

Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education

"When you speak to a police officer and [call them] du": Examining the impact of short-term study abroad on Australian students' awareness of address forms in German
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	SAR-17004R2
Full Title:	"When you speak to a police officer and [call them] du": Examining the impact of short-term study abroad on Australian students' awareness of address forms in German
Short Title:	Australian exchange students and German address forms
Article Type:	Article
First Author:	Rosalind Blood
Corresponding Author:	Rosalind Blood University of Western Australia Crawley, AUSTRALIA
Funding Information:	
Keywords:	short-term study abroad; German studies; German address forms; pragmatic competence; metapragmatic awareness; language socialisation
Abstract:	This study examines the development of metapragmatic awareness of German address terms by Australian study-abroad participants during a 6-week language course in Germany. Data includes oral pre- and post- Language Awareness Interviews, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Students displayed a greater awareness of the German address system and showed a growing confidence and sophistication in justifying their choices of address forms as well as an increased reliance on information acquired from locals throughout their stay. Data indicates that students were socialised into appropriate address term use by way of explicit correction from locals on incorrect use of address forms. The study supports previous research stating that even short stays abroad can encourage improvement in language features that are difficult to acquire in the classroom and shows why this is beneficial in the context of German Studies due to the preference for direct and explicit speech in the German speech community.
Author Comments:	Dear Dr Howard, Thank you for the decision on my paper - I have responded to all of your and the reviewers comments. Kind regards, Rosalind Blood
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	

“When you speak to a police officer and [call them] *du*”: Examining the impact of short-term study abroad on Australian students’ awareness of address forms in German

Rosalind Blood

The University of Western Australia

Keywords: pragmatic competence, German address forms, language socialization, short-term study abroad, language learning

Abstract

This study examines the development of pragmatic awareness of the German second person pronoun system by Australian study-abroad participants during a 6-week language course in Germany. Data includes oral pre- and post- Language Awareness Interviews, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Students displayed a greater awareness of the German address system and showed a growing confidence and sophistication in justifying their choices of address forms as well as an increased reliance on information acquired from native and expert speakers throughout their stay in Germany. Interview data and field notes indicate that students were socialised into second language (L2) practices of address term use by way of explicit correction from L2 speech community members on incorrect use of address forms. Such correction appears to have influenced their pragmatic development. The study supports previous research stating that even short stays abroad can encourage improvement in language

features that are difficult to acquire in the classroom (Hassall, 2013) and shows why this is particularly beneficial in the context of German Studies due to the preference for direct and explicit speech in the German speech community.

1 Introduction

Language students in Australia are often geographically isolated from the country where the L2 is spoken. One means to overcome this distance is for students to participate in study abroad (SA) programs in order to fully experience the L2 culture. A great deal of support, both at national and university level, goes into sending students on such SA programs. Short-term programs especially (<8 weeks) are rapidly increasing in popularity. In a 2012 survey, 66% of Australian students who participated in an international experience (study abroad, exchange program, international internship/practicum) did so for less than 8 weeks (Nerlich, 2015).

For language students, there are certain aspects of the L2 which are considered difficult to acquire in the classroom. Pragmatic competence, and in particular address terms, fall into this category (Barron, 2006; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Hassall, 2013). Here pragmatic competence is understood as: 1) knowledge of linguistic forms and their functional meanings; 2) sociocultural knowledge; and 3) the ability to use these knowledge bases to create a communicative act in interaction (Taguchi, 2016, p. 3). With the case of address term use, this could include knowledge of the verb forms associated with each address pronoun coupled with an

understanding that an inappropriate choice of address form can cause offense and complicate communication (Belz & Kinginger, 2003):

[...] when you speak to a police officer and you refer to them as 'du' ('you' inf.) because everyone's your mate in Australia, but there [in Germany] it's gotta be professionalism [...] so you get a few looks [in Germany], but you know, it's a mistake, you're a foreigner! (Blood & Ludewig, 2016, p. 238)

This comment, made by a student who previously participated in the SA program described in this paper, illustrates the difficulties many students face in negotiating address term use while in the L2land. In Germany, it is illegal to address police officers with the informal *du* (Besch, 1998, p. 56). This student was apparently oblivious to the offense caused by his highly inappropriate choice of address pronoun, in spite of the strong potential for loss of face in such a conversation, as well as the possibility of legal prosecution. One of the major criticisms levelled at classroom foreign language instruction is the lack of incidents where learners become aware of the possibility that an inappropriate choice can offend people and even make communication difficult.

Whilst there is much existing research on pragmatic development in SA, the majority of this research looks at development during stays of a semester or longer (Barron, 2003; Kinginger, 2008; Marriott, 1995; Schauer, 2009; Shardakova, 2005; Shively, 2011; Taguchi, 2011). Those that have investigated gains during short-term programs have shown mixed results (Hassall,

2013). Given that short-term programs are rapidly increasing in popularity due to their affordability and accessibility (Nerlich, 2015), research in the area is warranted for both universities and SA program coordinators. Thus, this study investigates changes to Australian university students' awareness of the German second person pronoun system over the course of a 6-week program in Germany.

The research questions for the current study are as follows:

- 1) Can a short stay abroad result in increased metapragmatic awareness of the German second person pronoun system and its distinction between formal and informal address?
- 2) What role does explicit and implicit socialisation by L2 community members play in shaping participants' awareness of the German second person pronoun system?
- 3) How can we account for the learners' progress (or lack thereof)?

In the second section of this paper the current state of the German second person pronoun system is summarised, followed by a brief description of recent empirical research that takes learners' acquisition of this system in the SA context as a focal point. Section 4 outlines the theoretical background which shaped the analysis of the data in this study. Following a description of the research participants and the SA program is a summary of the data collection process and methods of analysis. Sections 6 and 7 outline the findings in response to the

research questions. The paper closes with a discussion of the implications of these findings, the limitations of the study as well as a brief consideration of potential future avenues of research.

2 Address pronouns in German

The way speakers address one another in any language carries much information and is crucial in defining social relationships. Although the German address form system is binary, with an informal T-form (*du*) and a formal V-form (*Sie*), there are many other factors which make the application of this system significantly more complicated (Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Clyne, Norrby & Warren, 2009; Kretzenbacher, Clyne & Schüpbach, 2006). T- and V-forms here refer to the informal *tu* and formal *vos* in Latin, whose counterparts are seen in many Western European languages (Clyne et al., 2009). Despite the simple, dichotomous treatment the subject is often given in language textbooks and grammar books (e.g. Di Donato & Clyde, 2016; Stief & Stang, 2002), it can be argued that the German address system is both binary (with two options for second person address, informal *du* and formal *Sie*) and scalar, due to the many linguistic and non-linguistic devices that serve as an intermediate position beyond this binary system (Hickey, 2003, p. 401). Table 1 shows an overview of second person singular and plural pronouns, inflected for case (the genitive case is not included here as these forms are rarely used: Barron, 2006, p. 61).

Table 1. Second person singular and plural pronouns

	Nominative		Accusative		Dative	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Informal	du	ihr	dich	euch	dir	euch
Formal	Sie	Sie	Sie	Sie	Ihnen	Ihnen

The choice of address pronoun also affects the verb form, for example the sentence 'You learn quickly' can be rendered in two ways, with two different verb forms: *du lernst schnell*// *Sie lernen schnell*. The use of possessive determiners is also affected by address pronoun choice, as illustrated in Table 2. It is important to note that the informal 2nd person pronoun is less intimate in the plural (*ihr*) than in the singular (*du*) (Barron, 2006; Clyne et al., 2009). Consequently, one may use *ihr* to address a group of people consisting of one or more members with whom the speaker is on *du* terms, even if that does not hold true for other group members.

Table 2. Second person possessive determiners

	Nominative		Accusative		Dative		Genitive	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Informal	dein(e)	deine	dein(en)/(e)	deine	deinem/deiner	deinen	deines/deiner	deiner
Formal	Ihr(e)	Ihre	Ihr(en)/(e)	Ihre	Ihrem/Ihrem	Ihren	Ihres/Ihrer	Ihrer

Generally, the 'polite/distant' *Sie* (V-form) is used where speakers use a title and surname to refer to each other while the 'intimate/simple' *du* (T-form) is employed where speakers are on first name terms (Barron, 2006). Until the late 1960s or early 1970s patterns of pronoun selection in Germany followed these general principles:

1. *Sie* as the default, unmarked term of address (i.e. used in a first encounter with an adult)
2. Members of the family are addressed with *du*
3. *du* is used to address children under the age of 15
4. Young children call everyone *du*
5. *du* is used in prayer
6. As a sign of friendship, speakers may make a verbal agreement to use *du*. This was often ritualised with a drink (*Brüderschaft trinken*). Once this decision has been made it is not reversible (except in the case of a permanent termination of a relationship) (Kretzenbacher, 1991)
7. Older people might asymmetrically address younger people, where the older speaker uses *du* and the younger *Sie* (Clyne et al., 2009, p. 6)

Following the student movement in the late 1960s, where students throughout Europe protested existing class structures and used the university as a base to transform society (Bayer, 1979; Clyne et al., 2009), a more progressive system of address pronoun use has developed, but

exists in competition with the traditional system depending on the roles of the speaker (Barron, 2006; Besch, 1998; Clyne, 1995; Clyne et al., 2009). As a result of the student movement and changes to the way staff and students addressed each other, the use of the T-form expanded into situations and relationships where previously *Sie* would have been used. Speakers began to use *du* as the default term of address to signify group membership and solidarity, for example amongst university students (and more junior staff), but also in sports teams, unions and other groups. On the other hand, *Sie* became the marked form of address used to indicate exclusion, distance and non-membership, especially within the university setting (Bayer, 1979; Besch, 1998; Clyne et al., 2009). Researchers named this system of rules for address pronoun selection A² and the system described above A¹ (Delisle, 1986). There has been a relaxation in the tendency to use *du* in such situations, in some part due to the fact that young people resented the imposition of a pseudo-egalitarian mutual T on behalf of their professors (Amendt, 1995).

These conditions have created a current situation where native German speakers are often uncertain which principles their interlocutor is basing their choice of address on: the traditional system of *du* for intimacy and *Sie* to show respect, or *du* for solidarity and *Sie* to mark distance (Kretzenbacher et al., 2006). More recent research suggests that there are situations in which *du* is the default address pronoun, for example with family members, and contexts where *Sie* is the default. However, in between there is a large 'grey area' where either T or V may be the

default pronoun (Clyne et al., 2009; Kretzenbacher et al., 2006). In such situations, native speakers rely on several factors to arrive at a choice. Age remains a crucial factor in determining address pronoun use. Speakers are more likely to address someone younger than themselves with *du*, especially if they themselves are young (Besch, 1998; Clyne et al., 2009). Status also plays a role, with speakers less likely to be on *du* terms with superiors in the workplace than with colleagues. The idea of the '*gemeinsame Lebenswelt*' (Kallmeyer, 2003, as cited in Clyne et al., 2009), or perceived common experiences and affinities also encourages the use of *du*, due to a perception of decreased social distance. For example, similar political attitudes, playing on a sports team or even being on holiday may produce enough commonalities to dispense with normal address rules (Clyne et al., 2009, p. 70). This extends to personal appearance, with one native speaker claiming '*Einen Punker in meinem Alter würde ich nicht Siezen, einen Banker schon*' [I wouldn't address a punk my age as *Sie*, but I would a banker] (Clyne et al., 2009, p. 72). Lastly, the basis on which a speaker makes his or her choice also varies from person to person: some claim to be '*du Typen*' (the type to use *du*) whilst others tend to prefer *Sie* (Clyne et al., 2009).

Given the current situation for native speakers, it is unsurprising that German L2 learners find it a difficult aspect of the language to master. Using address forms appropriately requires both a command of the morphological forms (i.e. the pronouns themselves as well as e.g. possessive determiners and their inflectional forms) and an awareness of the meaning of their use in

different social contexts (Barron, 2006; Belz & Kinginger, 2003). In German, mastery of the linguistic forms surrounding address term use is already more complex than in languages such as Swedish, where a choice of address term does not influence the verb form (Clyne et al., 2009). Arguably harder to acquire is an understanding that an inappropriate choice of address form can lead to 'confusion, misunderstanding or irritation' and an ability to avoid such inappropriate choices (Belz & Kinginger, 2003, p. 598). Researchers have argued that it is unrealistic for learners to acquire the whole system, if usage is restricted to the classroom (Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Delisle, 1986; Kinginger, 2008).

3 L2 learners' acquisition of address terms

3.1 Acquisition of address forms

Previous research suggests that learners struggle to use address forms appropriately without some form of intervention – whether that be participation in a telecollaborative exchange with age peers (Belz & Kinginger, 2003) or by a period spent in the L2-land (Hassall, 2013; Kinginger, 2008). In formal instruction, textbooks and metapragmatic information given by teachers tend to over-emphasise the use of *Sie* to 'be on the safe side' (Belz & Kinginger, 2003). The textbook used by the majority of the participants in this study (N=13/18) gives the following advice on using address forms:

“German speakers address one another as *Sie* or *du*. The formal *Sie* (you) is used with strangers and even co-workers and other acquaintances. Family members and friends address one another with *du* (you), as do children and, generally, students. Close personal friends address one another with *du* and first names. Most adults address one another as *Herr* or *Frau* and use *Sie*, although some might use first names with *Sie*. Children and students address adults who are not family or friends with *Sie*.” (Di Donato & Clyde, 2016, p. 3).

This excerpt does not make any reference to the use of *du* to express solidarity. In a follow-up exercise students are presented with pairs of interlocutors and asked which form of address they would use (*du* or *Sie*). Although the book gives *du* as the correct answer for a pair of students, it also suggests using *Sie* with any adult you do not know.

This textbook, along with many other beginners’ German textbooks, tends to emphasise the A1 system, leaving students unsure about using the T-form with their age peers. In Belz and Kingingers’ (2003) investigation of telecollaborative exchange, American students gradually increased their use of *du* only after receiving repeated explicit correction from their German email partners. The authors conclude that classroom instruction is inadequate for students to be able to accurately learn the nuanced use of address forms and recommend that students be exposed to a wider range of discourse options – through telecollaboration, or by spending time in the L2land.

3.2 Address form development during short-term trips abroad

In order to acquire address form competence, Belz & Kinginger (2003, p. 594) propose four prerequisites:

- 1) Exposure to a variety of L2 discourse options

- 2) The chance to have authentic conversations where there is potential for the speaker to lose face (Brown & Levinson, 1987)

- 3) Opportunities for observing how L2 speech community members use language in different contexts, for instance hearing German university students addressing each other with *du* on campus

- 4) Opportunities for peer-assisted learning

According to these prerequisites, study abroad appears (at least on the surface) to be an ideal environment for acquiring address form competence. There has accordingly been an increasing amount of research on pragmatic development abroad (e.g. Barron, 2003; Henery, 2015; Kinginger, 2008; Schauer, 2009; Shively, 2011; Taguchi, 2011); however, very few studies have looked at stays abroad of less than 8 weeks, perhaps in part due to the more recent popularity of these programs. Studies focusing on L2 learners of German are also especially sparse, as the majority of previous research focuses on L2 English or French.

One study, which looked at the awareness and use of address forms by American learners of French over the course of a semester, found a slight shift towards more appropriate use of address forms, particularly in the way learners justified their choice of address forms (Kinging, 2008). Participants became more comfortable with the use of the informal T-forms with age peers through their familiarity with using the form with other students in France. Kinginger also found that her participants were able to use address forms more consistently in role plays by the end of their sojourn.

In contrast to much other research looking at L2 learners' pragmatic performance in the SA context, Henery (2014; 2015) investigated the influence of expert mediation on SA participants' pragmatic awareness of various pragmatic practices in French. One group of participants kept a journal where they recorded their observations about language use, and met with the researcher fortnightly to discuss their observations. The second group also kept a journal but did not participate in journal discussion meetings. Participants in both groups most commonly commented on address pronoun use and colloquial language they encountered in France.

Although Henery found that both groups' metapragmatic awareness developed over the course of the semester, only the expert-mediated group incorporated the systematic concepts they were introduced to by the researcher (Henery, 2015). The non-expert-mediated group's observations tended to rely on real-life examples, which in several cases led students to draw

incorrect conclusions. Henery's findings illustrate the potential benefits of providing support for SA students in the learning of pragmatics.

Barron (2006) examined the pragmatic development of address term competence by 33 Irish learners of German throughout their 10-month sojourn. Using a discourse completion task (DCT) administered before and after the overseas sojourn, she found that although there was limited development towards L2 speech community norms, the learners made less non-functional code switches at the end of their sojourn and became more familiar with the principle of reciprocity. Barron suggests this improved understanding of symmetrical address form practices was due to the availability of ample reciprocal input (2003, p. 85). The author herself acknowledges the weaknesses associated with using DCTs, including the fact that "the consequences of an inappropriate choice of address form are, thus, not as serious as in real-life communication" (Barron, 2006, p. 71). In addition, DCTs have been shown to elicit less natural features of speech than other data collection methods such as role plays or natural observation (e.g. Turnbull, 2001; Yuan, 2001).

Finally, in the only study to look at the development of address form competence in a short-term program, Hassall (2013) looked at Australian students' use and understanding of the Indonesian address form system. Although he found that participants rapidly acquired knowledge of various address terms in the vocative 'calling' slot, their progress was more limited for address terms in the pronoun slot. Hassall explained that the learners' more limited progress in the pronoun slot

was related to the fact that some of the pronouns studied are used very differently in the L2 compared to English. For instance, the pronoun *mas* ('older brother') is used in a much wider variety of settings than the approximate English equivalent 'bro'. This was further compounded by the fact that address terms are not always symmetrical in Indonesian and native speakers seemed reluctant to correct learners on inappropriate address term usage. Hassall's finding aligns with other research on pragmatic development in the SA context that has shown that L2 speakers are unlikely to provide feedback on language use which is related more to pragmatics than to issues of grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation (Barron, 2003; DuFon, 1999; Shively, 2011). This lack of feedback may lead learners to believe that their language use is appropriate when it is not (DuFon, 1999; Hassall, 2013). The following section explores the role played by explicit and implicit socialisation in the development of language awareness.

4 Theoretical framework: Language socialisation theory

When SA participants arrive in their host country, they are faced with the task of acquiring new pragmatic norms (Shively, 2011). With the case of address pronouns, the L2 system may differ considerably from the students' L1 system, as is the case for L1 English learners of German.

One theory that lends itself well to understanding how and why students do or do not adopt these new L2 community norms is language socialisation. Language socialisation can be defined as the process by which "children and other novices are socialised through language, part of such socialisation being a socialisation to use language meaningfully, appropriately and

effectively” (Ochs, 1996, p. 408). The theory posits that linguistic and cultural knowledge is “constructed through each other” (Watson-Gegeo, 2004, p. 339), that is those acquiring language are active and selective in the process.

Language socialisation is said to occur via two sets of socialisation processes – implicit and explicit socialisation (Duff, 2007). Ochs (1990) argues that “the greatest part of sociocultural information is keyed implicitly” (p. 291). Implicit socialisation involves participation in everyday events where novices have the opportunity to interact with experts, such as sharing breakfast with a host family. Through this participation, learners come to understand what type of language use is appropriate in these situations. For instance, through repeated participation in service situations, students may observe that address term practices differ between for example a student bar and a bank and adapt how they address people in similar situations. On the other hand, explicit socialisation involves an expert telling a novice how and when they should speak in certain situations. For the participants in this study, this could involve a language teacher telling the class that they would prefer to be addressed with *Sie*.

Although the above processes apply equally to L1 and L2 socialisation, there are a number of factors which make L2 socialisation arguably more complicated (Duff, 2007). When students embark on SA programs, they bring their own set of linguistic, discursive and cultural traditions from their L1 community (Duff, 2007; Wang, 2010). Whilst there is seldom any resistance to socialisation in the L1, there may be obstacles to the socialisation of novices in the L2 on the

part of the learners themselves or the L2 community (Wang, 2010). For instance, learners may attempt to draw on L1 norms for behaviour in certain situations (Shively, 2011) or there may be no comparable L1 speech behaviour. The latter is the case for English L1 speakers who must acquire appropriate patterns of address in an L2 with multiple pronouns for second person address (Barron, 2006; Hassall, 2013; Kinginger, 2008). Alternately, learners may be reluctant to adopt L2 community norms when they feel they clash with pre-existing L1 norms (Duff, 2007; DuFon, 1999; Hassall, 2013; Siegal, 1994).

Theoretically, SA appears at least on the surface to be an ideal context for language socialisation. However, in the SA context, learners may either be welcomed or rejected by their hosts: the degree to which learners are granted access to the new discourse community varies greatly (Hassall, 2015; Kinginger, 2008). Capacities or skills in the L2 community are strengthened through active participation in different roles, whether this is as a peripheral or full participant (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Students become part of a range of 'communities of practice' (COP), in the language classroom, with their host families, on public transport and in shops. However, whether they are brought into or excluded from these COP by locals plays a role in determining their language socialisation (Watson-Gegeo, 2004, p. 341).

Given that SA represents, for some students, their first opportunity to learn the L2 in a second language rather than a foreign language environment, this change of context holds important consequences for the way in which language is learnt and taught (Shively, 2008). Students

participating in SA (ideally) have access to repeated participation in everyday activities as well as interaction with locals potentially leading to explicit socialisation of language practices. SA therefore emerges as an ideal context for the exploration of language socialisation.

Researchers have also described language socialisation theory as “eminently capable” of describing pragmatic development of language learners (Kasper, 2001). Language socialisation emerges as an appropriate framework for this study due to the focus on the influence of context and the opportunity to explore reasons why learners may adapt to or resist L2 norms.

5 Methods

5.1 Participants

18 students of German participated in this study (see table 3 for their demographic information¹). All participants attended a 6-week language and culture program in Stuttgart in January and February of 2016 and had some prior knowledge of German. 12 students were female and six male. The majority of students (N=16) were aged 18-25, with two older students (Julie in her early 30's and Amelia in her late 20's). The mean age was 22 years. All but two students were completing an undergraduate degree, with two students (Natalie and Raj) completing masters level qualifications. 16 students had English as their native language, of the two other students, one had Hindi as his native language, and the other spoke some German at

¹ All names are pseudonyms

home. The presence of a heritage learner amongst research participants is one limitation of the study, although she did note that she had not spoken German outside a classroom context with anyone but family members since the age of 15. Study participants were recruited via email, in class at the researcher's home university and at the welcome meeting at the host institution in Stuttgart. Participation was on a voluntary basis and students were not remunerated.

During the program, students completed a 6-week language course taught by local staff in a building separate to the main university campus. All were completing the program for degree-credit at their home universities. Students lived with local host families, the majority by themselves (N=13); five participants lived in host families with at least one other student. As shown in Table 3, the participants varied in both their L2 proficiency and amount of time they had previously spent in the L2land. Following a computerised grammar test and an examination of in-class oral speaking skills, students were placed into classes between A2.1 and B1/B2. The levels refer to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, where A= basic user, B= independent language user, C= proficient user. The majority of students was placed around the A2 elementary level upon their arrival in Stuttgart (N=15), and had completed two semesters of language study at their home universities (N=9). Although 11 of the 18 participants had visited Germany previously, only two students had spent more than four weeks in the L2land. These students had both completed high school exchange programs.

Table 3. Demographic information of participants

Name	Age	Gender	L1	Time spent in Germany	German prior to university (years)	German at university (semesters)	Placement level in Stuttgart *
Colin	25	M	English	Y - 2 weeks independent travel	0	2	A2.2
Jenni	19	F	English	N	0	2	A2.1
Russell	18	M	English	N	0	2	A2.2
Sharn	23	F	English	Y - 4 weeks independent travel	0	2	A2.1
Julie	31	F	English	Y - 2 weeks tour	0	6	A2.1
Amy	19	F	English	Y - school trip	0	2	A2.2
Kate	18	F	English	N	0	2	A2.2
Elise	23	F	English	N	0	4	A2.1
Natalie	21	F	English	Y - 2 weeks independent travel	0	4	B1/B2
Maddy	19	F	English	Y - family holidays, 2 weeks independent travel	0	2	A2.1
Tracy	19	F	English/German	Y - family holidays, 3-month school exchange	5	2	B1/B2 (C1)**
Eric	19	M	English	Y - 2-week family holiday	5	4	A2.2
Lisa	19	F	English	N	0	4	A2.1
Amelia	28	F	English	Y - 3 weeks' independent travel	1	0	A2.2

Nicole	20	F	English	Y – school music tour	0	2	A2.1
Tom	21	M	English	N	0	2	A2.2
Sean	20	M	English	Y – family holidays, 6-week school exchange	5	2	B1/B2
Raj	25	M	Hindi	N	2	0	A2.2

* Students completed a computerised language test (which focused largely on grammar) on their first day of classes in Stuttgart.

** Tracy was placed in the highest-level class (B1/B2); however, her teacher described her as a C1 student

A group of 14 native speakers of German also participated in the study to provide a baseline of address term usage in the Language Awareness Interviews. Whilst students' responses were gauged against empirical research on the norms of address term usage in the German speech community, the native-speaker participants' responses formed a guide to judging the appropriateness of students' responses to the specific situations under study here. The native speakers were deemed an appropriate comparison group, given they were similar in age and background to the Australian students. These students were all participating in a study abroad program at the researcher's home university and were recruited via email. The average age of this group (mean= 24 years) was only slightly higher than the learners (mean= 22 years). Nine students were female and five were male.

5.2 Data collection

This study used several methods to examine participants' awareness of and socialisation into German address term practices. Participants were interviewed twice, once before and once after the program. Additional data was recorded in the form of participant observer field notes.

In the pre-departure interview students were asked about their motivation for choosing to study abroad, their language learning and travel histories, and their expectations for the program.

Upon their return from Stuttgart, students were interviewed about their experiences in Stuttgart (including questions that focused on their language classes, host families, social circles and language use). At the conclusion of each interview, students also completed a Language Awareness Interview (LAI).

The LAI in this study was based on that used by Kinginger (2008) and consisted of three sections. Only the third section focused on address terms; discussion of the other two sections of the LAI remains out of the scope of this paper. The third section consisted of six situations designed to assess awareness of French address forms, adapted in this study for the German context. Anything that made reference to France was replaced. For example, *tu* and *vous* were replaced with *du* and *Sie*, the names of French cities and institutions were replaced with German ones. Students read through six situations and were asked to decide whether they would use *du* or *Sie* to address their fictional interlocutors and explain the basis of their choice. See table 4 for a description of the six situations.

Table 4. Description of situations from LAI

Situation 1	You are eating lunch in the university cafeteria when one of your classmates sits down across the table from you and greets you. The classmate is about your age but you are not yet personally acquainted with them
Situations 2 and 3	You are being interviewed for a part-time job babysitting for a 6-year-old boy. When you meet the boy's mother, do you call her ' <i>du</i> ' or ' <i>Sie</i> '? (2) When you meet him for the first time do you call the boy ' <i>du</i> ' or ' <i>Sie</i> '? (3)
Situations 4 and 5	You have been frequenting the same bakery for several weeks and the lady at the counter now recognises you and often exchanges pleasantries with you when you visit the bakery. She is about 50 years old and has a daughter who sometimes works at the bakery after school. Do you call the older woman <i>du</i> or <i>Sie</i> ? (4) Do you call the younger woman <i>du</i> or <i>Sie</i> ? (5)
Situation 6	You are walking down the street when you run into someone you met at a party last week.

Some of these situations were deliberately ambiguous in order to prompt more extensive reflection on their knowledge of address forms (Kinging, 2008). Previous research (Barron, 2006; Kinginger, 2008) has shown that students are often not able to convey the full extent of their pragmatic knowledge in the context of role plays or DCT. As the researcher was also present with the students throughout the program, she observed students' use and discussion

of address terms in class and on class excursions, program meetings, welcome and farewell dinners. The observations were then recorded in field notes. Participants also discussed address terms with the researcher at other points in the semi-structured interviews. These data provided a picture of the participants' awareness of German address terms.

All interviews were recorded using a digital recorder and transcribed in their entirety. Any identifying information (names, institutions, location) were anonymised in the transcripts. LAI responses, interview data and field notes were coded and thematically analysed following Grbich (2012) with the help of N-Vivo.

6 Findings

6.1 Awareness of the German pronoun system

Overall, participants showed an increase in their awareness of how and why German address forms are used. Table 5 shows their responses to the pre- and post-LAI's. As seen in Table 5, the native speakers show a high level of agreement in all situations aside from the most ambiguous one (Situation 5).

Table 5. Choices in the pre- (T1) and post-tests (T2) for learners and native speakers (NS) (all responses are in %)

	Classmate (S1)	Babysitting mother (S2)	Babysitting child (S3)

	NS	T1	T2	NS	T1	T2	NS	T1	T2
<i>Sie</i>	-	55.6	33.3	85.7	100	100	-	5.6	11.1
<i>Du</i>	100	44.4	66.7	-	-	-	100	94.4	88.9
unsure	-	-	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	-
	Bakery mother (S4)			Bakery daughter (S5)			Party peer (S6)		
	NS	T1	T2	NS	T1	T2	NS	T1	T2
<i>Sie</i>	100	55.6	83.3	57.1	33.3	50	5.5	16.7	-
<i>Du</i>	-	33.3	11.1	14.3	55.6	44.4	88.9	66.7	92.9
unsure	-	11.1	5.5	28.6	11.1	5.6	5.5	16.7	7.1

The learners have more convergence in their responses on the post-test – especially for the situations regarding age peers (Situations 1 & 6). The students show a good understanding of the reasons why *Sie* would be an appropriate choice in Situation 2, and that children are generally addressed with *du* (Situation 3), prior to their sojourn, therefore these situations are not discussed further. Their responses to the other four situations are analysed more fully in the sections below.

6.2 Address forms and age peers

Participants show a moderate shift towards an L2-like understanding of the factors guiding the use of the *du* form with age peers. The native speakers (N=14) unanimously chose to address the student in Situation 1 with *du*. This response from one of the native-speaker participants illustrates how strongly they felt about the need to use *du* in such a situation:

„ich würde auf jeden Fall du sagen, weil also es ist einfach komisch jemand vom gleichen Alter zu siezen und ähm das, ich weiß nicht, sowas macht man eigentlich nicht, dann bist du der Freak! [I would absolutely say du, because it's just strange to say Sie to someone of the same age and um, I don't know, you just don't do something like that, otherwise you're a freak!].

Although some learners displayed a good understanding of the use of *du* to show solidarity in group membership prior to their stay in Germany, in the pre-test 55.6% (N=10) of learners opted to address the fellow classmate with non-L2-like *Sie*, although their status as students would call for the use of *du*. The influence of classroom training in Australia was evident in the students' responses, where students cited using *Sie* as a safer option:

“I always [...] err on the side of *Sie*, but if they're your age and your classmate, they're probably not going to be offended if you use *du* [...] but when you've never learnt German and you learn at home [...] use *Sie* until someone specifically tells you to use *du* unless it's a kid” (Amelia, interview 1)

Table 6. Factors used in making their choice; % of students who mentioned each factor

	Pre-interview	Post-interview	Native speakers
Age of interlocutors	72%	94%	100%
Based on experience in Stuttgart	-	44%	N/A
Depends on personality	5.5%	5.5%	-
Depends on region	-	-	21.4%
<i>Du</i> for fellow classmates	-	33.3%	78.5%
<i>Du</i> for personal relationships	11.1%	11.1%	21.4%
<i>Du</i> is used for kids	5.5%	27.7%	85.7%
<i>Du</i> for younger people		16.6%	21.4%
<i>Du</i> for things in common			14.3%
Familiarity with interlocutor	55.5%	55.5%	42.8%
Formal situation	22.2%	22.2%	14.3%
Informal situation	55.5%	22.2%	85.7%
Knowledge of other FL's influenced my choice	16.6%	-	N/A
Maintaining reciprocity	11.1%	33.3%	35.7%
Previously taught in formal instruction	11.1%	-	-
<i>Sie</i> to be on the 'safe side'	27.7%	27.7%	-

<i>Sie</i> for politeness/respect	27.7%	22.2%	35.7%
Social level of interlocuters	16.6%	11.1%	21.4%
Work/service situation requires <i>Sie</i>	38.9%	94.4%	71.4%

Table 6 presents a summary of factors involved in choices in all situations. There are several important differences between the factors students use to arrive at a choice before and after the program, notably that 44% of students based their choices in the post-LAI on their experiences in Stuttgart. In the post-test, however, 33.3% (N=6) of students still chose *Sie*. Two students who had chosen *du* in the pre-test chose *Sie* in the post-test and cited an incident in German class where a teacher informed the students that after turning 16 years of age Germans expect to be addressed with *Sie*:

If you're not acquainted with somebody and they're over the age of 16, then you should be using *Sie* with them, [...] Heinz ((German teacher)) was actually telling us [...] when he turned 17, no 16, he used to get offended when people would use *du* with him

(Nicole, interview 2)

This information was apparently interpreted by the students to mean everyone over the age of 16, even in cases where the T-form for solidarity would obviously be in play. Of those students

who changed from *Sie* at T1 to *du* at T2 (N=5), two students cited instances where they were specifically told by native speakers to use *du* with age peers:

Colin: [...] younger people seem to care a little bit less about the formal-informal thing, [...] even the people- like we talked to a lawyer in the café and he was like, no *du* is fine

I: yeah did you ask him?

Colin: yeah, we were just talking to him, like we were being formal and he said 'oh no don't worry about that' [Colin, interview 2]

The other three students cited now feeling more comfortable using *du* with fellow students.

Situation 6 asked students to consider which address form they would choose, if they encountered someone they had met at a party on the street. Participants again showed some development, with 66.7% choosing *du* at T1 and 88.9% at T2. The familiarity of the interlocutor and informality of the party situation made participants feel more comfortable choosing *du*.

6.3 Address forms and service situations

Students also showed some development towards L2 norms for situations 4 and 5 which involved a middle-aged woman and an age peer in a service situation. The native speakers unanimously agreed on the use of *Sie* with the older woman citing the fact that she works on the other side of the counter. In the pre-test, 55.6% of learners chose to address the older woman

as *Sie*, by the post-test this rose to 83.3%. Students largely based their choice of *Sie* at T1 on the woman's age, by T2, 7 learners had expanded this explanation by emphasising the setting of the situation and its professional nature. As seen in Table 6, only 38.9% of participants explained their choice on the basis of the 'work/service setting' at T1, whereas by T2 this had risen to 94.4%. For example, at T1 Russell opted to use *du* saying "we have the basis for [...] a friendly relationship, so I think it would progress to *du*". By T2 he had sought advice from his host mother about which term to choose in service situations and stated that she had told him "it's professional life, you would always use *Sie*". He added that a teacher had also informed him that the older person will make the switch to *du* first, something that many students were apparently unaware of before receiving advice from teachers and host families.

With the younger interlocutor (Situation 5), students appear to have chosen *du* more readily than the native speakers at both T1 and T2. Participants frequently cited the younger woman's age as a factor in their choice, despite the fact that in service situations *Sie* tends to be more readily used irrelevant of the server's age. This situation was also perceived as especially ambiguous by native speakers with one participant claiming '*Ist schwierig zu sagen, es kommt total auf die Situation und auf die Leute an.*' [It's hard to say, it completely depends on the situation and on the people]. Sharn's comment from T2 expresses a similar sentiment and illustrates her growing understanding of the fact that different people have different personal

preferences regarding address terms and that this would influence her choice of address term in such a situation:

She might, I don't know some people might be offended with you being formal with them, which just makes things really complicated because some people are offended if you're not formal and then some people are offended if you're formal. It's like when I was growing up, because my parents are kind of old-fashioned sometimes, and they were like, you have to call every one of your friends' parents Mr and Mrs blah blah, so I always did and then some people's parents would be like stop it! [laughs] [...] I dunno I guess it depends on the woman yeah...

7 Findings: Explicit and implicit socialisation into address term practices

Several of the excerpts in the previous section illustrate both explicit and implicit processes of socialisation at work. In contrast to previous research looking at pragmatic development in a SA context (e.g. Hassall, 2013; Shively, 2011), thematic analysis of LAI data, interview transcripts and field notes revealed a significant number of instances where learners were given feedback on their address term practices. This section will examine instances of implicit and explicit socialisation in the students' narratives to determine the influence of these processes on their understanding and awareness of the German second person system of address.

7.1 Implicit socialisation

As explored in section 4, implicit socialisation into appropriate language use occurs when novices repeatedly participate in everyday situations where they have the opportunity to interact with and observe expert members of the community (Shively, 2011). The L2-mediated situations that participants in this study most commonly took part in included service situations, language classes and meals with the host family (see Table 7 for a summary). It is then somewhat unsurprising that the majority of their comments on language use focused on their behaviour in these situations. The following excerpt illustrates how students were implicitly socialised into appropriate address term use in service situations:

Tracy: I've generally been thinking about that about how [...] in bars when people were ordering drinks, they would say *du*

I: yeah

Tracy: like to the service people, and they would say *du* back and yet they hadn't met each other before and that was like, and I was always saying *Sie* because, it's, in my head [...] if you're not in the same position of the other person [...] and it's like a professional situation that they're in and you're in like a casual situation...

Tracy is a heritage language learner who sometimes speaks German at home with her mother and with her family in Germany. Her surprise that service members in bars addressed

customers with *du* is likely related to the fact that the last time she went to Germany she was 15 and was visiting family. At the time, she was also not of legal age to visit the kind of drinking establishments frequented by younger people who are more likely to use *du*. Tracy's repeated participation in drinking at 'younger' bars in Stuttgart enabled her to observe the address term practices in use in these types of locations, and adjust her own understanding of address term use accordingly.

Table 7. Implicit socialisation processes

Location/activity	Example
In the language classroom	“ <i>wir siezen um das zu üben</i> ” [we use <i>Sie</i> in order to practice (both forms)] (Helga [German teacher] – in a conversation to the researcher)
Conversations with host family (e.g. dinner table, family gatherings)	“my host family would always use <i>Sie</i> like for people that weren't close friends or relatives” (Kate)
Service situations	“I've generally been thinking about that about how like in bars when people were ordering drinks, they would say <i>du</i> ” (Tracy)
General conversations with L2 experts	“everyone my age pretty much called me <i>du</i> on first meeting me” (Amelia)

These comments frequently surfaced while participants were completing the LAI as they reflected on their choices in the six situations discussed in the previous section and illustrate the influence of their observations of language choices while participating in everyday activities in Stuttgart. For example, students reported that host family members would address students

with *du*, as would other students in the *Mensa* [German university cafeteria], whereas the students would likely be addressed with *Sie* in service situations and by their teachers (the researcher's own experience accompanying students in classrooms and cafés confirmed this). Address form use in Germany is almost always reciprocal (except for in very particular circumstances, cf. section 2 and Clyne et al., 2009, p. 84). This would have likely encouraged students to imitate their interlocutor's use of address forms. Russell's comment about students' behaviour in the *Mensa* illustrates this:

It's just the logical thing because that's how um all the German students in the *Mensa* talked to each other and that's how we talked to them so, it just seems logical to do that.

[Russell, interview 2]

7.2 Explicit socialisation

Interestingly, although the larger data set on which this paper was based also looked at students' awareness of colloquial language and leave-taking terms, the majority of the instances of explicit socialisation focused on address term use. In contrast to prior research on pragmatic development in the SA context, participants in this study received direct (and often quite confronting) feedback on their (at times inappropriate) language use. Table 8 presents a summary of the groups of L2 community members who most frequently critiqued participants' language use.

Table 8. Explicit socialisation processes

L2 community member	Example
Language teacher	“Heinz [German teacher] says it's like a taboo thing like if [...] someone's older than you, you have to wait for them to say, to ask or anything um [on asking whether to say <i>du</i>] (Nicole)
Host family	“yeah um, mind you our host family from like the first day she said call her <i>du</i> ” (Eric)
Friends	“my German friend said if there's a ten-year age gap between roughly you or if they're um normally you just use <i>du</i> ” (Lisa)
Strangers	“one of the guys I was with kept referring to him as <i>Sie</i> and he kept giving him a lecture on when you're drinking beer together and having a good time, call me <i>du</i> ” (Maddy)

Participants reported engaging in often lengthy discussions with host community members

about the intricacies of the German address term system. At times participants sought advice

from L2 speakers, most often their host families, language teachers and the researcher.

However, there were also instances where members of the public offered advice on

inappropriate language use. A notable example of this, which was discussed amongst the entire

program cohort, was from a student not participating in this study who tried to start a

conversation with an elderly woman at a train station by saying ‘*wie geht es dir?*’ [how are you

(informal.)?]. The woman began to lecture the student about how it is inappropriate to address

strangers (and in particular older strangers) with *du*. Several students enjoyed striking up informal conversations with older people they met on the street and all of these students made note of Pete's (pseudonym) story. Colin discussed a conversation in which a young lawyer he met in a café asked him to use *du* and described how younger people tend to prefer this. Maddy mentioned sitting in a beer hall in Munich and being told by a young man at her table to use *du* when you are sharing a table and drinking beer. These conversations appeared to be very effective at alerting students to issues of identity and face that are brought about by unusual or inappropriate address term practices and for some, made them aware of address practices with which they had previously been unfamiliar:

Lisa: My German friend said if there's a ten-year age gap [...] normally you just use *du*, but it's hard because in the younger generations [...] if they look your age, you just say *du*, but the older generations are still like if they're 18 you must firstly address them as *Sie*, so it's kind of like how you interpret it, but I'd rather her advice because [...] she's German herself

I: and is she your age as well?

Lisa: yeah, yeah she's a couple of years older but she's still like, just *du*, [...] the younger generation kind of expect it, [...] they know you're foreign because you're using *Sie*... (Lisa, interview 2)

Lisa chose to address all of her fictional interlocuters (except for the young boy in Situation 3)

with *Sie* prior to the program and also laughed off the fact that her mother often teased her about using the formal pronoun too widely in Dutch (she speaks Dutch with her family in the Netherlands). Her conversations with local friends and her host mother appear to have drastically influenced both her understanding of local norms regarding address pronoun use and the embarrassment potential associated with using them inappropriately. Lisa's story in her return interview illustrates the influence of explicit socialisation on her awareness of the German second person system of address.

8 Discussion

Although the excerpts in sections 6 and 7 present some evidence to indicate that participants' understanding of the German address system changed as a result of their stay in Stuttgart, this was not the case for all students participating in the SA program. Four participants in this study showed little change in their understanding of German address terms between their pre-departure and return interviews. In many cases, implicit and explicit socialisation into appropriate address term use on the part of locals mediated participants' awareness of practices surrounding address pronouns. This section explores how access to certain everyday activities and L2 speakers influenced participants' pragmatic development as well as potential reasons for a higher level of explicit socialisation in this study compared to previous research.

8.1 Access to opportunities for socialisation

Several participants in the current study spent noticeably less time in the company of local L2 speakers which therefore lessened opportunities for L2-mediated language socialisation to occur. For instance, one participant's host family told her early on in her stay that they wanted to host an English-speaking student in order for their children to have additional English conversation practice at home, and told their children off if they were caught speaking German to her. Another student was ill for two of the six weeks of the program and was also placed in a German family who hosted two other students from the program and another three boarders, resulting in an arrangement that felt more "like a B&B than a host family". This particular student showed no change between his pre- and post-LAI and also maintained the practice of addressing his teacher with *du* (although she had informed the class on several occasions that she would prefer to be addressed with *Sie*). The experiences of these two students lie in stark contrast to Russell, who showed a greater willingness to communicate in the L2 and often spoke about the advice he had obtained from host family members and other L2 speakers about how to appropriately use *du* and *Sie*. The strong individual differences amongst students in this study confirm findings by other researchers about the variability and often arbitrary nature of the SA experience (Hassall, 2013; Kinginger, 2008; Klapper & Rees, 2012).

8.2 Explicit socialisation in the German-speaking context

In contrast to previous research (e.g. Barron, 2003; Hassall, 2013; Kinginger, 2008; Shively, 2011), a striking feature of the data in this study was the comparatively high amount of explicit

feedback students received on their language choices. There are two possible explanations for this finding. The first rests in differences in German vs English speakers' preferences in communication style. According to research in intercultural communication, there are five dimensions on which German and British English speakers differ (Hall, 1983; House, 1996; 2006; Hofstede, 1984; Thomas, 2003). Germans tend to prefer 1) directness over indirectness; 2) orientation towards the self over orientations towards the other; 3) orientation towards content over orientation towards addressee(s); 4) explicitness over implicitness and 5) ad-hoc formulation over verbal routines. The preference for directness and explicitness amongst most German L1 speakers appears to have influenced their willingness to give learners feedback on what many L1 Australian English speakers may have considered face-threatening topics (Grieve, 2010).

As discussed in the previous section, explicit socialisation by locals appears to have played a major role in facilitating participants' understanding of the German address system. According to Belz & Kinginger (2003) such opportunities for realising the potential loss of face are essential for address form competence to develop. The German partners in Belz & Kinginger's (2003) study gave similar explicit advice ('*Sie* makes me feel old') to their American partners which raised their awareness of the appropriateness of using *du* to address fellow students, also over a short period of 8 weeks. The willingness of most Germans (compared to, for example the Indonesian host families in Hassall's study) to explicitly socialise these students

into appropriate address form usage is likely to be in some part culture-specific, given the lack of feedback from locals from other cultures in similar research (DuFon, 1999; Hassall, 2013; lino, 1996; Siegal, 1994; Shively, 2011). Whilst Barron (2006) did look at the development of address term competence in L2 German, she did so using DCTs. There was no narrative or naturally occurring data to further explain the reasons behind her participants' choices (cf. Henery, 2014; Kinginger, 2008; Shively, 2011).

A second potential explanation for so many locals' willingness to give feedback on address term practices lies in the fact that address terms are often explicitly negotiated amongst German speakers in conversation anyway (cf. Besch, 1998; Clyne et al., 2009; Kretzenbacher et al., 2006). The somewhat old-fashioned notion of *Brüderschaft trinken*, where speakers share a drink to cement the change in their relationship from that of *Sie* to *du*, represents one such instance where address terms are explicitly negotiated. German speakers also talk about offering the *du* to someone [*jemandem das du anbieten*], something which the German native speakers in this study also frequently mentioned in their LAI responses. If the negotiation of what address term to use is so explicit, this potentially encourages explicit discussion of address term use in other domains.

The results of this study suggest that SA programs, even of a short duration, can have a meaningful impact on the pragmatic competence of L2 learners. SA proves especially beneficial for the development of address term competence, given the multiple opportunities for explicit

and implicit socialisation of this language feature to occur. The learners in this study showed improvement in their recognition of address term usage as an issue of identity and face that has consequences for inappropriate use. Such improvement has been shown to be difficult to foster in the foreign language classroom at home. The extent of explicit socialisation of the learners in this study suggests that German speakers' preferences for explicit, and direct modes of communication represent an advantage for L2 learners of German who choose to spend time in the L2land. Knowing this, future researchers could collect and analyse naturally occurring data alongside LAIs. Having both data sets would allow researchers to triangulate participants' knowledge and awareness of address form usage in LAIs with actual instances of explicit socialization as they occur in conversation, which could be quite illuminating.

References

- Amendt, G. (1995). *Du oder Sie: 1945-1968-1995*. Bremen: Ikaru-Verlag.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context* (Vol. 108). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing
- Barron, A. (2006). Learning to say "you" in German: The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context. In: Dufon, Margaret, A & Churchill, Eton (Eds.) *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (Vol. 15, pp. 59-88). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bayer, K. (1979). Die Anredepronomina DU und SIE. Thesen zu einem semantischen Konflikt im Hochschulbereich. *Deutsche Sprache*, 7(3), 212-219.
- Belz, J. A. & Kinginger, C. (2003). Discourse options and the development of pragmatic competence by classroom learners of German: The case of address forms. *Language learning*, 53(4), 591-647.
- Besch, W. (1998). *Duzen, Siezen, Titulieren: zur Anrede im Deutschen heute und gestern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blood, R & Ludewig, A. (2016). Interkulturelles Lernen während eines kurzzeitigen, studienbegleitenden Fremdsprachenprogramms. Erfahrungen australischer

Studierender in Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*,
21(1).

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4)
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. G. (1995). *The German language in a changing Europe*: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). *Language and human relations: Styles of address in
contemporary language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Delisle, H. H. (1986). Intimacy, solidarity and distance: the pronouns of address in German. *Die
Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 19(1), 4-15.

Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues.
Language Teaching, 40(04), 309-319.

DuFon, M. A. (1999). The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Indonesian as a second
language by sojourners in naturalistic interactions. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved
from Proquest Dissertations and Theses (9951181)

Di Donato, R. & Clyde, M. D. (2016). *Deutsch: Na Klar* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grbich, C. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Grieve, A. (2010). "Aber ganz ehrlich": Differences in episodic structure, apologies and truth-orientation in German and Australian workplace telephone discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(1), 190-219.
- Hall, E. T. & Hall, M. R. (1983). *Hidden differences, studies in international communication: How to communicate with the Germans*. Hamburg: Grüner & Jahr.
- Hassall, T. (2013). Pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: The case of address terms in Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 55, 1-17.
- Hassall, T. (2014). Individual Variation in L2 Study-Abroad Outcomes: A Case Study from Indonesian Pragmatics. *Multilingua*, 34(1), 33-59.
- Henery, A. (2014). *Interpreting 'Real French': The Role of Expert Mediation in Learners' Observations, Understandings, and Use of Pragmatic Practices While Abroad*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://repository.cmu.edu/dissertations/442/>
- Henery, A. (2015). On the development of metapragmatic awareness abroad: two case studies exploring the role of expert-mediation. *Language Awareness*, 24(4), 316-331.
- Hickey, R. (2003). The German address system: Binary and scalar at once. In: Taavitsainen, I. & Jucker, A. H (Eds.), *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. (pp. 401-425) Amsterdam: Benjamin Johns Publishing Company.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*.

Beverly Hills: Sage.

House, J. (1996). Contrastive discourse analysis and misunderstanding: The case of German

and English. In E. Ammon (Ed.), *Contrastive Sociolinguistics* (pp. 345-362). Berlin:

Mouton De Gruyter.

House, J. (2006). Communicative styles in English and German. *European Journal of English*

Studies, 10(3), 249-267.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied linguistics*, 22(4),

502-530.

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France.

The Modern Language Journal, 92(s1), 1-124.

Klapper, J., & Rees, J. (2012). University residence abroad for foreign language students:

analysing the linguistic benefits. *The Language Learning Journal*, 40(3), 335-358.

Kretzenbacher, H. L. (1991). Vom Sie zum Du-und retour. In Kretzenbacher, H. L. (Ed.), *Vom*

Sie zum Du-mehr als eine neue Konvention (pp. 9-77). Hamburg and Zurich:

Luchterhand Literaturverlag.

Kretzenbacher, H. L; Clyne, M. & Schüpbach, D. (2006). Pronominal Address in German: Rules, Anarchy and Embarrassment Potential. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(2), 1-18.

Iino, Masakazu, 1996. 'Excellent foreigner!': gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations: an ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from <http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI9627938/>

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.

Marriott, H. (1995). The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In: Freed, B. F (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, (pp. 197 – 224) John Benjamin Publishing, Amsterdam.

Nerlich, S. (2015). Students from Australian universities studying abroad: A demographic profile. *Australian Universities' Review*, 57(1), 52 - 59.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In G. H. S. Herdt, Richard A; Stigler, James W (Ed.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In: Gumperz, J. & Levinson, S. (Eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. (pp. 407-438) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context*. New York: Continuum.
- Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural pragmatics*, 2(4), 423-451.
- Siegal, M. S. (1994). *Looking east: Learning Japanese as a second language in Japan and the interaction of race, gender and social context*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9529497)
- Shively, R. L. (2008). *Politeness and social interaction in study abroad: Service encounters in L2 Spanish*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3311436)
- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1818-1835.
- Stief, C., & Stang, C. (2002). *German grammar in a nutshell*. Munich: Langenscheidt

- Taguchi, N. (2011). The Effect of L2 Proficiency and Study-Abroad Experience on Pragmatic Comprehension. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 904-939.
- Taguchi, N. (2016). Contexts and pragmatics learning: Problems and opportunities of the study abroad research. *Language Teaching*, 1-14. doi:10.1017/S0261444815000440
- Thomas, A. (2003). *Psychologie interkulturellen Handelns*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Turnbull, W. (2001). An appraisal of pragmatic elicitation techniques for the social psychological study of talk: The case of request refusals. *Pragmatics*, 11(1), 31-62.
- Wang, C. (2010). Toward a second language socialization perspective: Issues in study abroad research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 50-63.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331-350.
- Yuan, Y. (2001). An inquiry into empirical pragmatics data-gathering methods: Written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 271-292.

Authors address

Rosalind Blood

European Languages and Studies, School of Humanities

The University of Western Australia

M204/ 35 Stirling highway

Perth, Western Australia 6009

rosalind.blood@research.uwa.edu.au

Reviewer #1:

<p>1) Revise the final section of your conclusion - the end seems a bit abrupt. What about linking your final few ideas: "The extent of explicit socialization of the learners in this study suggests that German speakers' preferences for explicit, and direct modes of communication represent an advantage for L2 learners of German who choose to spend time in the L2 land. Knowing this, future researchers could collect and analyze naturally occurring data alongside LAIs. Having both data sets would allow researchers to triangulate participants' knowledge and impressions of address form usage in LAIs with actual instances of explicit socialization as they occur in conversation, which could be quite illuminating." (or something like that)</p>	<p>I have modified the last two sentences of the paper</p>
<p>2) The title seems a little long. You might want to play around with shorter quotation options.</p>	<p>I have modified the quotation to make it shorter, however I'm also satisfied with the original title and don't find it too long.</p>

Reviewer 2

<p>Reviewer #2: The paper has very much changed its orientation from the first to the second version, with the quantitative part</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	------------

<p>removed and the concentration on the qualitative methodology. Accordingly, the discussion of the findings is much more careful now, which I think is the right way to do it. The paper has improved much and can be published in this form, in my eyes (I did not check typos neither bibliographical entries).</p>	
--	--

Editor's comments

<p>Include author's name and affiliation after the heading</p>	<p>Added</p>
<p>p.1, line 8 - insert 'second language' before the acronym 'L2', and place 'L2' in parenthesis.</p>	<p>Replaced</p>
<p>p.2, line 2 of the 'Introduction' - is 'withstand' the best word??</p>	<p>Replaced with 'overcome'</p>
<p>p.2, line 6 of the 'Introduction' - you refer to 'study abroad' and then 'exchange program' - is there a difference?</p>	<p>Exchange students don't pay to study at their host institution as part of reciprocal agreements between universities – I don't find the distinction important to the paper and study abroad is more widely understood so I've replaced 'exchange' with 'study abroad program' in each case</p>
<p>p.4 - research question 2 - 'on behalf of' - is this the best wording??</p>	<p>Replaced with 'by'</p>
<p>p.4, 4th last line - you refer to the sections where the "first and second research questions" will be discussed - it's a little strange not to refer</p>	<p>Removed 'first and second' in order to include 3rd research question here</p>

to the third research question here.	
p.5, line 3 - I'm concerned that readers may not understand what 'T-form' and 'V-form' refer to - I know these are taken from French, and it might be useful to clarify this here.	I've added a single sentence to clarify this
p.6, 2nd sentence, beginning "The use of..." - since the two clauses in this sentence are very short, I would suggest rephrasing "this is illustrated in table 2" as ", as illustrated in table 2".	Replaced
p.6, last line before the table - delete 'with' at the end of the sentence, and I would suggest inserting a clause along the lines of ", even if that does not hold true for other members".	Extra clause added
p.9, first line of last paragraph - "it is no small wonder" - this is very informal, and I would advise rephrasing.	Replaced with 'it is unsurprising'
p.10, 3 lines from the end before the quotation - change "tends" > "tend".	changed
p.12, 6 lines from the end - delete the comma before 'however', and insert ';' instead.	Replaced
p.13, first line of main paragraph - change learner's > learners'	Changed
p.13, 5 lines from the end - is "scientific" the best choice of word??	Replaced with 'systematic'

p.14, 3rd last line of 1st paragraph - delete the space between 'DCT s' > 'DCTs	deleted
p.16, 2nd last line - 'on behalf of' - how about 'on the part of' ??	replaced
p.17, line 2 - "no pre-existing cultural schema" - it's difficult to follow how this might be the case for L2 learners who have already the address system of their L1 - you could clarify this better.	Replaced with 'or there may be no comparable L1 speech behaviour'
p.17, 3rd last line - delete the comma after 'language,'	Deleted
p.18, 2nd last line - "the other spoke some German at home" - this distinguished this learner from the others somewhat, and could be seen as a limitation - this fact should be noted as a limitation.	Added a sentence to address this
p.19, 3rd line of main paragraph - change "lived in" > "lived with"	changed
p.19, delete the comma after (N=13), and insert ';' instead	Replaced
p.21, 2nd note after the table - delete the comma after (B1/B2), and replace with ';'. Also, insert a comma after 'however'.	Replaced and inserted comma
p.22, 1st line of 2nd paragraph change "based off" > "based on". 2nd line - delete the comma after 'terms,', and insert ';'.	Changed, deleted and inserted
p.24, Heading 6 - it would best to indicate to the	Changed headings in section 6 accordingly

<p>reader that you are presenting the findings in two sections. And therefore, I would suggest that the heading be modified as follows: 6.</p> <p>Findings / 6.1 Awareness of the German pronoun system</p>	
<p>p.28, at the end of the table, it would be good to include a note on what the percentages refer to.</p>	<p>I've changed the title of the table to show this more clearly</p>
<p>p.28, 1st line - rephrase "See Table 6...." to "Table 6 presents a summary of...." It's also important to comment on the results presented in this table.</p>	<p>Rephrased and a sentence added commenting on table</p>
<p>p.29, 2nd last line - 'Table 3' - is this correct??</p>	<p>Changed to Table 6 (this sentence also comments on the results in the table)</p>
<p>p.31, lat lien before 7.1 - rephrase "students' understanding" as "their understanding"</p>	<p>replaced</p>
<p>p.32, line 2 - replace "L2 speakers" with "their"</p>	<p>Replaced</p>
<p>p.37, line 6 of the Discussion - replace 'on behalf of' with 'on the part of'</p>	<p>Replaced</p>
<p>p.38, line 3 change participants' > participant's</p>	<p>Changed</p>
<p>p.38, line 8 'like a B&B than a host family' - is this a quote? If yes, then use "..."</p>	<p>Yes it is, changed accordingly</p>
<p>p.38, 2nd last line before 8.2 - change 'confirms' > 'confirm'</p>	<p>changed</p>
<p>p.38, 8.2 heading - change 'German speaking' > 'German-speaking'</p>	<p>changed</p>

p.39, lines 1-2 - "The researcher's own experience..." - this is somewhat anecdotal, and should be avoided.	Yes, it is, I've removed the sentence
p.40, line 2 - "culturally specific" - or 'culture-specific' ??	Changed to 'culture-specific'
p.40, 9. Further implications - I'm not sure it is necessary to have this heading	Agreed and removed
p.41, 3rd last line - "this finding" - which finding??	These last couple of sentences were changed according to the first reviewer's feedback
Bibliography - include full details for the reference to the author	Details added
Besch / Brown & Levinson / Grbich / Ochs / Stief & Stang- include place of publication Hassall / Taguchi - include journal volume and issue number	All added, except the volume and issue number for the Taguchi article aren't available as it's only online. Doi added
At the end of the article include author's name / address where you will receive your copy of the journal issue and email address.	Added