Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Journal of Pragmatics 66 (2014) 1–14

journal of PRAGMATICS

www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma

Connecting production to judgments: T/V address forms and the L2 identities of intermediate Spanish learners

Dan Villarreal *

Department of Linguistics, University of California, Davis, United States

Received 21 May 2013; received in revised form 11 February 2014; accepted 12 February 2014

Abstract

This study investigates the L2 identities of native English-speaking intermediate-level Spanish learners by combining two methods, production and metapragmatic judgments, and focusing on T/V address forms (tú and usted). Twelve intermediate-level Spanish learners interacted with Spanish speakers in oral role-play scenarios designed to elicit different address forms. Learners answered a questionnaire one week later about desired address form use in various interactional scenarios (which were matched with role-play scenarios). An analysis of questionnaire judgments revealed that these learners were both cognizant of the second-order indexical potential of T/V address forms and determined to utilize this indexical potential to construct notions of their desired L2 identities. Conversely, learners' address-form production exhibited an overgeneralization of T, a result that starkly contrasts with the overgeneralization of V found in previous studies. Whereas some learners failed to consistently produce their desired address forms, compromising their selfconstructed ideal L2 identities, others showed an adeptness at matching their production to their judgments. I thus suggest that future research on L2 pragmatics and L2 identity move beyond a focus on L2 pragmatic competence and toward a consideration of learners' indexical awareness and agency.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics; Identity; Intermediate learners; Address forms; Awareness; Agency

1. Introduction

The process of learning a language does not merely consist of the acquisition of its grammar and phonology, but crucially includes the ability to use the language in real-time discourse. This ability is typically framed in terms of second language (L2) pragmatic competence, which often assumes that, as with grammatical competence or accent, learners seek to conform to native-speaker pragmatic norms (Kasper and Schmidt, 1996). As the language we use in real-time discourse shapes how the world perceives us, pragmatics is also an important vehicle for our social identities whether in L1 or L2. Second-language learners thus face the unique challenge of constructing L2 social identities via the pragmatic resources available in L2.

One such pragmatic resource in several languages (Spanish, French, German, Russian, and others) is the choice of so-called T/V address forms (e.g., *tú*/*usted* in Spanish, *tu*/*vous* in French). Although T is broadly said to denote a familiar and V a formal addressee (Brown and Gilman, 1960), T/V choice does not represent a simple form-to-meaning mapping but rather entails a complex set of social indexical meanings (Morford, 1997). As a result, address forms can present

* Correspondence to: Department of Linguistics, University of California, 175 Kerr Hall, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, United States. Tel.: +1 302 562 6688.
E-mail address: djvill@ucdavis.edu.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.005
0378-2166/

difficulties for native speakers of languages without T/V, especially in the foreign-language classroom environment; these learners often lack the cultural benefit of socialization into the T/V paradigm and/or sufficient classroom instruction about the pragmatics of address forms (Belz and Kinginger, 2002). As learners start to gain an understanding of the indexical significance of T/V, they will also start to work out what their use of T/V means about them as users of L2 (whether they consider themselves relatively formal, who they are solidary with, etc.). Even if a learner is able to construct (or begin to construct) notions of their L2 identities, however, they face the challenge of realizing them in real-time discourse.

In this paper, I investigate intermediate Spanish learners' use of T/V from two angles: metapragmatic judgments about their (desired) T/V usage as well as their actual production of T/V in discourse. In so doing, I seek to uncover what this relationship between judgments and production means for learners' ability to construct and realize L2 social identities.

2. L2 pragmatic competence

L2 learners face several challenges in acquiring L2 pragmatic competence. First, the acquisition of pragmatic competence in one's first language (L1) is accomplished through an involved, highly culturally specific process of language socialization (e.g., Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986). Because this process is so culturally specific, learners' L2 pragmatic repertoires will initially suffer greater resemblance to L1 pragmatic norms than L2 norms—the result of pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992:207). Takahashi and Beebe (1993) asked speakers to respond to the following situation: ''You are a professor in a history course. During class discussion, one of your students gives an account of a historical event with the wrong date'' (140). The majority (64%) of American English speakers preceded their correction with a positive remark, whereas only 13% of Japanese speakers used a positive remark. Accordingly, only 23% of Japanese ESL speakers used a positive remark, and these remarks hardly conveyed approval or support: ''Well, *I'm almost satisfied* with your account of that event except the date of it'' (141, emphasis original). The form of this utterance may be pragmatically appropriate in Japanese, but not so in English. It is possible that these speakers lacked the metapragmatic awareness (Silverstein, 2001), the knowledge of appropriate English forms in given contexts, necessary to produce appropriate utterances in English.

Even if learners are metapragmatically aware, they may still lack the necessary control over L2 to apply their awareness in production (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei, 1998). Koike (1989) investigated beginning Spanish learners' awareness of speech act pragmatics by asking different groups of learners to attempt to identify speech acts or produce request/command speech acts in given circumstances. Whereas the first group of learners succeeded overwhelmingly at differentiating requests, apologies, and commands, the second group failed badly at producing polite requests and commands. These learners were reluctant to use more polite and grammatically complex forms (such as requests and hints) in delicate situations, choosing instead to use easily translated but less polite forms (such as direct commands) in the name of expediency. Similarly, Pearson (2006) found that learners who were made aware of differential levels of formality in Spanish nevertheless failed to produce appropriate utterances thanks to struggling with complex verbal paradigms. Both of these studies suggest that L2 pragmatic production is constrained to a substantial degree by L2 grammatical competence (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei, 1998; Pearson, 2006).

2.1. Pragmatics and identity

A given speaker's patterns of language-in-use reflect strongly on that speaker's *identities*, which I define—drawing on Gee (2001) and Norton Peirce (1995)—as the malleable, contextually based subject positions, emerging within interactions, that represent an individual as a social being (i.e., who the individual is seen to be ''out in the world''). Following van Compernolle and Williams (2012:237), I consider identities to be related to, but distinct from, an individual's *self*. Whereas self is an internal state (or process), identities are the external manifestations of self (and therefore a window through which an outside observer attempts to ascertain self). For example, a person who phrases requests as imperatives rather than questions, omits words like ''please,'' and uses a flat intonational contour will be said to be ''impolite.'' This individual's identity in this situation (impoliteness) derives from their repertoires of language-in-use (economical speech) being perceived as indicating underlying, intrinsic personality features.

An important property of identities is that they are unavoidable (as it were), since they are ''in part an outcome of others' perceptions and representations'' (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005:606). That is, the act of speaking necessarily signals identities regardless of the specific linguistic choices the speaker makes. But identities are often also personally motivated—existing not only ''out in the world'' but also ''in the head''—as speakers may ''actively recruit and facilitate the responses of others'' (Gee, 2001:104) in an attempt to produce identities that will reflect a certain self. Van Compernolle and Williams (2012:237) define this ability to utilize the symbolic potential of linguistic forms as *sociolinguistic agency*.

Given the unavoidability of identities and the connection between pragmatics and identity, L2 learners with incomplete L2 pragmatic competence may be at risk of inadvertently signaling the ''wrong'' identities. For instance, by failing to precede their corrections with a positive remark, Takahashi and Beebe's (1993) Japanese learners of English would likely

come across as unsympathetic, rude, or cold to native English-speaking Americans. However, L2 learners are by no means incapable of developing agency in L2. Norton Peirce (1995) demonstrates how several immigrant women were able to remake their identities from positions of disempowerment as English language learners to positions as mothers or multicultural citizens, thereby (re)claiming their right to speak. In other words, not only can learners' desired L2 identities be fluid and dynamic (Kinginger, 2004), but so can their ability to realize their desired L2 identities.

This contrast sets up a fundamental tension in studying L2 identities through the lens of pragmatic competence. On the one hand, it seems odd to speak of a learner's pragmatic self-awareness unless they have spent enough time within the L2 community to develop a cogent L2 metapragmatic awareness (e.g., Kinginger and Farrell, 2004). To return to the example of Japanese learners of English, it is unlikely that these learners would have desired a cold, unsympathetic identity, so in this case, a lack of pragmatic competence restricts their L2 agency. On the other hand, it is not clear that we should automatically describe all early identity development as naïve. As Kasper and Schmidt (1996:156) note, ''the assumption underlying most [L2 pragmatics] studies is that NS [native speaker] norms are an adequate target for NNSs [non-native speakers]. If this were the case, any difference between NS and NNS pragmatic comprehension or production would have to be seen as potentially problematic, indicating a deficit in the NNSs' pragmatic competence.'' Unlike grammatical competence, there is no single 'null native speaker' pragmatic norm to which all learners necessarily aspire. In fact, some advanced learners intentionally flout some of the pragmatic norms of native speakers as a strategy for marking their L2 status (Kasper and Schmidt, 1996). Moreover, we might assume a certain naïveté about L2 pragmatic norms regardless of one's level of engagement in the L2 community. Does this naïveté preclude the possibility that learners are developing L2 identities?

3. T/V address forms

The lens through which this study examines learners' L2 identities is the T/V address-form system.[1] Unlike English, which has only one singular address-form pronoun (*you*), several languages (including Spanish) have split address-form systems in which different forms are used for different singular addressees. Brown and Gilman's (1960; hereafter BG) classic survey of several European languages' T/V systems defined a semantic basis of pronoun usage rooted in the conflicting considerations of power and solidarity, where T denotes a ''familiar'' pronoun and V a ''polite'' one (157). Under this system, the address form used by a given speaker is a function of ''the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee'' (156).

Unfortunately, the simplicity of the BG analysis has since been discredited. Morford (1997), in particular, argues against BG's semantics-based analysis in favor of a pragmatics-based analysis, citing considerable interspeaker variation in a group of Parisians' metapragmatic judgments about T/V and reported usage of T/V. To some speakers, asymmetrical T/V indexes vestiges of an outmoded, hierarchical society, and so greater usage of T is observed among urban dwellers (Marín, 1972; Solé, 1978), the politically left-leaning (Morford, 1997), and even ''comrades'' in revolutionary movements (Marín, 1972). Furthermore, T/V choices are not static; symmetrical V is the unmarked address pattern between two adult strangers of equal age and status, but as their relationship becomes more intimate, symmetrical T is likely to be initiated (Morford, 1997; Solé, 1978). Address form choice is so complex that at times even native speakers (who linguists typically assume to be experts of their own languages) have considerable difficulty making T/V choices (Delisle, 1986).

Morford accounts for the complexity inherent in the T/V system by utilizing Silverstein's (1992) notion of *orders of indexicality*. At the first order of indexicality, address forms signal aspects of both the interlocutors' relationship and the nature of the interactional context. For example, individuals in upper-management positions are more likely to use V to address subordinates, as their organizational authority gives them the power to initiate symmetrical T (or decline to do so). The relationship between form and indexical meaning is in turn subject to ideological mediation, as the contextual and relational variables determining the choice of a given address form come to signal enduring characteristics of users of that form. This second order of indexicality, when applied to the above example, helps explain how an extensive use of V can come to index authority or an elevated social standing. Since this second-order indexical value is ideologically mediated, speakers may use it strategically; Morford gives an example of a couple ''who had taught their children to say [V] to them, [then] encouraged their offspring to begin addressing them as [T] when the father entered local politics'' (18). In other words, a speaker's choice of T/V has a strong bearing on social identity, giving speakers a strong incentive to use address forms in a way that will project the identities that they desire.

Consider, for example, an academic department consisting of three groups of individuals: professors, graduate students, and undergraduates. In this department, generally speaking, the professors and graduate students address all

[1] The reader should note that in this section, I address studies from several Indo-European languages with the T/V distinction. More important than the specific mechanics of the pragmatic systems governing T/V usage in particular languages, however, are general considerations of how T/V systems function pragmatically.

parties with T, while the undergraduates address professors with V and graduate students with T. Because these behavioral patterns of T/V use are also pragmatic standards for T/V use within the context of this department, a given individual's patterns will be judged against the existing departmental patterns. If one of the graduate students bucks this standard by instead addressing the professors with V, some of his fellow graduates may perceive him as undervaluing his social standing within the department. An undergraduate who sees herself as a good candidate for graduate study may address professors with T—but only in office hours—in order to signal her self-appraisal without denying the teacher-student hierarchy inherent in the classroom or publicly disaligning herself from her fellow undergraduates. A veteran professor, fed up with departmental infighting, may begin addressing colleagues with V (and expecting V in return) as a grudging acknowledgment of an unfriendly workplace climate, but may come off as hostile in doing so.

In all cases, it is clear first that T/V has a nontrivial and dynamic social significance for these individuals, and second that this social significance is not captured by the BG analysis. This significance is derived from the fact that the department's social landscape is ''not simply reflected by but [is] indeed *defined in* and *constituted through* language use'' (Morford, 1997:7, emphasis added); we might therefore find it essential that each member of the small linguistic community of this academic department be tapped into the localized pragmatic norms that mediate between language use and social relations. At the same time, the pragmatic moves of even a completely pragmatically aware member of this community may not necessarily be interpreted as desired thanks to the potentially conflicting meanings that an address form choice may have at multiple orders of indexicality. In a more general context, the complexity of T/V places limitations on the sociolinguistic agency of even native speakers.

3.1. T/V and L2 learners

We can imagine that if T/V carries such difficulties for native speakers, then doubly so for L2 learners whose first language is English, as T/V is a novel pragmatic distinction for L1 English speakers. Since the grammatical function of both T and V is combined in (Modern) English *you*, learners must base their T/V choices on the materials presented in the classroom (Dewaele, 2004a; Kinginger, 2000). Far from providing learners with cogent guidance, textbooks and courses tend to present learners with a heavily simplified T/V paradigm resembling the BG power/solidarity account (Delisle, 1986; Kinginger, 2000; Solé, 1978). Worse, the classroom context limits learners' opportunities to use T/V forms in differing social contexts (Belz and Kinginger, 2002, 2003); the only fluent L2 speaker in the classroom is typically the instructor, whom pragmatic norms dictate students must address with V.

It should not surprise us, then, that native and non-native speakers exhibit significant differences in pronoun choice (Dewaele, 2004b). In accordance with L2 learners' general tendency to underuse informal variants and overuse formal variants relative to native speakers (Howard et al., 2013), learners tend to overgeneralize V. For instance, it is the norm in both Spanish and French to address an unfamiliar, same-age classmate with T, since the university context presupposes a shared relationship that overrides the interactants' unfamiliarity; learners typically use V in this context (Belz and Kinginger, 2002; Dewaele, 2004b; Kinginger and Farrell, 2004; Marín, 1972).[2] Kinginger and Farrell (2004) give the example of a pre-study-abroad student who expressed a preference for V in all social contexts (including the unfamiliar-classmate context), explaining her choices as follows:

> Probably just throughout the years its [*sic*] just always been kinds [*sic*] like teachers were always addressed as [V] and they'd be kind of like trying to make it a point to make sure that you don't do something highly offensive and call someone [T] that you shouldn't so I feel like I should be safer? and use [V]. (30)

The example of an unfamiliar classmate represents a situation in which one address form is clearly marked under native pragmatic norms. But even in this situation, a learner's preference for the marked form may not reflect metapragmatic naïveté. Kinginger and Farrell also give the example of an advanced learner, Benjamin, who observed while abroad that most speakers his age address unknown classmates with T; Benjamin nevertheless chooses V in these situations in the name of politeness: ''I would say [V] but that's just me'' (36). We thus return to the fundamental tension, discussed above, between assessing learners' metapragmatic awareness as naïve and taking learners' metapragmatic awareness at face value. What are we to make of Benjamin's defiance of L2 pragmatic norms? Is Benjamin participating in the construction of his desired L2 identities, or is he merely exhibiting L2 naïveté?

In this paper, I take the position that even intermediate-level language learners could be developing notions of how they would prefer to utilize the pragmatic resources of their L2 to represent their self—in other words, *desired* L2 identities—even though we expect these notions to evolve (or perhaps change precipitously) as learners engage further with the language (Iwasaki, 2010; Kinginger, 2004). We can gain insight into whether these emergent norms truly represent a

[2] Van Compernolle et al. (2011:68) give an excerpt from an introductory French textbook that presents students with an essentially BG-like approach to T/V choice: bulleted lists following the headings ''use [T]'' and ''use [V].''

construction of desired L2 identities or merely indicate naïveté by investigating learners' metapragmatic awareness. With respect to address form choice, learners' orientation to T/V must move beyond the BG-like approach that they learn in the classroom and toward a realization that their choice of address forms is a complex indexical toolkit that bears on their L2 identities. I also reject approaches such as that of Koike (1989) and Pearson (2006) that assume that learners unambiguously aim toward a native-speaker pragmatic norm. These approaches view L2 identities as a prescribed end state, such that all deviations from native pragmatic norms represent deficiencies; instead, I view L2 identity development as a process, such that learners may define the pragmatic norms under which they want to operate. As a result, it is important to consider learners' ability to realize their own pragmatic norms, whether or not these norms accord perfectly with native-speaker norms. Even if learners have well-articulated reasons for (internal) T/V judgments, their (external) identities are still constrained by their sociolinguistic agency—in this case, the extent to which they are able to successfully actualize these judgments in L2 production.

4. The present study

This study investigates the L2 identities of native English-speaking Spanish learners by examining their metapragmatic judgments about desired usage of T/V as well as their production of T/V in real time. In particular, I have chosen to study intermediate learners (those in second-year university Spanish classes) since most studies of L2 pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and/or identity development focus on more advanced learners. While Koike's (1989) and Pearson's (2006) tasks were apparently too advanced for their first- and second-semester participants (respectively), this should be seen as a lower bound of proficiency.

Moreover, this study's focus on address forms is well-suited to intermediate learners. First, these learners' choice of address forms in production is less likely than other pragmatic resources to be constrained by their intermediate grammatical competence. The polite mitigation of a request, for example, requires the ability to hedge effectively and/or to use complicated portions of the grammar (such as the subjunctive mood) which may be introduced at different times in the classroom. The choice of one address form over the other, on the other hand, is a matter of choosing between two pronouns and/or inflections that foreign-language classes typically introduce simultaneously (e.g., as part of the same inflectional paradigms). This means that, unlike speech acts, it is possible to study the real-time production of T/V even among intermediate learners. Second, learners are likely to learn of the overall concept of a split address-form system very early on in their Spanish classes—though the fact that they receive a simplified BG-like picture of T/V means that they have a chance to develop their metapragmatic awareness beyond an initial, simplistic understanding.

Most importantly, T/V is a well-studied feature of L2 pragmatics. Kinginger and Farrell (2004) examined the development of French learners' metapragmatic awareness by analyzing learners' responses to a pre- and post-study-abroad questionnaire asking which form they would choose in particular social situations and why. Similarly, Dewaele (2004b) compared questionnaire data about French learners' T/V choices to production of T/V by a separate group of learners. This comparison was only done on a group-wide scale, however; I investigate individual learners' production and judgments of T/V.

My research questions follow:

1. (a) What are intermediate Spanish learners' judgments about their desired use of T/V? (b) To what extent do these judgments reflect a construction of desired L2 identity?
2. How do intermediate Spanish learners use T/V in actual production?
3. (a) To what extent does learners' T/V production match their metapragmatic judgments? (b) What implications does this match or mismatch have for learners' Spanish identities?

4.1. General methods

Fourteen undergraduates at a four-year university in northern California were recruited from second-year Spanish-language courses. Participants were required to be between the ages of 18 and 24 since some of the T/V scenarios and judgments hinged on the participant being younger than the interlocutor. Participants also had to self-identify as monolingual English speakers in order to avoid possible pragmatic transfer from other T/V languages. A proficiency baseline of Intermediate (on an oral proficiency interview) was established to ensure that participants' address-form production in spontaneous speech would not be overly constrained by a lack of grammatical competence. One prospective participant failed to meet this baseline, but all others scored Intermediate-Low ($n = 8$), Intermediate-Mid ($n = 3$), or Intermediate-High ($n = 2$) and completed the project. I later excluded one participant who had met the baseline of Intermediate-Low but whose production data I later deemed to be too improficient to be included in the study. The data reported here is that of the remaining 12 participants. (All names given here are pseudonyms.)

Table 1
Role-play and questionnaire scenarios, given in order of role-play scenario appearance. Note that the Bank Teller and Mother questionnaire scenarios had no corresponding role-play scenarios.

#	Role-play scenario	Questionnaire scenario	Unmarked form
1	Niñero	Client	V
2	Compañero de Clase	Classmate	T
3	Tía	Aunt	T or V
4	Accidente	Stranger	T or V
5	[N/A]	Bank Teller	V
6	[N/A]	Mother	T

Participants completed two tasks, a role-play production task and a judgments questionnaire. Participants completed the role-play task first, with one week separating the tasks. The questionnaire collected metapragmatic judgments about T/V (addressing research question 1), the role-play task collected T/V production (addressing research question 2), and the combination of both tasks addressed research question 3.

4.1.1. Scenarios

In each task, participants either acted out or gave their judgments about interactional scenarios varying by first-order indexical properties affecting address form choice: age, social standing, relationship, and overall discourse context. Table 1 displays the four role-play scenarios and six questionnaire scenarios; for comparison's sake, all role-play scenarios had a counterpart on the questionnaire. (See Appendices A and B, respectively, for the full text of the role-play task and questionnaire.) Scenarios were specifically chosen to represent a range of unmarked address forms, as shown in Table 1. For instance, scenario 2 tested the generalized situation of an unfamiliar, same-age classmate, a context in which (as noted above) learners tend to use V (Belz and Kinginger, 2002; Dewaele, 2004b; Kinginger and Farrell, 2004; Marín, 1972). In fact, the Classmate questionnaire scenario was based near-verbatim on a scenario from Kinginger and Farrell's (2004:41) questionnaire in order to facilitate direct comparison between the two groups of learners.

In two scenarios neither address form was marked, giving participants greater leeway to project desired social identities. Scenario 4, for example, put participants in a position of aiding a male stranger in his late 20s, either after he has just been in a minor accident (Accidente role-play) or is clearly lost (Stranger questionnaire item). While the interactants' unfamiliarity could suggest V, their lack of a preexisting hierarchical relationship (such as agent–client), as well as the caretaking tenor of the interaction, could suggest T. Moreover, participants could interpret the interlocutor's age as either placing them in the same age-group as the interlocutor or as representing a generational difference.

I will discuss the results of the judgments questionnaire first in order to address the research questions in order.

5. Metapragmatic judgments

5.1. Methods (questionnaire)

The questionnaire presented six brief scenarios and asked participants to give both a narrative explanation and a rating-scale frequency judgment (e.g., Dewaele, 2004b) for which address form they would use in each scenario (see Appendix B). Participants had four choices: ''only *usted*,'' ''mostly *usted* but sometimes *tú*,'' ''mostly *tú* but sometimes *usted*,'' and ''only *tú*.'' I converted these judgments into numerical scores from 1 to 4 (only-V = 1, mostly-V = 2, mostly-T = 3, only-T = 4) and averaged each participant's and each scenario's scores in order to calculate a *T/V index* for each participant and scenario. This index ranges from 1–4, such that a participant or scenario whose index is close to 1 can be said to be highly ''V-preferring,'' a participant or scenario whose index is close to 4 can be said to be highly ''T-preferring,'' and an index of 2.5 represents a midpoint between the two address forms.

I will first address research question 1a by analyzing participants' responses on this rating-scale judgment task. Participants' narrative explanations will allow me to address research question 1b, as these explanations indicate whether participants saw T/V as reflecting a simplistic form-to-meaning mapping or as an indexical resource that can define and constitute social contexts and relationships (e.g., Morford, 1997). In other words, I analyze these explanations for participants' awareness that T/V is a resource for identity-work.

5.2. Results (judgments)

Table 2 gives counts of judgments for the six questionnaire scenarios, arranged from top to bottom in ascending order of T/V index (i.e., from most V-preferring to most T-preferring). Notably, Table 2 shows a stratification of judgments across scenarios, indicating that participants had a notion of the range of uses of T/V. In the aggregate, these participants judged

Table 2
Number of address form judgments by form and scenario, ranked by T/V index. V = only-V, v = mostly-V, t = mostly-T, T = only-T.

	V	v	t	**T**	**T/V** index
Client	7	4	1	0	**1.50**
Bank Teller	4	4	2	2	**2.17**
Stranger	2	3	5	2	**2.58**
Aunt	3	2	3	4	**2.67**
Mother	1	0	3	8	**3.50**
Classmate	0	0	4	8	**3.67**
Total	**17**	**13**	**18**	**24**	**2.68**

Table 3
Address form judgments by scenario and participant. Both scenarios (top to bottom) and participants (left to right) ranked by increasing T/V index. Large and small T/V notation equivalent to Table 2.

	Steph	Murray	Rich	Myra	Marie	Helen	Tasha	Nicole	Renee	Rachel	Robin	Luke
Client	**V**	**V**	v	**V**	**V**	**V**	v	v	**V**	v	**V**	t
Bank Teller	**V**	**T**	t	**V**	**V**	v	v	**V**	t	v	v	**T**
Stranger	**V**	**V**	t	v	t	t	v	v	**T**	t	t	**T**
Aunt	**V**	**V**	**V**	**T**	v	t	**T**	**T**	v	t	**T**	t
Mother	**V**	t	t	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	t
Classmate	t	**T**	t	t	**T**	**T**	t	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**
T/V index	**1.33**	**2.33**	**2.5**	**2.5**	**2.5**	**2.83**	**2.83**	**2.83**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3.5**

that they would use T/V roughly in line with native-speaker norms; all but one participant chose V when speaking with a prospective client, two-thirds chose V for a bank teller, and all but one chose T for their mother. The Stranger and Aunt scenarios were designed to have no unmarked form (see Table 1), and indeed, both scenarios have a T/V index near the 2.5 midpoint. The most T-preferring scenario was Classmate, for which two-thirds of participants gave only-T judgments and no participants gave V judgments. The T/V index across all scenarios is 2.68, meaning that if we take these scenarios to be representative of a range of social contexts (if not necessarily the full range thereof), then these learners had a very slight preference for T over V, if any preference at all.

This is not to say that these participants all patterned identically, however. Table 3 displays participants' choices of address forms for the six questionnaire scenarios, with both scenarios and participants arranged in increasing T/V index order. These results indicate a fair amount of variation with respect to overall T/V choices among these learners. Two participants were below the 2.5 midpoint, seven were above it, and three were directly on the midpoint. Table 3 also indicates that these judgments were not randomly scattered but systematic. To take the two extreme examples, the most V-preferring participant, Steph, gave the sole V judgment for the second most T-preferring scenario, Mother, whereas the most T-preferring participant, Luke, gave the sole T judgment for the most V-preferring scenario, Client. There were exceptions to these general trends; Murray was second only to Steph in preferring V in general, but broke with the other participants in choosing only-T for Bank Teller. As I will show in the following section, Murray's choice here was the result not of naïveté but a conscious choice related to his desired L2 identities.

5.2.1. Judgments and identity

Several narrative explanations were based on a simplified BG-like analysis of the discourse context. For example, Murray explained his only-V Client judgment with ''With wanting her to pay me, I would use [V],''[3] a decision predicated on power/unequal status. Rachel's explanation for a mostly-V Bank Teller judgment, ''I would attempt & intend to use the [V] form because I want to show respect & give them the point of authority,'' exemplifies a common ideology found in participants' responses—the use of V as a way to show respect—and demonstrates the connection of ''respect'' to the power semantic. Renee's explanation for a mostly-T Bank Teller judgment also demonstrates the influence of the power semantic on ''politeness'' (as well as the belief in maintaining asymmetrical-T/V interactions): ''I am the customer and he has to be polite to me.'' Likewise, BG's solidarity semantic was evident in many judgments, such as Luke's explanation for using only-T with a classmate: ''He's a peer of mine, so I would use [T], even if I don't know him.'' Participants commonly

[3] For the sake of consistency in terms and comparability to other studies, participants' responses have been re-written with the letters T and V in place of the Spanish pronouns. Typographical errors have not been fixed.

invoked solidarity in the Aunt and Mother scenarios, where family relations were seen as the basis for common ground, as in Myra's explanation for an only-T Aunt judgment: ''My aunt is my family so I would only use [T] even if I haven't seen her lately.''

The power/solidarity semantics were commonly flattened, surfacing as single variables such as age, as in Rich's explanation for a mostly-T Stranger judgment: ''He's around my age so [T] would make more sense.'' But age was not an absolute factor, as evident in Tasha's explanation for a mostly-V Stranger judgment: ''He is a stranger and is older than me so I would use [V], but if we started chatting, since he is still close to my age, I would use [T].'' Interestingly, Tasha uses age as a pivot here; before she and the stranger are solidary, their age difference serves to separate them, but once they become friendly, their age difference becomes compressed, switching from an asymmetry to a symmetry.

Tasha's explanation for Stranger exemplifies a class of responses that exhibit an understanding that social relationships and the social contexts are ''not simply reflected by but are indeed *defined in* and *constituted through* language use'' (Morford, 1997:7, emphasis added). If Tasha relied on a simple semantics-based form-to-meaning mapping in making her T/V choices, then age could only suggest one form over the other, but not both; instead, the first-order indexical properties of address forms allow an age difference to be reanalyzed based on T/V choices. Similarly, Marie explained her mostly-T choice for Stranger with ''Use familiarity to gain trust; if he looks uptight or old-fashioned, use [V].'' Under a BG analysis, T could only reflect solidarity, but Marie's explanation indicates her intention to use T to create solidarity.

Finally, a majority of participants turned to self-presentational concerns in explaining at least one of their T/V choices, displaying an awareness that their use of address forms had a bearing on their Spanish identities. Robin chose only-V for Client, explaining, ''I *want to seem professional* since we have never met. I also want to seem like I respect her as she is looking to hire me and she is older than I am'' (emphasis added); that is, Robin knew that she could project an identity of professionalism via her choice of V. Rich demonstrated an understanding of both the second-order indexical power of T/V and the general preference for symmetrical address in explaining his mostly-T Classmate judgment: ''I'd use [T] primarily because I *wouldn't want to seem subservient to him/her*. If he/she used [V] then I would as well, however'' (emphasis added).

Finally, the second-most V-preferring participant, Murray, represents an interesting case with respect to L2 identity construction. He explained his only-V Stranger judgment (one of just two only-V judgments in that scenario) by mapping V onto ''sir,'' a marker of deference in English: ''In English I'd say 'can I help you with something sir?'.'' But as noted above, he gave one of just two only-T Bank Teller judgments (the other being Luke, the most T-preferring participant), since ''I *try to be as personable as possible* and interact with people as I am their equal, not as they are doing a job for me'' (emphasis added). In other words, Murray had not only a clear idea of what he would like his Spanish identities to be, but also how he should utilize the indexical potential of T/V to that end.

6. T/V production

6.1. Methods (role-play task)

The role-play task was devised in such a way as to circumvent the Observer's Paradox (Labov, 1972). In particular, the task had to lead participants to produce sufficient address-form tokens (at least at a greater rate than a randomly selected segment of conversation), but could not allow participants to gain awareness of the study's focus on T/V lest their attention to T/V affect their production (thus damaging the role-play task's ecological validity). As a compromise solution, the role-play scenarios were designed as information-gathering tasks, with participants collecting information relevant to their interlocutors. Individual items within the scenarios necessitated questions that forced some sort of address-form pronoun and/or inflection (subject, object, etc.). As an example, one sentence from the Tía scenario read, ''You should ask if she [the participant's 'aunt'] has talked to your mother recently, and if she knows what your mother wants for her birthday; if not, ask if she has any recommendations'' (underlines added). The phrasing of this sentence should, in concept, result in the participant producing at least three T/V tokens.[4]

6.1.1. Transcription and coding

Role-play tasks were given a broad transcription using the program Transcriber (Barras, 2002). Transcripts were then coded for address-form tokens, defining a token as any singular address-form pronoun, clitic, or inflection that could either take a T or V form—in other words, any form that denoted addressee-reference—with some systematic exceptions. (All coding examples given here are excerpts from actual role-play data.)

[4] This method was apparently rather successful, at least with respect to the number of tokens generated, as the 48 role-plays together produced 614 T/V tokens, an average of 13 tokens per scenario (median: 10.5 tokens). Whether this method fulfilled its other goal, that of collecting speech representative of participants' typical conversational production in Spanish, is much more difficult to quantify.

Table 4
T/V production by scenario and participant. Both scenarios (top to bottom) and participants (left to right) ranked by increasing percentage of T tokens. *n*/*m* = *n* T tokens out of *m* total address-form tokens.

	Murray	Tasha	Helen	Myra	Renee	Nicole	Rich	Robin	Steph	Marie	Rachel	Luke	Total
Niñero	2/7 29%	0/6 0%	2/8 25%	8/9 89%	0/7 0%	12/17 71%	9/10 90%	11/12 92%	7/8 88%	3/6 50%	10/11 91%	6/6 100%	**70/107** **65%**
Tía	4/11 36%	3/3 100%	9/10 90%	8/8 100%	3/9 33%	7/8 88%	5/11 45%	6/6 100%	5/7 71%	10/10 100%	10/11 91%	6/6 100%	**76/100** **76%**
Accidente	9/10 90%	6/13 46%	7/10 70%	10/18 56%	25/25 100%	26/33 79%	21/21 100%	20/24 83%	8/8 100%	19/19 100%	12/12 100%	13/13 100%	**176/206** **85%**
Compañero de Clase	8/14 57%	14/18 78%	13/13 100%	11/13 85%	23/23 100%	19/19 100%	29/32 91%	9/9 100%	9/9 100%	6/6 100%	18/18 100%	25/27 93%	**184/201** **92%**
Total	**23/42** **55%**	**23/40** **58%**	**31/41** **76%**	**37/48** **77%**	**51/64** **80%**	**64/77** **83%**	**64/74** **74%**	**46/51** **90%**	**29/32** **91%**	**38/41** **93%**	**50/52** **96%**	**50/52** **96%**	**506/614** **82%**

In cases where overtly expressed subject pronouns co-occurred with a verbal inflection, the phrase was coded as a single token (e.g., *tú **[T]** quieres*). In cases where verbs failed to agree with their address-form subject pronoun, the token was coded according to the subject pronoun, but with an asterisk indicating inflectional non-agreement (e.g., *tú **[T*]** va*). In cases where an address-form pronoun was repeated due to repair or general disfluency, only the final repetition was counted as a token (e.g., *tú uh te **[T]** gusta*; *uh tú uh tú **[T]** sabes*). In some of these cases, the speaker repaired the address form itself; these cases were coded as a single token with a hyphen indicating repair. (e.g., *mi madre, su or tu **[V-T]** uh hermana*). The construction *a ti te gusta* (with no prosodic boundary between *ti* and *te*) was counted as a single token *te **[T]***. In recognition of the general grammatical constraints on learner interlanguage, nonstandard forms that clearly signaled addressee-reference (especially in the preterite, e.g., *estuvaste*; *comprastes*), were accepted as valid tokens (in this case both T), just as non-agreeing phrases such as *tú **[T*]** va* were accepted as valid tokens.[5] Address forms were not coded if participants were not addressing their immediate interlocutor, either where using what Cameron (1996) calls a ''nonspecific tú'' (e.g., *[fútbol es] el deporte que juegas con el pie*), where the address form referred to a different addressee (as when participants pretended to speak to a 911 operator during the Accidente role-play), or where an address form token was clearly accidental (e.g., *sí, puedo uh puedes uh ((laughs)) lo siento. puedo llamarlos*).

All other tokens were coded, with no restrictions on token counts within given turns or clauses (e.g., *quieres **[T]** darme tu **[T]** email*), save for the above-mentioned case of overtly marked subject pronouns. This practice was necessary since in some cases speakers would switch between address forms even within a single clause but beyond the scope of a repair (e.g., *voy a devolver tus **[T]** apuntes, uh a usted **[V]***).

6.2. Results (production)

Table 4 displays the results of each participant's role-play discourse task, with both scenarios and participants arranged in order of increasing percentage of T tokens. The most striking overall result is an almost overwhelming preference for T in production; across the entire set of role-plays, T tokens outweighed V by a ratio of more than four to one. Likewise, only two role-plays (out of 48) featured 100% V tokens (both in the Niñero scenario), whereas 19 role-plays featured 100% T tokens. As with judgments, participants represented a range of variation with respect to T/V production (between 55% and 96% T use). All but two participants averaged more than 75% T tokens. In addition, the four scenarios were stratified in production as would be expected by their unmarked forms (see Table 1 above): Niñero < Tía < Accidente < Compañero de Clase. This stratification is relative, however, and T dominated each scenario in an absolute sense; participants produced nearly two-thirds T tokens in Niñero, despite it being the most V-preferring scenario. As far as production is concerned, T appears to be these participants' default address form.

6.2.1. Address-form mixing

It is worth noting that almost one-third of all role-plays (15 of 48) did not feature categorical or near-categorical use of one address form over the other (i.e., between 16% and 84% T tokens). One possible reason for an intermediary

[5] We might hypothesize that tokens such as *tú va* reflect the application of coda /s/ deletion, a Spanish sociolinguistic variable, rather than indicating nonagreement. We would then expect participants to delete coda /s/ in contexts other than verbal inflections; as this was not the case for any participants, however, tokens such as *tú va* are clearly examples of nonagreement.

Tasha	V	V	V	V	T*	T	V	T	V	T	T		V-T V
DB												T	
Turn	1	6	8	10	14	16	18	20	23	25	27	34	37

Fig. 1. Address form diagram for Tasha's Accidente role-play. * = mismatched pronoun and inflection, – = repair (see Transcription & coding, above). DB = male interlocutor.

Myra	V	T-V	T*	T	T-V	T	V	V	T	T	V	V	T	V	T	T*	T	T	
DB																			T
Turn	1		3					7	9	11	13		15	23	25	29	30		

Fig. 2. Address form diagram for Myra's Accidente role-play. Notation equivalent to Fig. 1.

percentage of tokens could be a shift in address forms over the course of an interaction to effect a redefinition of the relationship between interlocutors; this was not the case in any of the role-plays, however. Instead, a number of participants mixed address forms throughout at least one scenario, possibly as a result of a lack of grammatical control.

In her Accidente role-play, for example, Tasha produced six T tokens and seven V tokens. In order to understand how Tasha's T/V choices unfolded over the course of this scenario, I use an analytic tool I am labeling an *address form diagram* (Fig. 1), which displays the raw results (tokens and turns) of an individual role-play.

Tasha begins this role-play by using V in the first few turns, but her fifth token ("tú **[T*]** está") consists of a T pronoun but a V inflection. Two turns later, she uses T again ("tu **[T]** carro"). The two tokens in the final turn suggest a possible role of grammatical constraints, as Tasha struggles with imperative forms: "No no dor- no duerma mm no duerme **[V-T]**, pero uh siéntense **[V]**;" *siéntense* is a somewhat common classroom command from teachers to students ("sit [yourselves] down"). In addition, Tasha's four *estar*, two *necesitar*, and one *ir* tokens were all V (inflections), whereas all of her overt pronouns (two subject pronouns, two possessive) were T. In other words, although it may appear early on in the interaction that Tasha is moving from V to T, she actually ends up mixing the two address forms throughout, with grammar apparently constraining her T/V production to a greater extent than pragmatics.

Myra's Accidente role-play (Fig. 2) featured even more dramatic T/V mixing. Particularly striking is the six-token sequence in turn 3, in which Myra mixes T/V tokens indiscriminately:

> uh tú **[T*]** está en un accidente de coche. uh tú manejá- tú **[T]** manejas tu- tu-su **[T-V]** coche en, en la la uh lado de la calle. tú s- tú **[T]** no sientes bien? t- tiene **[V]** dolor? en otros uh lugares uh de s- su **[V]** cabeza?

Although Myra's turn 3 represents an extreme case, T/V mixing was not uncommon. Nine participants mixed address forms mid-turn at least once across their role-plays, and six participants mixed address forms between subsequent turns at least once (e.g., several times between Tasha's turns 16–25 in Fig. 1).

In other words, participants were likely not closely monitoring their address-form production, but rather focusing on other aspects of interaction. It is likely that this lack of monitoring of address forms, as well as grammatical constraints,[6] is responsible for the commonness of T/V mixing.

7. Connecting production to judgments

Research question 3a asks to what extent learners' T/V production matches their metapragmatic judgments. We can get a broad, initial answer to this question by examining production results for given judgments; Table 5 displays separate percentages of T tokens for role-play scenarios in which participants chose only-V, mostly-V, mostly-T, or only-T on the questionnaire.

Examining each role-play individually from left to right in Table 5 reveals that in each case, as participants' judgments move from more V-p to more T-preferring, the aggregate percentage of T tokens produced in role-plays increases monotonically.

[6] In order to quantify the nature of these grammatical constraints, I carried out a variationist analysis of T/V production using Rbrul (Johnson, 2012). While the variationist analysis confirmed the broad findings discussed above (a general preference for T, stratification among learners), it did not reveal any significant grammatical constraints that applied reliably across the participant pool. It is possible that rather than sharing a community interlanguage grammar, these learners were constrained by individual grammars, but with only 50 or so tokens per learner, it is impossible to reliably investigate the nature of these grammars.

Table 5
T/V tokens by scenario, separated by judgments for matching questionnaire scenario. Scenarios ranked top-to-bottom by increasing percentage of T tokens. *n*/*m* = *n* T tokens out of *m* total address-form tokens. Large and small T/V notation equivalent to Table 2.

	V	v	t	**T**	**Total**
Client	33/57 58%	31/44 70%	6/6 100%	0/0	**70/107** **65%**
Aunt	14/29 48%	13/19 68%	25/27 93%	24/25 96%	**76/100** **76%**
Accident	17/18 94%	42/64 66%	79/86 92%	38/38 100%	**176/206** **85%**
Classmate	0/0	0/0	63/72 88%	121/129 94%	**184/201** **92%**
Total	**64/104** **62%**	**86/127** **68%**	**173/191** **91%**	**183/192** **95%**	**506/614** **82%**

Table 6
Production (left) compared to judgments (right) by scenario and participant, both ranked as in Table 4. T percentages converted to dominant production forms (V = 0–15%, v? = 16–39%, ?? = 40–60%, t? = 61–84%, T = 85–100%). Judgments notation equivalent to Table 2.

	Murray		Tasha		Rich		Renee		Myra		Helen		Nicole		Robin		Steph		Marie		Rachel		Luke	
Client	**V**	**V**	**V**	v	**V**	**V**	t?	**V**	**V**	**V**	t?	v	**T**	v	**T**	**V**	t?	**V**	??	**V**	**T**	v	**T**	t
Aunt	v?	**V**	**T**	**T**	**T**	t	**T**	**T**	v?	v	t?	**T**	??	**V**	**T**	**T**	t?	**V**	**T**	v	**T**	t	**T**	t
Accident	**T**	**V**	??	v	t?	t	??	v	**T**	**T**	t?	v	**T**	t	t?	t	**T**	**V**	**T**	t	**T**	t	**T**	**T**
Classmate	??	**T**	t?	t	**T**	**T**	t?	t	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	t	**T**	**T**	**T**	t	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**	**T**

Comparing the production in the Tía scenario to judgments about the Aunt scenario, for example, the three participants who chose only-V for Aunt produced 48% T in the Tía role-play, the two participants who chose mostly-V produced 68% T, the three who chose mostly-T produced 93% T, and the four who chose only-T produced 96% T. As a result, participants' T/V production matched (in relative terms) their desired stylistic differentiation. In absolute terms, however, participants' general preference for T in production apparently overwhelmed (or overrode) their metapragmatic judgments. The second column in Table 5 reflects production in the 12 role-plays matching participants' only-V judgments; in actual production, these role-plays featured more than three-fifths T tokens despite participants judging that they would use *no* T in these scenarios. Of course, participants were generally successful in fulfilling only-T judgments, with 95% T tokens in those role-plays.

Table 6 displays the results of each role-play scenario (converted from percentages into dominant forms) alongside their corresponding judgments, with gray cells indicating a mismatch between judgments and production. One noticeable result is the differentiation between scenarios in terms of mismatches; while more than half of the Niñero role-plays failed to match participants' judgments for the corresponding Client scenario, the Classmate scenario produced just one mismatch. It is not a coincidence that the most V-preferring scenario was also the most mismatched, but a further indication of the overwhelming T-preference in production; if participants assumed that they would primarily use T, they were bound to be correct. Interestingly, this result also means that the pragmatic ambiguity of the scenario did not have an effect on mismatches, since in that case we would expect that the scenarios with an unmarked address form would both produce fewer mismatches than the intermediary scenarios.

The results by participant can be interpreted as an indication of each participant's sociolinguistic agency (at least with respect to T/V), as participants who produced more mismatches displaying less agency. Nine participants produced at least one mismatch, with six producing more than one. Steph was the only participant guilty of three mismatches; despite being by far the most V-preferring participant in metapragmatic judgments, she produced 91% T tokens, more than eight participants. On the other hand, Luke both produced no mismatches and had the most T-preferring judgments and production. Like the difference between Babysitter and Classmate, the difference between Steph and Luke was one of expectations, as Steph's mismatches were the result of an apparently unreasonable expectation to use V predominantly (or at all). The examples of Helen and Renee, however, challenge an interpretation of agency as a monotonic march toward T. Neither learner had any mismatches, yet both judged and produced V in at least one scenario. Renee, in particular, produced neither a single T token in Babysitter nor a single V token in Classmate or Accident, despite having very high token counts in the latter two (see Table 4).

8. Discussion

The results reported above reflect several interesting findings about intermediate Spanish learners' judgments about T/V and production of T/V, as well as the implications of T/V for their Spanish identities and sociolinguistic agency. To return to research question 1, intermediate Spanish learners exhibited a very slight overall preference for T in judgments (albeit with variation among learners), with judgments stratified according to scenario. These results represent a stark contrast from previous studies of T/V in L2, which have shown a general overextension of V (Belz and Kinginger, 2002; Dewaele, 2004b; Marín, 1972), in particular in the Classmate scenario, for which even Kinginger and Farrell's (2004) post-study-abroad French learners did not agree on T. There are several possible reasons for this difference—the fact that all lower and intermediate-level courses at this university are taught by graduate students, who tend to be closer to students in age and status (and therefore more accessible) than professors, or the fact that as Californians, these learners have greater opportunity for contact with Spanish-speaking communities—but all are necessarily speculative.[7]

More importantly (to return to research question 1a), an analysis of learners' narrative explanations for their metapragmatic judgments indicated their awareness of the indexical potential of T/V to define and constitute social relationships, as well as their own L2 identities, in discourse. Interestingly, this work of desired identity construction apparently did not rely on participants' awareness of L2 norms. In explaining her only-T Aunt judgment, Tasha wrote, ''I know that the 'norm' in Spanish-speaking cultures is to use [V] for respect purposes, but I would probably only use [T] with my family because I'm personally a very informal person, as is my family.'' Here, Tasha uses her address form choice to indicate who she is as a speaker, despite her naïve understanding of L1 speakers' T/V use. That is, the identity construction that these learners carry out cannot be accounted for by a conception of L2 identity that relies on speakers' non-naïve metapragmatic awareness of L1 norms (which is often assumed to require extensive contact with the L1 culture). Instead, the only necessary condition for the construction of desired L2 identities is what I am calling *indexical awareness*: the learner's knowledge that certain pragmatic (or sociolinguistic) resources reflect on their L2 identities, whether or not they are aware of the precise indexical value that native speakers apply to these resources.

These learners' production told a rather different story than their judgments, however. To return to research question 2, learners broadly generalized T in production, to the extent that it seems valid to call T most learners' default address form. While there was variation in baseline T production across participants, and while the four role-play scenarios were stratified in terms of relative T production, over four-fifths of all address-form tokens were T. In addition, most participants exhibited some degree of address-form mixing in production, failing to clearly signal their choice of one form over the other, sometimes within the same turn. It thus seems reasonable to assume that a lack of control over grammar influenced T/V production, although the exact nature of these grammatical constraints is unknown (see note 6).

This disconnect between judgments and production is important in light of research question 3; learners whose production does not reflect their judgments fail to realize their desired L2 identities. With respect to research question 3a, judgments did predict production in only a relative sense, as participants who gave T judgments for a given scenario produced higher rates of T in that scenario than those participants who gave V judgments. In general, V judgments were not realized in production. In addition, just as there was variation among scenarios and learners with respect to both judgments and production separately, scenarios and learners also varied in matching production and judgments; half of the learners had production–judgments mismatches in two or more scenarios.

It is through comparing production and judgments for individual participants that we can address research question 3b, on the implications of a match or mismatch for learners' Spanish identities. For example, Robin explained that she would use only-V with a client because she ''want[ed] to seem professional,'' while Rich explained that he would use mostly-T with a classmate because he ''wouldn't want to seem subservient to him/her.'' Where these two participants differed is their ability to realize their judgments; Robin produced 11 of 12 T tokens in the Niñero role-play, while Rich produced 29 of 32 T tokens in the Compañero de Clase role-play. Whereas Rich succeeded in fulfilling an L2 identity that put him on an equal footing with a classmate, Robin ended up projecting an L2 identity that was, in her mind, unprofessional. In other words, both Robin and Rich had L2 indexical awareness with respect to T/V, and both constructed their desired L2 identities on this awareness; what separated these two learners (at least within these particular scenarios) is the sociolinguistic agency to translate their desired L2 identities into production.

[7] Kinginger and Farrell's (2004) participant Brianna represents an interesting contrast in this respect with Stella, the participant in this study whose results are otherwise excluded due to low proficiency. Whereas Brianna felt it would be ''safer'' to use V so as to not ''do something highly offensive and call someone [T] that you shouldn't'' (30), Stella explained her mostly-T Bank Teller judgment as ''I would probably use [T] [because] in class over the years I haven't been trained much on when to use [V]. Only that it is for people to show respect like teachers, parents, etc.'' That is, Brianna and Stella have different ideas about what the 'default' address form should be. It should be noted, however, that the other participants in the present study apparently do not quite share Stella's view of V as an infrequent choice that should be invoked only when respect enters the equation; otherwise, we would expect an overextension of T in metapragmatic judgments instead of a relatively balanced set of choices.

The two dimensions of indexical awareness and agency allow us to assess both the extent and the success of learners' L2 identity development. Murray, for example, had a fairly developed notion of his desired Spanish identities: someone who is generally polite and deferential, but also goes out of his way to demonstrate solidarity with those in the service industry. Murray's production, however, did not always reflect these identities, with mismatches between judgments and production in two scenarios. Renee, on the other hand, realized all of her judgments (including two V judgments) in production. She was even cognizant of the limitations on her grammatical control, explaining that she would address her aunt with mostly-V ''because she is my aunt and I should show respect by using [V] but *I might sometimes forget* and use [T] because I am familiar with her'' (emphasis added); indeed, she produced three of nine T tokens in the Tía role-play, two in embedded clauses and one in a routinized expression. Despite her awareness of grammatical constraints, however, all of her explanations were predicated on a BG-like understanding of T/V (as in her Aunt explanation, above). That is, whereas Murray exhibited the indexical awareness necessary to construct desired L2 identities, he lacked the agency to fulfill them in production. Whereas Renee possessed the agency to fulfill her metapragmatic judgments, she lacked (or at the very least, did not evidence) the indexical awareness to construct desired L2 identities in the first place. It may be an overreach to say that agency and indexical awareness are completely independent factors in L2 identity development, but it does not appear that one necessarily follows the other.

9. Conclusion

This study suggests several important conclusions and directions for further research. First, this study supports the finding of van Compernolle and Williams (2012) that intermediate, pre-study-abroad learners are capable of developing notions of their desired L2 identities (and often do). From a methodological standpoint, this means that it is possible to study the L2 identities of intermediate and/or pre-study-abroad learners. More importantly, this study has shown that the necessary condition for L2 identity construction is not the sort of specific metapragmatic awareness gained in a study abroad context, but instead a more basic indexical awareness; learners need not know the exact details of *how* native speakers utilize given pragmatic resources for identity-work, but simply that these resources *can* be utilized for identity-work. As a result, I suggest that future research on L2 pragmatics and L2 identity should move beyond a focus only on L2 pragmatic competence, a concept that assumes the adequacy of native-speaker norms as an end-state, and should instead focus on the complexity of both internal and external L2 identity processes.

Second, the fact that learners at this level are capable of developing desired L2 identities does not necessarily mean that learners have the control of L2 to realize these identities in production—nor, for that matter, do ambiguous or ill-formed identities necessarily invalidate a learner's process of constructing their desired L2 identities. Instead, learners vary along lines of agency, the ability to use L2 pragmatic (and sociolinguistic) resources to achieve the goal of L2 identities that align with their own conceptions of self. And while the results discussed here suggest that grammatical competence may be the major determining factor of agency, the exact nature of grammatical (or other) constraints on learners' agency remains unknown and should thus be a fruitful area of further study.

Third, while learners' ability to construct and fulfill L2 identities is important, the nature of these resultant identities is by no means a trivial matter. The overwhelming preference for T in production (and very slight preference for T in judgments) among the learners whose results are reported here represents a major departure from previous studies of T/V in L2. While the results reported here certainly do not by themselves falsify the general principle that learners overextend formal variants (Howard et al., 2013), they do suggest that different groups may deviate from this principle. A replication of this study among learners of other T/V languages could reveal variation among communities of learners. In addition, attention to the contexts (both classroom and non-classroom) in which indexical and metapragmatic awareness are developed could shed light on the roots of this variation.

In general, the major limitation of this study is that it is limited to a single point on each learner's developmental timeline. If we assume (as I do) that L2 identities are not states but processes, then it is insufficient to study general patterns of L2 identity development by attempting to deduce trajectories from single points. This gap is especially clear in light of this study's suggestion that indexical awareness and agency are subject to nonparallel development over time. Future research should thus take on longitudinal studies in order to deepen our understanding of the developmental processes governing L2 identity, indexical awareness, and agency. Whatever the eventual direction(s) of future research, it is clear that L2 identity is too complex a phenomenon to adequately study with just one method at a time; we can gain fascinating insights into who learners become in L2 and how they become it by connecting production to judgments.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Bob Bayley and Vai Ramanathan for their guidance, to David Beard and Tania Lizarazo for their tireless effort in carrying out this project, to Adam van Compernolle for his incisive and nuanced critique of the original version of

this manuscript, to the graduate students of the UCD Spanish Department for their help in recruiting, and to my participants themselves.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.005.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen, Dörnyei, Zoltán, 1998. Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. TESOL Quarterly 32 (2), 233–262.

Barras, Claude, 2002. Transcriber: A tool for segmenting, labeling and transcribing speech (Version 1.5.1) [freeware transcription program] Available from: http://trans.sourceforge.net/en/presentation.php (accessed 20.05.13).

Belz, Julie A., Kinginger, Celeste, 2002. The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: two case studies. Canadian Modern Language Review (La revue canadienne des langues vivantes).59 (2), 189–214.

Belz, Julie A., Kinginger, Celeste, 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.

Brown, Roger, Gilman, Albert, 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: Paulston, C.B., Tucker, G.R. (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings. Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 156–176.

Bucholtz, Mary, Hall, Kira, 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Studies 7 (4–5), 585–614.

Cameron, Richard, 1996. A community-based test of a linguistic hypothesis. Language in Society 25 (1), 61–111.

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

Dewaele, Jean-Marc, 2004a. The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in French as a foreign language: an overview. Journal of French Language Studies 14 (3), 301–319.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc, 2004b. Vous or tu? Native and non-native speakers of French on a sociolinguistic tightrope. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 42 (4), 383–402.

Gee, James Paul, 2001. Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. Review of Research in Education 25 (1), 99–125.

Howard, Martin, Mougeon, Raymond, Dewaele, Jean-Marc, 2013. Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. In: Bayley, R., Cameron, R., Lucas, C. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 340–359.

Iwasaki, Noriko, 2010. Style shifts among Japanese learners before and after study abroad in Japan: becoming active social agents in Japanese. Applied Linguistics 31 (1), 45–71.

Johnson, Daniel Ezra, 2012. Rbrul (Version 2.05) [variable-rule analysis utility]Available from: http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/rbrul.html (accessed 20.05.13).

Kasper, Gabriele, 1992. Pragmatic transfer. Second Language Research 8 (3), 203–231.

Kasper, Gabriele, Schmidt, Richard, 1996. Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18 (2), 149–169.

Kinginger, Celeste, 2000. Learning the pragmatics of solidarity in the networked foreign language classroom. In: Hall, J.K., Verplaetse, L.S. (Eds.), Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 23–46.

Kinginger, Celeste, 2004. Alice doesn't live here anymore: foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In: Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A. (Eds.), Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 219–242.

Kinginger, Celeste, Farrell, Kathleen, 2004. Assessing development of meta-pragmatic awareness in study abroad. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad 10, 19–42.

Koike, Dale April, 1989. Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: speech acts in interlanguage. The Modern Language Journal 73 (3), 279–289.

Labov, William, 1972. Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Marín, Diego, 1972. El uso de ''tú'' y ''usted'' en el español actual. Hispania 55 (4), 904–908.

Morford, Janet, 1997. Social indexicality in French pronominal address. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 7, 3–37.

Norton Peirce, Bonny, 1995. Social identity, investment, and language learning. TESOL Quarterly 29 (1), 9–31.

Pearson, Lynn, 2006. Patterns of development in Spanish L2 pragmatic acquisition: an analysis of novice learners' production of directives. The Modern Language Journal 90 (4), 473–495.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., Ochs, Elinor, 1986. Language socialization. Annual Review of Anthropology 15, 163–191.

Silverstein, Michael, 1992. The uses and utility of ideology: some reflections. Pragmatics 2 (3), 311–323.

Silverstein, Michael, 2001. The limits of awareness. In: Duranti, A. (Ed.), Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader. Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 382–401.

Solé, Yolanda R., 1978. Sociocultural determinants of symmetrical and asymmetrical address forms in Spanish. Hispania 61 (4), 940–949.

Takahashi, Tomoko, Beebe, Leslie M., 1993. Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In: Kasper, G., Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.), Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 138–157.

van Compernolle, Rémi A., Williams, Lawrence, 2012. Reconceptualizing sociolinguistic competence as mediated action: identity, meaning-making, agency. Modern Language Journal 96 (2), 234–250.

van Compernolle, Rémi A., Williams, Lawrence, McCourt, Claire, 2011. A corpus-driven study of second-person pronoun variation in L2 French synchronous computer-mediated communication. Intercultural Pragmatics 8 (1), 26–50.