

Standard or Colloquial Usage? What to teach (and when)

by Diane Dansereau

Linguistic Variation

Teachers of French, both in their own speech and also in the speech that they expect from their students, must constantly ask themselves: Which grammatical structures are right and which are wrong? Some are incorrect all of the time but others are less clear.

For example, in following sentences, what is right and what is wrong? *J'aime pain. Je comprends pas.*

It is obvious that the first sentence, a direct translation from the English, is wrong. No native speaker would ever say or write it. The second sentence is, however, more complicated. Although its appearance in a textbook is unlikely, it is included in the spoken repertory of most native speakers. Should it be classified then as right or wrong?

The second sentence exemplifies non-standard, colloquial usage and the concept of linguistic variation. This article will discuss the details of this concept and then apply them to a practical lesson on the interrogative in French.

The first of several interrelated questions to explore is whether or not one should teach non-standard, colloquial forms in the classroom. In other words, must foreign language teaching remain purely prescriptive (what we think students should produce) or can it be descriptive (what they will actually hear and see native speakers say and write)?

In order to answer this question we must ask another, namely: Why would one even consider including non-standard forms in the classroom? Don't we want our students to speak "correctly", that is, like educated native speakers? Actually that is precisely why nonstandard forms must be included in the classroom. For students to be able to achieve near-native proficiency, they must be able to better understand native speakers, educated or not, outside the academic environment.

It has long been established that students on study abroad programs are astonished by the disconnect between what they hear from native speakers and what they learned in the classroom. This unfortunate situation has been apparent to language teachers for decades. In 1978 Bonin remarked that students studying abroad "often experience serious comprehension problems when they are confronted with the informal, everyday use of the language" (90). She concluded that students "have only a very minimal understanding of colloquial French and awareness of the nature, function, and range of appropriateness of the various speech registers. It is equally evident that their college language training fails to prepare them to understand French as it is spoken by French people in the very informal, spontaneous interaction which students most want to share [...] and which most linguists equate with the *real*, live language of the people" (92).

This view is echoed 25 years later by Durán and McCool in their 2003 article entitled *If This is French, Then What Did I Learn in School?*

Bonin, Durán and McCool are describing the phenomenon of linguistic variation, sometimes referred to as stylistic variation. This term quite simply refers to the wide range of variant forms that are available to and used regularly by native speakers.

That this variation exists is not in question. The term *stylistic variation* was coined by Labov in 1972. In 1989 Valdman asserts that although French texts and instructors insist their students learn the French of the typical Educated Native Speaker, this speech is in fact highly variable and that “control of this repertoire, not of a particular norm, ... should constitute the ultimate goal for foreign language learning” (34). In 1997 O’Connor Di Vito argues that “the only descriptively accurate and pedagogically useful characterization of French is one that not only handles linguistic diversity but that actually assumes diversity in language use” (1).

Although most educators are aware of linguistic variation, the reasons for its existence are not always clear. One common misconception is that linguistic variations can be attributed to a simple difference between *oral* and *written* languages, specifically that one can equate the formal register with writing and the informal with speech. It is often taught, for example that the *ne* particle in the negative construction is never dropped in the written language but is often lost in speech. That characterization is, however, not entirely true. Both the oral and written languages contain in fact multiple genres with differing levels of formality (see George 156 and O’Connor Di Vito 5). For instance, language written for the theatre or for an advertisement might approach the style of spoken French and will often exclude the *ne* particle. Similarly, a spoken conference presentation resembles more closely a written text than does free conversation and will of necessity retain more *ne*’s. When addressing linguistic variation, then, it is important to avoid the simplified dichotomy of spoken vs. written language.

Another common explanation for linguistic variation is that it is linked to social class. For example, it is often said that *ne* retention is seen mostly in the speech of more educated individuals. Studies have established that the situation is much more complicated (see for example, Valdman 1989: 38-39). In fact, one person, regardless of his social class, adjusts his way of speaking regularly according to the situation in which he finds himself. It is not uncommon for government officials to drop their *ne*’s when speaking with friends or for local villagers to keep them in conversations with someone they want to impress.

The reality is that the choice of linguistic variants depends on multiple factors. Of these, linguistic and pragmatic factors are the most often overlooked. For instance, the choice of variant in an interrogative construction can depend on the length of the verb or the function of the message (e.g., to obtain or to confirm information). When educators think of linguistic variation they most often think of the sociological factors involved. These can include not only the speaker’s education, social status, profession, age, and sex, but also the speech act (e.g., free conversation vs. a written essay) and the social setting (Quillard 57, O’Connor Di Vito vii, Valdman 2000: 649 and 653).

This article supports the argument of Etienne and Sax that the goal in foreign language teaching should be the “development of students’ socio-pragmatic competence”..., [which] involves the ability to identify the elements of the social context (e.g., the status relationship between the interlocutors, degree of formality of the situation) and notice which linguistic forms are used and are thus appropriate for the context” (2009: 600-601).

Although many studies (including Etienne and Sax 2009, and Valdman 1982 and 2000) have argued the importance of teaching linguistic variation, many, if not most, French teachers and textbooks continue to ignore these variations in favor of traditional forms. The difficulties encountered by our students studying abroad reinforce the unfortunate fact that we have been neglecting linguistic variation in our classrooms.

The reasons for this neglect are twofold. First, and most obviously, educators are daunted by the sheer complexity of the system of variants that exists. Many do not know why they themselves switch from form to form (Durán and McCool 294). And most teachers find this level of detail too advanced for students.

The second reason to ignore linguistic variants may be less apparent : in many cases, negative value judgments have been attached to non-standard forms (George 167, Durán and McCool 289). Studies have shown that educated native speakers, including teachers, are often taken aback when foreigners use language that seems too informal, even if the setting justifies the informality (Stourdzé 19). Many native speakers expect the foreigner to speak better than they do, meaning more formally (Valdman 2000: 649). Thus many linguistic variants are often seen as inferior and associated with negative stereotypes. Even the terms used to define them show the negative judgments surrounding these forms of speech. *Le français vulgaire, populaire, relâché,* and *familier* are seen as substandard, while *le français soutenu* is considered correct (Ledegen and Quillard 300). The traditional forms are even sometimes called “*variantes de prestige*” (Blanche-Benveniste 23).

Nevertheless, despite all of their reservations, foreign language teachers must begin exposing students to linguistic variations. Their introduction to these forms is not intended to ensure that students master their usage but rather, in the words of Etienne and Sax, to “prime them to become better cultural and linguistic listeners and observers, and perhaps cautious interlocutors” (2006:945-946). We want to help students take the first steps away from simply mimicking standard prescribed forms learned in a classroom towards the development of an appreciation of the wide spectrum of forms available and in actual use. Exposing them to linguistic variation will give them the tools they need to begin to choose more natural and appropriate forms in their own speech and writing.

That being said, how exactly does one go about doing this? The manner, degree and timing of such exposure must be carefully crafted.

Concerning the question of timing, that is, when one should begin teaching linguistic variations, it is clear that some appreciation for *levels of language* should be present from the very beginning of study. Students must be made aware that variants exist and that the choice of form depends on multiple factors. Beginners need to be mindful of so-called formal vs. informal

speech and that many written genres (the ones that don't resemble spoken language) will use structures not found in conversations. By the third year of study, the level of detail governing variant choice can be quite high, as this article will demonstrate with the interrogative.

Introduction of specific variants into the classroom will depend on the complexity and importance of each feature. Nevertheless at the advanced (undergraduate) level all commonly-used variants should be made available to students. This is extremely important if they are to make the leap from Intermediate to Advanced level proficiency by the end of their undergraduate major. This article will discuss linguistic variants for the interrogative construction. A summary of variants applicable to other grammar points, and when to introduce them, can be found in the Appendix.

Three other important points must be kept in mind in the teaching of linguistic variation.

First, from the beginning of their study, students must understand the notion of *active vs. passive* learning. Active knowledge is what we expect them to produce and passive is what they will hear and read from native speakers outside of the foreign language classroom. The expectations for active production will increase along with the student's level of proficiency as will their exposure to more advanced examples of native speaker output.

Second, it is always important to teach in context. Grammar explanations must be accompanied by examples taken whenever possible from authentic texts that illustrate the range of stylistic differences and represent various genres of the spoken and written language. This will necessitate a variety of textual forms including literary prose, plays, advertisements, articles from the press, interviews, films, and many others. While some can be short, others need to be paragraph-length, in order to illustrate usage in a larger narrative context. For the importance of teaching grammar in context see Katz and Blyth and O'Connor Di Vito.

Finally, in order for students to learn which forms are more appropriate in which settings, they must be afforded ample opportunities to practice the variations in realistic settings, through meaningful, interactive oral and written exercises.

The interrogative

In this section, we will illustrate the teaching of linguistic variation with the French interrogative.

This subject was chosen because of the wide range of variants that exist. The assertions made are based on data provided in studies including Behnstedt, Coveney 1995, 1996 and 1997, Dewaele, Lightbown and d'Anglejan, McCool, Meyers, and Wall.

In a recent AATF conference presentation, when audience members were asked to write down all the ways they could think of to ask *Where does the boy live?* they came up with 12 variants:

1. Où est-ce que le garçon habite?
2. Où le garçon habite-t-il ?
3. Où habite le garçon ?
4. Il habite où le garçon ?
5. Le garçon, il habite où ?
6. Où il habite le garçon ?
7. Le garçon habite où ?
8. C'est où qu'il habite, le garçon ?
9. Où c'est qu'il habite, le garçon ?
10. Où est-ce qu'il habite, le garçon ?
11. Où ça qu'il habite le garçon ?
12. Où qu'il habite le garçon ?

The multitude of forms offered aptly illustrates the fact that native-speaker usage diverges radically from textbook teaching. Most university textbooks do two things: they limit their presentation of the interrogative to a list of “accepted” forms (1 and 2 above), ignoring non-standard variants altogether and at the same time, they give the impression that the traditional structures are entirely interchangeable. The few textbooks that do mention some of the non-standard variants offer little or no discussion of when to use them.

The following discussion of the interrogative will demonstrate the importance of 1) detailing important limitations on the traditionally “accepted” structures, 2) adding the more commonly-used variants and 3) offering clear examples of acceptable contexts in which each of these variants can, or sometimes should, be used. All of these goals can and should be achieved starting at the beginning level of study, but the number of variants will increase as the student achieves higher levels of proficiency.

When one teaches the interrogative, one begins with *total questions*, or yes-no questions, called *total* because they contain all of the information needed to answer. The introduction to *partial questions* follows soon thereafter. These contain a question word and are called *partial* because the responder needs to supply additional information in his answer. This article will similarly first discuss *total questions* before examining the more complicated structures in *partial questions*.

Total questions

The number of variants for total questions with a pronoun subject is limited to three. These follow the traditional groupings of intonation only, *est-ce que* and inversion. When the subject is a noun, other variants emerge for a and c, below.

Exemple 1 : total questions with pronoun subject

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. Intonation only | <i>Vous comprenez?</i> |
| b. <i>Est-ce que</i> | <i>Est-ce que vous comprenez?</i> |
| c. Inversion | <i>Comprenez-vous ?</i> |

Example 2 : total questions with noun subject

- a. Intonation only *Le garçon comprend? Il comprend le garçon ?*
 b. *Est-ce que* : *Est-ce que le garçon comprend?*
 c. Inversion : *Le garçon comprend-il ? Comprend-il le garçon ?*

Even at the beginning level, students traditionally learn the three variants in example one. With a noun subject they learn to use *est-ce que* or the first sentence in example 2c: inversion following the nominal subject of the verb with a redundant pronoun. This last variant is usually said to be limited to the written language but otherwise, all other forms, including those in example 1, are made to appear completely interchangeable.

What should be taught instead is that there are acceptable and unacceptable contexts for each of the variant forms. In free conversation, at all levels of formality, the structure of choice for native speakers is intonation only with a pronoun subject. If the subject is a noun, a pronoun is added to start the question and the noun most often comes at the end: *Il comprend le garçon?* Conversely all communication that excludes dialogue almost never uses intonation only.

Concerning the use of *est-ce que*, students learn that it is virtually absent from forms of communication that do not contain dialogue (which does not mean all forms of the written language). However, what is widely overlooked is that fact that its usage is highly restricted even in everyday conversation between native speakers. In one study of three year olds, there were no instances at all of *est-ce que* either from the children or from the adults (Redard 1976). At the beginning level of study, the case for the use of *est-ce que* should be made for situations in which clarity is paramount. These include talking on the phone and speaking with foreigners. This is precisely why foreign language teachers use *est-ce que* so often with their students. Consequently, beginning students should know that that it is acceptable for them, as foreigners new to the language, who need more time to formulate and respond to questions, to use *est-ce que* in their own speech. Advanced learners, however, should be advised to decrease their use of *est-ce que* in favor of intonation only. It is also at the advanced level that students will learn the other contexts in which they will hear *est-ce que* from a native speaker. These include interviews and lectures (again, for clarity), and usage in normal conversation to underline the question or to show emotion or doubt (*est-ce que c'est ici qu'on devait attendre?*), to introduce abstract, hypothetical or rhetorical questions, to introduce a new subject into the conversation, and to offer time to the responder to formulate an answer.

Finally, the use of inversion is also very restricted. It is virtually the only choice in forms of the written language that do not favor dialogue. Inversion is used also in free conversation but most often in *le style soigné* and with modal verbs: *Voulez-vous le faire? Pouvez-vous nous accompagner ? Savez-vous à quelle heure il arrive ?*

Partial questions

As seen in the twelve examples at the beginning of this section on the interrogative, the number of variants for partial questions can be quite long, especially if the subject is a noun. A recent article lists eighteen variants for *Il est venu quand ?* (Saugera 531). The author argues for familiarizing students with only the four most common of these (530). It is necessary to limit the

number of variants taught formally in the classroom since many are stylistically very informal and do not reflect the speech of the educated native speaker. Some of these other forms, however, can be included as linguistic notes for the most advanced students.

The most common variants for partial questions are represented in examples 3 and 4, where W = question word. It is important to note that traditional textbooks limit their presentation to *est-ce que* and inversion, ignoring the more commonly-used forms of 3 and 4, c and d, below.

Example 3: partial questions with pronoun subjects

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| a. <i>est-ce que</i> | <i>Où est-ce que tu vas ?</i> |
| b. inversion | <i>Où vas-tu ?</i> |
| c. post-posed W | <i>Tu vas où ?</i> |
| d. pre-posed W | <i>Pourquoi tu pleures ?</i> |

Example 4 : partial questions with noun subjects

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| a. <i>est-ce que</i> | <i>Où est-ce que Pierre va ?</i> |
| b. inversion | <i>Où Pierre va-t-il ? Où va Pierre ?</i> |
| c. post-posed W | <i>Il va où Pierre ?</i> |
| d. pre-posed W | <i>Pourquoi il part Pierre ?</i> |

The same rules of usage for inversion and *est-ce que* in total questions also apply to partial questions. That is, one hears *est-ce que* only in certain instances (including speech with a foreigner) and inversion is mainly restricted to forms of the written language not favoring dialogue and to free conversation with modal verbs in a formal context (*Où voulez-vous manger ?*). Also of importance with partial questions is the fact that, even in *le style soigné* or with a modal verb, inversion with a noun subject and redundant pronoun is very rare in the spoken language, more so than inversion with a pronoun subject. *Comment va-t-il?* is more common than *Comment votre fils va-t-il ?*

Partial questions containing direct inversion with a noun subject (*A quelle heure arrive le train?*) should be learned as passive knowledge at the beginning level. Advanced students must learn the linguistic restrictions for this structure: it never occurs with *Pourquoi* (**Pourquoi pleure l'enfant?*), with a compound verb (**Où a mangé Pierre?*) or if the verb has a direct object (**Où achète Louise ses chaussures?*). Additional stylistic guidelines for the choice between the two variants involving inversion should also be made available to advanced students, namely, that direct inversion is favored in conversation and inversion with redundant pronouns is used more frequently in styles that avoid conversation such as magazines, tourist guides, lectures, and television news programs.

First year students should be taught to use *est-ce que* almost exclusively with a question word in their own speech (*Où est-ce que tu as mangé? A quelle heure est-ce que le président va parler?*). One important exception involves inversion with a modal verb in formal speech (*Où voulez-vous manger?*). Although these students should learn to expect the variants c and d in their listening and reading activities, they should not try to produce them themselves, given the complexity of factors involved in the choice of pre- vs. post-posed question words.

In addition, students of all levels must learn that *Qu'est-ce que* is the structure of choice at all levels of free speech over forms using inversion and post-posed *quoi*. *Est-ce que* is also necessary in questions of the type *Qui est-ce le professeur cherche?* in order to avoid the ambiguity inherent in the same question with direct inversion, *Qui cherche le professeur ?*

At the advanced level, students must learn that regardless of whether the subject is a noun or a pronoun, in free conversation, native speakers most often form partial questions with a pre- or post- positioned question word, avoiding the use of inversion and *est-ce que*. It is at this stage of study, then, that the somewhat complicated factors governing the choice between these two structures become important. By laying out some of the linguistic and pragmatic factors that come into play, we can help students better understand native speaker choices. Giving them this level of detail reinforces their appreciation for the complexity of linguistic variation, and for the richness and nuance involved in all linguistic choice. It will also motivate them to pay more careful attention to native speaker usage and to endeavor to imitate it more closely in their own speaking and writing.

Following are some of the most important linguistic and pragmatic factors influencing the choice between pre- and post-posed question words in French.

As a general rule of thumb, the question words *Pourquoi* and *Comment* appear most frequently in pre-posed position while the other interrogative adverbs are usually found at the end of the question. Some sense can be made of these choices in the following ways.

First, the question word *Quand* is almost never pre-posed in order to avoid confusion with a declarative phrase beginning with the adverb: *Quand il arrivera, nous partirons.*

Second, *Comment* is found at the beginning of many fixed expressions like *Comment ça va?* *Comment ça se dit/fait?* *Comment tu t'appelles?*

Third, it has been argued that a post-posed question word often asks a question for which the answer is already known, obvious or easy to give. At the end of the query, the question word occupies the same position as a verbal complement, that is, the same position as the answer. Hence we see the simple substitution of the answer for the question word: *Vous allez où? Vous allez à la bibliothèque?* The question words *où*, *quand* and *combien*, which are most often post-posed, require the answer of a simple place, time, or quantity while *pourquoi* and *comment* (most often pre-posed) require more complicated answers. For example, in the film *Le Placard*, the neighbor shifts *Pourquoi* to the end of his question because he knows the answer: *Et ils vous ont viré pourquoi?* In another example taken from the film *Il y a Longtemps que je t'aime*, instead of using the more frequent *Qu'est-ce que*, the speaker asks *Et vous auriez pu dire quoi?* because the answer is clearly *Rien!*

An additional factor to consider is that a question word that is normally pre-posed can be moved to the end of the question in order to convey emotion. *Il t'a dit quoi?* has a very different connotation from *Qu'est-ce qu'il t'a dit?* The first shows an emotion on the part of the speaker (surprise? anger?). The second is a simple request for information.

Conclusion

This brief discussion of linguistic variation in the French interrogative has been in many ways simplified and is by no means exhaustive. It is meant to underline the complexity of linguistic variation possible in French while at the same time to encourage French instructors to consider investigating further the phenomenon of linguistic variation in native-level speech. It is hoped that they will then pass on to their students an appreciation of the importance of this variation as well as the basic tools they need in order to choose more natural and appropriate forms in their own speech and writing.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER

Appendix

Grammar points and linguistic variants

The following grammar points are listed in order from those with fewer variations to those with more. *Level of study* indicates the level at which the variants should be introduced.

Grammar point	Variants	Level of study
articles	none	
infinitives	none	
participles/gerunds	none	
present indicative	used for past narration	advanced
future indicative	<i>futur simple</i> <u>vs.</u> <i>futur proche</i>	beginning/ advanced
descriptive adjectives	change of position for stylistic effect: <i>Quel magnifique tableau!</i>	advanced
adverbs	<i>ne</i> deletion exclamations: <i>Comme il fait beau !</i> <i>Ce qu'il fait beau ! Qu'il fait beau !</i> <i>Qu'est-ce qu'il fait beau ! Combien il fait beau !</i>	beginning intermediate
past indicative	literary tenses, <i>imparfait narratif</i>	advanced
conditional	journalistic style : <i>Le président aurait</i> <i>visité la ville</i>	advanced
	replaced by imperfect : <i>Un peu plus, je tombais</i>	advanced
subjunctive	<i>après que, le fait que, il est probable que,</i>	

	<i>espérer</i> + subjonctif	advanced
	<i>bien que, quoique</i> + indicatif	
object pronouns	<i>J'aime ça vs. Je l'aime.</i>	advanced
relative pronouns	<i>J'ai vendu la maison que je tenais tant, un copain que j'ai passé mon enfance avec lui, un train où il y a des personnes dedans, tous les gens auxquels je leur en ai parlé, etc.</i>	advanced
	(examples from Gadet 94-96)	
indirect discourse	<i>Nous devons nous demander à quelle heure va-t-il rentrer.</i>	advanced
passive voice	<i>par or de ? passive vs. active : Le Sénateur a été réélu par ses constituants. Ses constituants ont réélu le Sénateur.</i>	
	pronominal passive vs. <i>on</i> :	advanced
	<i>Le vin se boit avec le fromage vs. On boit le vin avec le fromage.</i>	
interrogative	multiple : given in this article	beginning/ advanced

Works cited

- Behnstedt, P. "Viens-tu ? est-ce que tu viens ? Tu viens ?" *Formen und Strukturen des direkten Fragesatzes im Französischen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1973.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. "La Notion de variation syntaxique dans la langue parlée." *Langue française* 115 (1997): 19-29.
- Bonin, Thérèse M. "The Role of Colloquial French in Communication and Implications for Language Instruction." *Modern Language Journal* 62.3 (March 1978): 90-102.
- Coveney, Aidan. "L'Approche variationniste et la description de la grammaire du français: le cas des interrogatives." *Langue française* 115 (1997): 88-100.
- _____. *Variability in spoken French: a sociolinguistic study of interrogation and negation*. Exeter, UK: Elm Bank Publications, 1996.
- _____. "The Use of the QU-final interrogative structure in spoken French." *French Language Studies* 5 (1995): 143-71.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc. "Structures interrogatives dans le discours français oral d'apprenants et de locuteurs natifs." *Actes du XXIIe congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romances*, Vol IX. Ed. Annick Englebert et al. Berlin: Niemeyer, 2000. 69-76.
- Durán, Richard, and George McCool. "If This is French, Then What Did I Learn in School?" *French Review* 77.2 (2003): 288-99.
- Etienne, Corinne and Kelly Sax. "Stylistic Variation in French: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Textbooks." *Modern Language Journal* 93.4 (2009): 584-606.
- _____. "Teaching Stylistic Variation through film." *French Review* 79. 5 (2006): 934-50.
- Gadet, Françoise. *Que Sais-je?: Le Français Populaire*. Paris: PUF, 1992.
- George, Ken. "Alternate French." *Language in its Social Context*. Ed. Carol Sander. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 155-70.
- Katz, Stacey and Carl Blyth. *Teaching French Grammar in Context*. New Haven/London: Yale UP, 2007.
- Labov, W. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.
- Ledegen, Gudrun, and Virgine Quillard. "Quelle référence pour l'interrogation totale ? Réponses syntaxiques et pragmatiques." *Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique* 26 (2000): 297-312.
- Lightbown, Patsy, and Alison d'Anglejan. "Some Input Considerations for Word Order in French L1 and L2 Acquisition." *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Susan Gass and Carolyn Madden. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1985. 415-30.
- McCool, George J. "Teaching the Formation of Questions: Lessons from New French." *Modern Language Journal* 78 (1994): 56-60.
- Meyers, Lindsay Lee. *WH-Interrogatives in Spoken French: a Corpus-Based Analysis of their Form and Function*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin, 2007.
- Molinier, Christian. "Morpho-syntaxe des pronoms interrogatifs et des pronoms relatifs sans antécédent." *Le Français Moderne* 70. 1 (2002): 3-19.
- O'Connor Di Vito, Nadine. *Patterns Across Spoken and Written French*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Quillard, Virginie. "La Diversité des formes interrogatives : comment l'interpréter ?" *Langue et Société* 95 (2001): 57-72.
- Redard, F. "Étude des formes interrogatives en français chez les enfants de trois ans." *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* 21 (1976): 98-110.

- Saugera, Valérie. "(Tu choisis) comment (est-ce que) (tu) choisis (-tu) ? : Acquisition des variantes interrogatives." *French Review* 85. 3 (2012): 519-32.
- Stourdzé, Collette. "Les Niveaux de langue." *Le français dans le monde* 69 (1969): 18-21.
- Terry, Robert. *Contemporary French Interrogative Structures*. Montréal: Cosmos, 1970.
- Valdman, Albert. "Comment gérer la variation dans l'enseignement du français langue étrangère aux Etats-Unis." *French Review* 73. 4 (2000): 648-66.
- _____. "The Problem of the Target Model in Proficiency-Oriented Foreign-Language Instruction." *Applied Language Learning* 1. 1 (Spring 1989): 33-51.
- _____. "Français standard et français populaire: sociolèxtes ou fictions ?" *French Review* 56. 2 (1982): 218-27.
- Wall, Kerstin. "Les Questions dans la langue parlée. Usage actuel et problèmes pédagogiques." *Moderna Språk* 97 (1985): 233-38 and 309-17.