution of teachers is fairly even according to gender (females=29; males=30), but less so according to age ($\geq 50=11$; $30-49=28$; $\leq 29=19$).² While the teachers are all native speakers of French, all but three report having little-to-no difficulty speaking English. Lastly, the teachers include 16 who teach French Language Arts, 8 who teach interactive subjects (i.e., music, fine arts, and physical education), and 35 who teach other subjects (e.g., physics, natural sciences, geography, law). To analyze the predictive power of the teachers' socio-professional characteristics on their choice of forms, we have used the statistical program GoldVarb. It performs a regression analysis to identify those factors with a statistically significant impact on the use of a particular form, either a positive association (factor effect values above 0.50) or a negative one (values below 0.50).

Findings

Taxonomy of Nominal Address Forms

Table 1 shows the nominal address forms used by the teachers to address the whole class. As can be seen, *tout le monde* 'everyone' is by far the most highly dispersed, being used by 36 of the 59 teachers. The form *les élèves* 'students' is the most dispersed of the remaining forms, and the dispersion rates of *guys* and *les amis* 'my friends' are comparable, but only approximately half that of *les élèves*. Lastly, *Messieurs Dames/Mesdemoiselles et Messieurs* 'Ladies and Gentlemen' are found in the speech of only three teachers.

Table 1

Frequency and dispersion of nominal address forms used by teachers to address the whole class

Forms Used with Whole Class	n	%	Dispersion
<i>tout le monde</i>	103	50	(36/59) 61%
<i>les élèves</i>	39	19	(9/59) 15%
<i>guys</i>	41	20	(5/59) 9%
<i>les amis</i>	18	9	(4/59) 7%
<i>Messieurs Dames/Mesdemoiselles et Messieurs</i>	4	2	(3/59) 5%
Nonce forms: <i>la gang, les gens, tous les groupes</i>			
TOTAL	208		

Table 2 presents those forms used to address small groups. As can be seen, the most well dispersed forms are those that include an address term followed by a relative clause introduced by *qui* 'who', which specifies the addressees in terms of a location, an activity, etc. (e.g., *ceux qui ont étudié le commerce* 'those who studied commerce'). These forms are used by three quarters of the teachers. The forms *les autres* 'the others', *l'équipe/le groupe/la rangée* 'the team/group/row', and *les + #* (e.g., *vous avez fini les cinq?* 'Have you five finished?') are much the same but happen not to have been followed by a relative clause with *qui*. The gender-specific forms *les filles/les gars/les garçons* 'girls/boys' are used by just over a third of the teachers. A small number of teachers also used forms with humorous connotations (e.g., *les touristes* 'the tourists') or with titles (e.g., *les madames* 'ladies').

Table 2

Frequency and dispersion of nominal address forms used by teachers to address small groups

Forms Used with Small Groups	n	%	Dispersion
<i>ceux/ceux et celles/gens/personnes/groupes/gang/du monde + qui</i>	142	52	(44/59) 75%
<i>les filles/ les gars/les garçons</i>	89	33	(21/59) 36%
<i>les autres</i>	8	3	(6/59) 10%
<i>l'équipe/le groupe/la rangée</i>	13	5	(4/59) 7%
<i>les (#) retardataires/touristes/mousquetaires</i>	6	2	(4/59) 7%
<i>les + #</i>	4	1	(3/59) 5%
<i>les/mes demoiselles, les madames, Messieurs</i>	8	3	(2/59) 3%
Nonce forms: <i>les gens</i> , first names of all individuals in a group			
Total	272		

= numeral adjective or numeral pronoun

Concerning the forms used to address individual students, Table 3 shows that almost all teachers use students' first names (the three teachers who did not use this form did not use any nominal forms of address with individual students). The only other category of forms used with any substantial frequency is first + last name, which accounts for 3% of tokens and is used by 39% of the teachers. For the remaining forms, even though their frequency is low, they carry special socio-symbolic value, as we will see below.

Table 3

Frequency and dispersion of nominal address forms used by teachers to address individual students

Forms	n	%	Dispersion
first name	3080	92	(56/59) 95%
first + last name	96	3	(23/59) 39%
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle/jeune homme</i>	54	2	(20/59) 34%
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle + last name</i>	34	1	(15/59) 25%
<i>Mon/ma + belle (first name)/ami (first name)/grand(e)/homme/petite madame/petit + first name/belle fille/petite fille/chère (first name)/ange, bud(dy)</i>	45	1	(12/59) 20%
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle + first name</i>	42	1	(6/59) 10%
Nonce: <i>Monsieur + first and last name, first + humorous name</i>			
Total	3353		

The impact of teachers' socio-professional characteristics on the use of forms to address individual students

Concerning the impact of the teachers' socio-professional characteristics, Table 4 shows a linear association between first names and the teachers' age, with a positive factor effect for the younger teachers (0.652), an almost neutral factor effect for the mid-aged teachers (0.547), and a clearly negative factor effect for the older teachers (0.256). While gender does not have a significant impact on the use of first names, subject taught has some predictive value, with the interactive and 'other' subject teachers favouring this category of forms. These two types of subjects had to be regrouped in the analysis because of a slight discrepancy between the hierarchy of influence indicated by the percentages and the factor effects. Concerning the use of first and last names, the only characteristic selected by the regression analysis is subject taught, with French teachers favouring this form and teachers of 'other' and interactive subjects disfavouring it. The use of titles on their own displays a linear correlation with age, namely a strong effect for the older teachers, an almost neutral effect for the mid-aged teachers, and a negative effect for the young teachers. For the use of titles plus last name, only gender was selected, with males showing a clear preference for these forms. Lastly, the use of titles plus first name and the use of terms of endearment both display a linear correlation with age, with the older teachers strongly favouring them, the mid-aged teachers favouring them, and the young teachers clearly disfavouring it. These forms are also clearly associated with the female teachers.

Table 4

Impact of age, sex, and subject taught on the teachers' use of nominal forms to address individual students

Factor	First Name	Other Terms	Effect 1 st Name	First + Last Name	Other Terms	Effect 1 st + Last Name	Title	Other Terms	Effect Title	Title + Last Name	Other Terms	Effect Title + Last Name	Title + 1 st Name	Other Terms	Effect Title + 1 st Name	TOE	Other Terms	Effect TOE
Old	(745) 82.1	(162) 17.9	0.256	(42) 4.6	(865) 95.4	n.s.	(39) 4.3	(868) 95.7	0.814	(11) 1.3	(861) 98.7	n.s.	(34) 3.8	(861) 96.2	0.876	(35) 3.9	(872) 96.1	0.889
Mid	(957) 94.8	(53) 5.2	0.547	(21) 2.0	(1047) 98.0	n.s.	(10) 0.9	(1058) 99.1	0.480	(9) 0.8	(1052) 99.2	n.s.	(7) 0.7	(1052) 99.3	0.635	(8) 0.8	(1002) 99.2	0.530
Young	(1184) 95.5	(56) 4.5	0.652	(32) 2.5	(1265) 97.5		(5) 0.4	(1292) 99.6	0.275	(15) 1.2	(1282) 98.8		(1) 0.1	(1282) 99.9	0.140	(1) 0.1	(1239) 99.9	0.165
Female	(1950) 90.2	(211) 9.8	n.s.	(72) 3.3	(2108) 96.7		n.s.	(46) 2.1	(2134) 97.9	n.s.	(14) 0.7		(2128) 99.3	0.407	(38) 1.8	(2128) 98.2	0.587	(43) 2.0
Male	(1016) 94.2	(62) 5.8		(24) 2.0	(1150) 98.0		(8) 0.7	(1166) 99.3		(22) 1.9	(1148) 98.1	0.666	(4) 0.3	(1148) 99.7	0.341	(1) 0.1	(1077) 99.9	0.127
French	(1300) 87.7	(183) 12.3	0.417	(69) 4.4	(1490) 95.6	0.654	(36) 2.3	(1523) 97.7	n.s.	(13) 0.9	(1513) 99.1	n.s.	(33) 2.1	(1513) 97.9	n.s.	(33) 2.2	(1450) 97.8	n.s.
Other	(1666) 94.9	(90) 5.1	0.570	(21) 1.6	(1271) 98.4	0.394	(13) 1.0	(1279) 99.0		(14) 1.1	(1274) 98.9		(4) 0.3	(1274) 99.7		(7) 0.6	(1244) 99.4	
Interact.				(6) 1.2	(497) 98.8	0.322	(5) 1.0	(498) 99.0		(9) 1.8	(489) 98.2		(5) 1.0	(489) 99.0		(4) 0.8	(501) 99.2	
	Input 0.933; Sig. 0.000; Log -858.230			Input 0.027; Sig. 0.003; Log -429.332			Input 0.010; Sig. 0.000; Log -251.642			Input 0.010; Sig. 0.003; Log -193.594			Input 0.004; Sig. 0.046; Log -193.825			Input 0.003; Sig. 0.010; Log -193.020		

Discursive Functions

The three most frequent discursive functions associated with each form used to address individual students are displayed in Table 5. There are two reasons for limiting ourselves to a ternary hierarchy of function frequency. First, the top three functions account for the majority of the data within the various categories of forms. Second, with the categories other than first names, the frequency of occurrence is so low that going further than three functions would risk establishing rank differences based on too few tokens to be meaningful. It should be noted that due to the overwhelming frequency of first names in the corpus, we have coded the functions for a randomly selected sample of 950 instances (i.e., about one third of the 3080 forms).

As Table 5 shows, asking a question, making a request, and/or turn management (e.g., indicating which student is being invited or allowed to speak) are part of the top three discursive functions for each of the categories of forms. Functions associated with relational work (i.e., praising/thanking/reassuring or reprimanding) are among the top three functions for all categories of forms beyond first names, with or without a title. Finally, the use of first and last names is also associated with the pragmatic tasks of returning work/roll call, reflecting the need to be unambiguous when performing such tasks.

Table 5

Discursive functions associated with the nominal address forms used by the teachers with individual students

Forms	Frequency of Discursive Functions (n)
first name (3080)→(950)	asking a question (171) requesting (110) turn management (106)
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle</i> + first name (42)	asking a question (16) turn management (13) requesting (7)
first + last name (96)	returning work/roll call (24) requesting (20) praising/thanking (8)
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle/jeune homme</i> (54)	praising/thanking (16) asking a question (9) turn management (7)
<i>Monsieur/Madame/Mademoiselle</i> + last name (34)	requesting (8) reprimanding (7) asking a question (6)
ma/mon + term of endearment (45)	praising/thanking/reassuring (10) requesting (10) reprimanding (10)

Discussion

The present study responds to several dimensions of Francols' call (2010, p. 114) for additional research on how nominal address forms are used by teachers in the classroom. In producing a taxonomy of forms used by the teachers of adolescent learners (ages 14-18 years), we, first, expand what is known about the range of nominal address forms used with students of different ages than those focused upon in past studies. In so doing, we have found that there are forms that are used across age groups (e.g., *tout le monde* to address the whole class, *ceux qui* + relative clause to designate particular groups of students, the use of first names and/or titles to address individual students, and the use of certain terms of endearment, such as *ma belle* and *mon ami*). At the same time, we have identified forms that reflect the particular age of the students considered in our research. For instance, terms such as *les retardataires*, *les touristes*, and *les mousquetaires* (e.g., *ok les touristes on fait sûr que demain vous avez votre costume* 'okay tourists make sure tomorrow you wear your uniform') presuppose learners who are old enough to understand the complexity and humour of such terms but also young enough to be addressed with terms that stress the relative role and status of the students in comparison to the teachers. The age of our students is also reflected in the absence of certain terms that are only suitable for very young

learners (e.g., the term of endearment *mon petit coco* documented by Francols, 2010, in classes of 5–6-year-olds; *les enfants* documented by Barbu, 2014, to address a class of 7-8 year olds). Second, our study enlarges the geographical locations considered in previous research by examining the use of French nominal address forms in the Canadian educational context and, more specifically, by using data collected in a situation of language contact. This has allowed us to document forms such as *guys* borrowed from English to address the entire class (e.g., *guys regardez ben la troisième colonne* 'guys take a good look at the third column'). Such forms illustrate the incorporation of terms from the other language of bilingual teachers (akin to the use of *benti* borrowed from Arabic by the teachers in Lahmar's 2009 study). The Canadian focus of our study has also revealed the absence of certain forms that are rarely used, if at all, in Canadian French (e.g., *les copains* documented in schools in France by Francols, 2010). Finally, our study is the first to have provided information on the frequency of the nominal terms of address used by a sizeable number of teachers and, consequently, to be able to measure their dispersion, a finer metric than frequency alone. For instance, based solely on frequency, one would have concluded that *guys* and *les élèves* are equal, but the dispersion rates show that the former has less currency among the teachers (being used, it turns out, only by teachers of interactive subjects).

In investigating the impact of the teachers' socio-professional characteristics on their use of nominal address forms with individual students, the present study has found that the teachers' age reveals meaningful associations with their choice of such forms, unlike what past studies of these same teachers showed for their selection of sociolinguistic variants (e.g., Mougéon & Rehner, 2019). For instance, the use of first name only was shown to be favoured by the younger teachers, while the older teachers favoured the use of titles (either on their own or in combination with students' first names) and terms of endearment. Regarding the impact of gender, the female teachers favour terms of endearment and titles + first name, two options that tend to reduce social distance, while male teachers favour titles + last name, a form that may increase such distance. Finally, concerning subject taught, despite the importance of this professional characteristic in our past research and in that of Gervais, Ostiguy, Hopper, Lebrun, & Préfontaine (2000), this characteristic impacted the teachers' use of only two categories of forms. The use of the more formal and more official combination of first + last names showed a positive association with French Language Arts teachers, while the use of the more egalitarian first names on their own showed a positive association with teachers of subjects other than French. This finding is not unlike the greater propensity of French teachers to favour formal standard variants (as documented in our previous work and in that of Gervais, Ostiguy, Hopper, Lebrun, & Préfontaine, 2000) and of teachers of interactive subjects to favour informal vernacular variants (as shown in our past research). This finding of a limited impact of subject taught on the use of nominal address forms sheds some light on Francols' (2010) call to address the lack of research on this topic.

Finally, in examining how the different categories of address terms used for individual students are associated with certain discourse functions, the present study has also addressed Francols' (2010) call to better understand how the use of such forms impacts the distance versus closeness of the teacher-student relationship. In doing so, we have, first, identified three discourse functions that, in keeping with past research (Francol, 2010) are most frequently associated with the teachers' interactions with individual students (i.e., asking a question, making a request, and turn management), in that one or more of these functions is among the top three for each of the categories of forms in our study. However, it is also noteworthy that the relational functions of praising/thanking/reassuring and reprimanding are among the top three for first + last names, titles either on their own or with a last name, and terms of endearment. In contrast, they are much further down the list of functions for first names either on their own or with a title. The use of emotionally-laden terms of endearment for both the positive relational work of praising/thanking/reassuring (e.g., *comme ça c'est excellent change rien ma belle* 'it's excellent like that don't change anything my dear') and the softening of face-threatening reprimands (e.g., *moi j'apprécierais que maintenant là tu fasses ton travail mon homme* 'me I'd appreciate it if you'd do your work now my man') is in line with similar findings by Barbu (2014) and Francols (2010). What is not so straightforward is the association of such relational work with the seemingly more formal categories of first + last names and titles either on their own or with a last name. It is hoped that the novel contributions of the present study, in terms of it being the first to examine the use of address terms by teachers in the classroom in the Canadian context and

using a methodology that borrows from variationist sociolinguistics, will serve to inspire continued research on this topic.

Notes

¹ These four Franco-Ontarian communities are different from Francophone communities in Ontario's larger metropolitan centers such as Toronto or Ottawa, where Francophone immigrants from around the world are represented (Heller, 1989; 2006).

² One teacher did not provide age-related information.

References

- Barbu, V. (2014). Les formes nominales d'adresse dans l'interaction didactique. Étude comparative français/roumain. In C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni (Ed.), *S'adresser à autrui : les formes nominales d'adresse dans une perspective comparative interculturelle* (pp. 143-178). Université de Savoie.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University Language: A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers*. Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.23>
- Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(2), 189-214. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.2.189>
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2004). *Vous or tu?* Native and non-native speakers of French on a sociolinguistic tightrope. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42, 383-402. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2004.42.4.383>
- Edmonds, A., & Guesle-Coquelet, C. (2015). Reported use and perception of *tu* and *vous* among less integrated and highly integrated Anglophone cultural migrants in France. In F.F. Lundell & I. Bartning (Eds.), *Cultural Migrants and Optimal Language Acquisition* (pp. 83-114). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783094042-005>
- Francols, N. (2010). Les formes nominales de l'adresse dans l'interaction entre maître et élèves à l'école primaire. In C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni (Ed.), *S'adresser à autrui : les formes nominales d'adresse en français* (pp. 89-116). Éd. de l'Université de Savoie.
- Gervais, F., Ostiguy, L., Hopper, C., Lebrun, M., & Préfontaine, C. (2000). *Aspects microstructurels du français oral des futurs enseignants*. Conseil de la Langue Française.
- Guesle-Coquelet, C. (2010). *Les termes d'adresse en français : comment aider les non-francophones à comprendre et en maîtriser l'utilisation*. L'Harmattan. <http://digital.casalini.it/9782296247888>
- Heller, M. (1989). Variation dans l'emploi du français et de l'anglais par les élèves des écoles de langue française à Toronto. In R. Mougeon & E. Beniak (Eds.), *Le français canadien parlé hors Québec: aperçu sociolinguistique* (pp. 153-170). Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. Continuum. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630802413680>
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (Ed). (2010). *S'adresser à autrui : les formes nominales d'adresse en français*. Éd. de l'Université de Savoie.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (Ed). (2014). *S'adresser à autrui : les formes nominales d'adresse dans une perspective comparative interculturelle*. Éd. de l'Université de Savoie.
- Lahmar, K. (2009). *Les formes d'adresse dans les interactions verbales chez les non natifs au milieu universitaire algérien*. [Master's thesis, Ferhat Abbas University, Setif, Algeria]. <http://dspace.univ-setif2.dz/xmlui/handle/setif2/118>
- Li, X. (2010). Sociolinguistic variation in the speech of learners of Chinese as a second language. *Language Learning*, 60, 366-408. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00560.x>
- Liddicoat, A.J. (2006). Learning the culture of interpersonal relationships: Students' understandings of person reference in French. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6, 55-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/IP.2006.003>
- Lyster, R., & Rebuffot, J. (2002). Acquisition des pronoms d'allocation en classe de français immersif. *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère*, 17, 51-72. <https://doi.org/10.4000/aile.842>

Rehner, Katherine, Raymond Mougeon et Françoise Mougeon. « *Ok Francis lis l'autre strophe mon grand* : Teachers' in-class use of nominal address forms with their students. » *Nouvelle Revue Synergies Canada*, N°17 (2023)

- Mougeon, R. & Rehner, K. (2019). Patterns of sociolinguistic variation in teacher classroom speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 23(2), 163-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12336>
- Mougeon, R., Mougeon, F., & Rehner, K. (2022, June 15-17). *Emploi des variantes sociolinguistiques du français par les enseignants en salle de classe : influence de la discipline enseignée* [Paper presentation]. Les Français d'ici 8th Annual Conference, Chicoutimi, QC, Canada.
- Morford, J. (1997). Social indexicality in French pronominal address. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 7(1), 3-37. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1997.7.1.3>
- Ostiguy, L., Champagne, E., Gervais, F., & Lebrun, M. (2005). *Le français oral soutenu chez des étudiants en formation pour l'enseignement au secondaire*. Office québécois de la langue française.
- Starr, R.L. (2017). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Acquisition in Two-Way Language Immersion: Negotiating the Standard*. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096381>
- Williams, L., & van Compernelle, R. A. (2009). *On* versus *tu* and *vous*: Pronouns with indefinite reference in synchronous electronic French discourse. *Language Sciences*, 31(4), 409-427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2007.11.001>