Verbally incomplete *parce que* ('because') clauses: a longitudinal and multimodal study of second language French

Melissa JUILLET
Université de Neuchâtel, Chaire de linguistique appliquée
Rue de la Pierre-à-Mazel 7, 2000 Neuchâtel, Suisse
melissa.juillet@unine.ch
ORCID: 0009-0004-7047-8189

Cette recherche se focalise sur l'utilisation du connecteur *parce que* en interaction en français langue seconde (L2), plus précisément lorsqu'il est utilisé en tant que dernier élément verbal du tour. Cet article présente une étude longitudinale de ce phénomène, en se focalisant sur l'utilisation qu'en fait Aurelia, une locutrice de L2, sur une période s'étendant sur 11 mois. Une première section est consacrée aux usages précoces, dans lesquels *parce que* apparait au sein du package *parce que* + complétion multimodale, et projette un élément facilement inférable par le contexte et, en plus, complété avec des gestes et des vocalisations dépeignant cet élément. Nous verrons ensuite en quoi les cas plus tardifs, ne contenant aucune complétion mimo-gestuelle, diffèrent des premiers cas. Les analyses se focaliseront également sur la manière dont une coparticipante, Mia, traite et répond à ces énoncés verbalement incomplets au fil du temps. Ces résultats contribuent à la recherche actuelle sur la place de la grammaire dans le développement de la compétence d'interaction en L2, et montrent le rôle de la multimodalité et de la socialisation dans la compréhension mutuelle des participant-e-s.

Mots-clés:
analyse conversationnelle, acquisition d'une langue seconde, *parce que*, multimodalité, compétence d'interaction, tours verbalement incomplets, complétion multimodale, socialisation.

Keywords:
conversation analysis, second language acquisition, *parce que* ('because'), multimodality, interactional competence, verbally incomplete utterances, embodied completion, socialisation.

1. Introduction

This study is dedicated to *parce que* ('because') and its use in second language (L2) French interaction. *Parce que* has been shown to work as a causal connector in written French and as discourse marker in spoken French, but its role as an action projector and the study of its multimodal ecology remains largely unexplored.

The present study aims to investigate what *parce que* projects in talk, and how it is intertwined with embodied resources. The analysis will focus on a collection of cases where *parce que* is the last verbal element of the turn. Longitudinal analyses will illustrate how, at a beginner level, the speaker uses the package *parce que* + embodied completion to produce a high-grade negative assessment, and then *parce que* + silence, at a more advanced level, to refer to implicit and shared knowledge.

In the illustrative example below, the target speaker Aurelia initiates a *parce que* clause and then completes it in an embodied way. She sticks her tongue out while producing a vocalization to depict the action of vomiting. Thereby producing a high-grade negative assessment (Antaki et al. 2000) about a food she did not like.

Illustrative excerpt_chocolat_2017-03-27

```
AUR: parce Oque (.)O #*hhr°(a)°*
     because           ((mimics vomiting))
aur          Oshaken headO
aur                     *sticks her tongue out*
                     #fig.1
```


Figure 1

In this study, I analyse *parce que* within its multimodal ecology, which is innovative for French, thereby contributing to a better understanding of its use in L2 interaction. The aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, it seeks to contribute to a better understanding of the use of *parce que* in French L2 interaction, specifically focusing on *parce que* in an under-explored sequential context, namely as the last verbal element of a verbally incomplete clause. We will see that this use plays an important role in the management of intersubjectivity, that is in how participants maintain mutual understanding in interaction (Schegloff 1992). On the other hand, the paper aims to propose further evidence for the development of an 'L2 grammar-for-interaction' (Pekarek Doehler 2018), by demonstrating how a linguistic resource comes to perform new actions over time.

In what follows, I will first review some central concepts in the existing literature on *parce que*, the grammar and body interface, and verbally incomplete turns (Section 2). In Section 3, I will present the data and the methodology. I will then analyse four excerpts illustrating a longitudinal change (Section 4). I will then return to the general and quantitative results and discuss them in the final part (Section 5).

2. Background

2.1 Parce que *('because')*

Parce que has been widely investigated since a pioneering study by the Lambda Group (Groupe Lambda-l 1975), mainly in its written form (Ferrari 1992; Moeschler 2009). These studies have prominently shown how *parce que* works as a subordinating conjunction (i.e., when it creates a causal relation between two clauses).

However, studies focusing on spoken French and interaction have shown that *parce que* does not just work as a subordinating conjunction, but also as a discourse marker creating paratactic links between turns, working on a pragmatic level, and often providing the reason for an enunciation (Moeschler 1987; Debaisieux 1994, 2004; Simon & Degand 2007; Zufferey 2012). These studies have demonstrated that *parce que* can be used in many turn positions and accomplish various social actions. Research outside of French has also been interested in the interactional use of causal connectors, with studies in English (Schiffrin 1987; Schleppegrel 1991; Ford 1994; Ford & Mori 1994; Couper-Kuhlen 1996, 2004), Mandarin (Li 2016) and Hebrew (Inbar & Maschler 2023). *Parce que* and its equivalents in other languages have been shown to play a role in turn-transition (Schleppegrel 1991; Couper-Kuhlen 2011; Pekarek Doehler 2018), to allow speakers to elaborate on a preceding turn (Schleppegrel 1991; Couper-Kuhlen 2012), to deal with dispreferred, disaffiliative responses (Ford 1994; Couper-Kuhlen 2011) or to demonstrate the speakers' understanding of the interlocutors' stance (Couper-Kuhlen 2011).

Two main papers have already considered *parce que* in L2 interactions. The most important research on *parce que* in L2 has been carried out by Hancock (1997), who compared the use of *parce que* between L1 and L2 speakers. She notably showed an overuse of *parce que* by L2 speakers, mainly in turn-initial position to manage turn-taking (Hancock 1997: 19). The paper highlights interesting features of *parce que* in L2 interactions but relies on audio data and does not thus take embodiment into account. In the unique study about the development of *parce que* in L2 French, Pekarek Doehler (2018) showed how an au-pair sojourning in the French-speaking part of Switzerland increasingly uses *parce que* in turn-initial position over time, evidencing a development from the canonical use of *parce que* as a causal connector towards uses in turn-initial position "as a means for organizing social interaction" (Pekarek Doehler 2018: 13). Although both studies highlight the interactional functions of *parce que,* they do not account for the multimodal environment of production.

Research has already shown how *parce que* is mobilized interactionally, creating logical and pragmatical relations *in situ*. The present study contributes to a better understanding of *parce que*, by showing its important use as an action projector. *Parce que* has been identified as having the potential to introduce embodied behaviour such as laughter, thus leaving the rest of the utterance implicit (Hancock 1997). Conjunctions have also been compared to deictic items that "collaborate with the body to produce meaningful precision-timed action" (Keevallik 2017: 69). Indeed, studying *parce que* as the last verbal element of a turn, that is, in verbally incomplete turns, will demonstrate that projecting an action through grammar and embodiment is interactionally relevant.

2.2 The grammar body interface of verbally incomplete turns

A steadily growing body of conversation analytic research on second language acquisition (in short: CA-SLA) (Kasper & Wagner 2011) investigates L2 speakers' development of interactional competence. While many studies focus on the longitudinal development of speakers' 'methods' (i.e., systematic procedures; Garfinkel 1967) for performing actions in interaction, the present research aligns with a more recent strand in CA-SLA focusing on the development of specific linguistic resources in interaction as part of L2 speakers' interactional competence. Indeed, this study explores the developmental use of *parce que* in L2 interaction, in the specific context of verbally incomplete turns.

While exploring the interactional use of linguistic patterns, it is also fundamental to consider how they are deployed multimodally. Increasingly, research is treating linguistic and embodied resources as equal in interaction (Goodwin 1979; Hayashi 2005; Keevallik 2013, 2018; Mondada 2014; see the papers in Pekarek Doehler et al. 2022). People deploy their whole body as much as their linguistic repertoire in interaction as resources to perform coherent social actions (Goodwin 2000). Keevallik (2018) argues that exploring the use of grammar within interaction and in its multimodal ecology can reveal how speakers shape their turns and constantly adapt them to perform actions in a coordinated way. She concludes that "grammar and lexis only make sense in local multimodal ecologies; grammar emerges incrementally and responsively to interactional contingencies, among them embodied ones" (Keevallik 2018: 17). Thus, mutual understanding is constantly managed through the interplay between language and the body. Speakers also deploy their linguistic and multimodal resources together, in the form of a "multimodal package" (Hayashi 2005), a "multimodal assembly" (Pekarek Doehler et al. 2021) or "complex multimodal gestalt" (Mondada 2014).

This connivance between linguistic and embodied resources is particularly salient in the context of verbally incomplete turns. Chevalier (2008) argued that "syntactic items that are *missing* are often not only guessable, they can regularly be *obvious*" and that "neither repair nor misunderstanding tend to ensue" (Chevalier 2008: 6, original emphasis). Incomplete turns are thus highly inferable from the context of production. Research on conversational data has examined this phenomenon in different settings. In classroom interaction, for instance, "designedly incomplete utterances" are used by teachers for didactic purposes (Koshik 2002; Hazel & Mortensen 2019; Wang, this issue). In everyday conversation, incomplete utterances occur in delicate and/or dispreferred contexts (Chevalier 2009), where such utterances are related to facework. This is also the case in the context of negative assessments and complaint sequences (Skogmyr Marian 2021) or critical assessments (Park & Kline 2020).

Studies on embodied completion have shown how gestures contribute to action ascription and allow speakers to reach a "joint good enough understanding" (Levinson 2012: 104). Furthermore, it has been shown that gestures at the end of a turn contribute to action recognition and projection of the next action (see for example how gaze in turn-final position recruits the interlocutor in Stoenica & Fiedler 2021).

The present paper will focus on two different cases of verbally incomplete turns, that is, when followed by an embodied completion or by silence. The analyses presented below investigate the role of *parce que* as the last verbal element of the turn in terms of projection, and how what follows is understood as intertwined with the prior clause. In other words, analyses will show how speakers make sense of *parce que* + embodied completion (excerpts 1 and 2) or *parce que* + silence (excerpt 3 and 4), within the context of production.

3. Data & methodology

This study draws on longitudinal conversation analysis (Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler 2021) to identify and track interactional functions of *parce que* over time. The data was collected between 2016 and 2018 (Skogmyr Marian 2022) and consists of 80 hours of video-recorded interactions of small groups (2-5 participants per group) of L2 French speakers participating in a conversation circle in the French-speaking part of Switzerland. Participants were invited to take part twice a month during the university semester. The conversation circle was designed to provide participants with the opportunity to practice their L2. Learners were initially grouped according to their estimated proficiency level, although they progressed at different rates, and they demonstrated different levels of (interactional) competence by the end of the programme. Participants took part in the conversation circle for a duration ranging between 3 and 18 months; most participants took part for 9 months, allowing for longitudinal analyses.

In this study, I document the developmental trajectory of Aurelia. She started the conversation circle at a beginner level[1] and participated in the conversation circle 18 times over 15 months. Her use of verbally incomplete *parce que* clauses was first noticed through unmotivated looking (Sacks 1984). All occurrences of the target phenomenon were then brought together in a collection (Schegloff 1996) of 19 cases over 11 months. Four excerpts, including the first and last ones recorded, will be analysed in this study and presented chronologically (excerpt 1 during month 1, excerpt 2 during month 3 and excerpts 3 and 4 during month 11). All four excerpts include the same co-participant, Mia, in order to ensure maximal longitudinal comparability between the excerpts (see Wagner et al. 2018 and Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler

---

[1]   https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/sanction

2021, on the challenge of warranting comparability in longitudinal CA). Excerpt 1, 3 and 4 are dyadic conversations between Aurelia and Mia, and excerpt 2 includes three other participants. Analyses were conducted using sequential and multimodal analyses to capture the whole ecology in which the pattern was produced. Verbal transcripts follow the conventions by Jefferson (2004) and the transcription of embodied conduct follows the conventions by Mondada (2018).

4. Analysis

Aurelia mobilizes verbally incomplete *parce que* clauses from the very first recording. In addition to decreasing in frequency[2], as shown in Table 1, the functions performed by the pattern change over the course of time.

Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3
9	8	2

Table 1: Aurelia's use of verbally incomplete parce que clauses over the three semesters

During the first semester, *parce que* strongly projects an *obvious* lexical item, which can be inferred from the context, and which is then enacted through bodily conduct by Aurelia (see excerpts 1-2). These turns often elicit an affiliative response from coparticipants, and in some cases – as in the first excerpt – the coparticipant verbally completes the element projected by *parce que* and expressed by the embodied conduct.

The first occurrence of *parce que* as the last verbal element of the turn is taken from the first encounter and interaction in the conversation circle between Aurelia and Mia. Mia is also at a beginner level at the beginning of the recordings (A2 according to the CEFR). The last case is taken from the last recorded interaction between Aurelia and Mia, 11 months later. While some of the observed change can be addressed in terms of development of Aurelia's interactional competence, it is also important to look at the differences between the first and last excerpts in terms of a development tied to the larger process of socialization (Berger & Pekarek Doehler 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Skogmyr Marian, in prep.). We know from what speakers say in the data that they became friends and were meeting each other outside of the conversation circle. The way Aurelia uses incomplete turns and the way Mia understands them evolve over the course of their interactions; to put it another way, the "recipient design of turns is informed by prior knowledge about and shared experience with recipients" (Deppermann 2015: 1).

---

[2]   On the contrary, Aurelia's general use of *parce que* increases over time (0.5 occurrences/minute in semester 1 vs 1.25 occurrences/minute in semester 3).

4.1 Early uses: parce que + embodied completion
4.1.1. Month 1

As previously mentioned, this excerpt takes place during the very first encounter between Aurelia and Mia. While they are talking, chocolates are placed on the table by the researcher (who is doing the recordings) for them to eat. Aurelia and Mia have already eaten one. When the excerpt begins, Aurelia takes another chocolate, asking Mia if it is also 'white chocolate' (l.01), to which Mia responds 'no' in line 04.

Excerpt 1_chocolat_2017-03-27

```
01 AUR: ça chocolat blanc (.) aussi?
        that white chocolate  too

02 MIA: &mh-mh.&
   mia  &shakes head 'no'&

03 AUR: non?=
        no

04 MIA: =°nan.°
         no

05      (2.0)

06 AUR: parce ✪que (.)✪ #*hhr°(a)°*
        because            ((mimics vomiting))
   aur        ✪shakes head✪
   aur                  *sticks her tongue out*
               #fig.1

07 AUR: [£hhh. hh.£ ]

08 MIA: [c'était pas] bon,
        it wasn't good

09      (1.0)

10 AUR: ↑oui ↑oui mai:s,
        yes yes  but

11 MIA: £oui oui mais,£
        yes yes but

12 AUR: je préfère eh chocolat (.) normal.
        I prefer      normal chocolate
```

Figure 1

After a long pause in line 05, Aurelia initiates a new turn using *parce que* (l.06), which is also the last verbal element of the turn[3]. *Parce que* has been described as being used by speakers to manage turn-taking (Hancock 1997), and also to initiate an account for a prior action accomplished by the speaker (Couper-Kuhlen 2011). In this case, Aurelia is providing an account for her previous action: the question in line 01 about the type of chocolate.

---

[3]   The turn-position is not relevant for the collection, what matters is that no verbal completion
        follows *parce que*.

Here, however, the *parce que* clause is verbally incomplete and the account for the preceding question is displayed in an embodied way. Aurelia slightly shakes her head during the small gap following *parce que* in line 06; She then sticks out her tongue while producing a vocalization *hhr (a)*. She subsequently retracts her tongue while laughing softly (l.07). The combination of vocalization and embodied conduct depicts the action of vomiting, allowing Aurelia to produce a high-grade negative assessment (Antaki et al. 2000) about the chocolate. Interestingly, Mia offers an appropriate verbal completion with *c'était pas bon* ('it wasn't good') in line 08, which is confirmed by Aurelia (l.10), and at the same time, she claims her understanding of the meaning conveyed by Aurelia's locally relevant embodied completion (Mori & Hayashi 2006). Here, Aurelia uses the multimodal packages *parce que* + embodied completion to provide a negative assessment.

It is not possible to determine whether Aurelia uses an embodied completion to compensate for a word or expression that is not in her linguistic repertoire at that moment, but what we can observe is that *parce que* allows her to project an account that is relevant in that sequential position. By completing her clause in an embodied way, she produces a high-grade negative assessment, which can be a resource to elicit affiliation. Note that in this case, Aurelia laughs softly on her own (l.07), while Mia does not share this laughter. Indeed, the next relevant and preferred action after an assessment is an affiliation, or an upgraded assessment (Pomerantz 1984); yet here Mia merely provides a candidate completion, as in a word-search context. Mia's turn in line 08 displays an understanding that treats Aurelia's assessment as a word search. Conversely, Aurelia does not deploy any behaviour usually associated with a word search and a request for help, such as syllable lengthening, repetitions, filled pauses, etc. (Schegloff et al. 1977).

It is also interesting to note Aurelia's responsive turn in line 10. After a pause, she produces a very high-pitched confirmation *oui oui* ('yes yes') followed by *mai:s* ('but'). In line 12, Aurelia admits that she prefers 'normal' chocolate. It is a delicate matter to explicitly criticize something (Park & Kline 2020), and moreover, with someone you do not know very well. In addition, the chocolates that Aurelia is criticizing were offered by the researcher making the recordings. Aurelia first manages the issue of criticizing by completing her assessment multimodally (Chevalier 2008, 2009) but Mia's turn in line 08 creates another sequential occasion to verbally address the criticism. Here, Aurelia's response *oui oui mais* ('yes yes but') first project agreement with Mia's question with *oui oui* ('yes yes'), and then the *mais* ('but') projects a dispreferred response (Pomerantz 1984; Steensig & Asmuß 2005). Aurelia then downgrades her assessment when she has to verbalise it, going from an embodied completion meaning 'it makes me vomit' (l.06) to the verbalisation of 'yes it was good, but I prefer normal chocolate' (ll. 10 and 12).

4.1.2. Month 3

Before this second excerpt, the group has been discussing the topic of thrill-seeking activities for some minutes. Just before the excerpt begins, Aurelia said that she will never bungee jump because she is too scared of hurting herself. Again, in this excerpt, *parce que* is not followed by verbal completion (l.10).

Excerpt 2_vomis_2017-05-08

```
01 AUR: je peux seulement penser à:: ♥(.) une rock,=
        I   can   only       think of      a rock
   aur                                  ♥joins hand to depict a round shape-->

02      =♥et me: mon t:ê♥te TAh=♥
         and me: my head
   aur-->♥RH on templeLH on table♥smashes RH hand on LH♥

03 NAT: =ouais y┌ea:h ┌ouais y┌ea:h,   ┐
         yeah  yeah    yeah  yeah

04 AUR:         └comme ça ouais.┘
                like that yeah

05      non je- non mais (.) >je suis comme ça<=
        no  I   no  but       I   am   like that

06 NAT: =ou: ou- ou-
         or

07 AUR: je pense à des choses comme ça,
        I   think about things  like that

08      o: si ♥#je vomis,
        or if    I throw up
   aur  ......♥left hand under her chin-->
             #fig. 2

09 NAT: £YEAH §AH ┌AH HAH hah§ h hh hh hh£
   nat      §points AUR----->§puts right hand on her mouth and laughs-->

10 AUR:           └et je meurs de vomis parce que #*rgh rhg rhgk♥*
                   and I die of vomit because
   aur

11 NAT: hah hah ┌hu┐ huh§ ┌huh hh. Hh.┐
   nat        -->§

12 MIA:         └Øhh.┘
   mia         Øputs left hand on her mouth, laughs silently-->

13 AUR:               └£non non£  ┘
                       no  no
```

Figure 2

Figure 3

In this excerpt, Aurelia develops two potential scenarios to explain why she does not want to bungee jump. In lines 01-03, she produces a first incomplete clause (without *parce que*), which she completes with a gesture by slapping her right hand hard on her left arm, to depict her 'head' (l.02) smashing on a *rock* (l.01).

In line 08, Aurelia initiates another imaginary scenario with *o: si* ('or if'), placing her hand under her chin as she produces *je vomis* ('I throw up'). She is also gazing at her coparticipant Natascha the whole time (as in Figure 2). Overlapping Natascha's loud laughter, she ends this second scenario with an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz 1986) about dying from vomiting, as a way of legitimizing her claim. She immediately gives an account of this formulation with *parce que*. As in excerpt 1, *parce que* is not followed by any verbal completion but by some vocalizations and an embodied conduct depicting the action of choking and/or vomiting.

The reactions of the co-participants are highly affiliative: Natascha laughs loudly from line 09 onwards and continues to laugh after Aurelia's vocalizations (l.11); Mia laughs silently while putting her hand over her mouth, interestingly mirroring

Natascha's posture between lines 09-11. Here, embodied completion is not treated by co-participants as a problem or as a potential demand for a linguistic element; instead, it is treated as a strong (and amusing) negative evaluation through Aurelia's "extreme case expression" (Skogmyr Marian 2021), which makes affiliation the next relevant action.

Although it does not contain *parce que*, the first incomplete utterance in lines 01-02 is also a representative example of the interactional context in which Aurelia mobilizes incomplete clauses with multimodal completion, namely complaints. This refers back to Skogmyr Marian's (2021) observations on the same corpus: incomplete utterances serve to deliver high-grade assessments, through extreme case expressions and/or formulations (Pomerantz 1986).

4.1.3. Summary

By producing the completion through bodily conduct, Aurelia produces what Skogmyr Marian (2021) has called "'extreme-case expressions' that convey negative stance in a high-grade manner" (Skogmyr Marian 2021: 1). Chevalier (2008) also shows that non-linguistic items, such as vocalizations, gestures, and facial expressions can be mobilized for interactional purposes.

At a beginner level, Aurelia uses the package *parce que* + embodied completions to provide high-grade negative assessments. One possible interpretation could be that, as a beginner speaker, Aurelia is lacking linguistic resources to produce negative assessments in a high-grade manner. Moreover, in excerpt 1, it allows her to formulate a criticism without having to formally verbalise it. In excerpt 2, it allows to pursue affiliation.

In excerpt 1, we saw Mia's first encounter with one incomplete utterance produced by Aurelia. In this excerpt, Mia offers an appropriate verbal completion; she is thus orienting toward the 'completeness' of the turn, even if it is already recognizable and understandable. In excerpt 2, Mia laughs, showing that she understands that Aurelia's turn is 'laughable' and that there is no need to finish it.

4.2 Later uses: parce que *+ silence*

4.2.1. Month 11

The last two excerpts take place during the last recorded conversation between Aurelia and Mia, 11 months after they first met and had their first recorded conversation, and exemplify another multimodal package, that is, *parce que* + silence. By then, Aurelia and Mia have interacted together 12 times in the conversation circle and, as mentioned earlier, they have also been meeting outside the conversation circle.

In excerpt 3, Aurelia and Mia are talking about Aurelia's recent breakup with her boyfriend. In line 01, Mia is asking who decided to end the relationship.

Excerpt 3_longue histoire_2018-02-26

```
01 MIA: =mais tu as eh: arrêté °ou: lui?°
             but  you did   end.   or  him

02 AUR: (1.8) moi.=
              me

03 MIA: &=°oké°
           okay
    mia     &nods-->

04       (1.1)&
    mia      -->&

05 AUR: parce que::,
        because

06       (1.0)
07       &ouais.&
          yeah
    mia  &nods--&

08       (0.6)
09       tsk oh c'est une longue histoire=
             oh it is  a   long   story

10 MIA: =>&mhm mhm<
    mia  &nods-->
```

Aurelia answers that she decided to stop the relationship in line 02, after a long pause. Mia ratifies that response quickly, which could end this sequence. But after another pause, Aurelia comes back with a new turn in line 05 to provide an account initiated by *parce que* but followed by silence. In line 05, Aurelia orients to the need of an account of her turn in line 02. However, she produces this *parce que* with lengthening and no verbal completion. In other words, she does not provide a verbal account for why she broke up with her boyfriend. This stresses the fact that an account could be expected, even relevant. Indirectly, it also highlights the fact that there are some reasons why she broke up, even if she does not verbalise them. But after one second, she then closes that initiation of an account with *ouais* ('yeah') with a falling intonation. Her next turn in line 09 accounts for why she is not providing any verbal account in line 05. The topics that Aurelia and Mia share now are also more personal. Here, Aurelia's incomplete turn in line 05 orients to the fact that Mia, who knows about Aurelia's relationship, could expect an account, and at the same time toward the fact that these reasons do not need to be verbalised. Mia does not orient toward the completeness of the turn; she nods at a TRP in line 03 and 10, but also in line 07, already recognizing Aurelia's preceding turn as pragmatically complete.

4.2.2. Month 11

This excerpt was taken from the same conversation, and Aurelia and Mia are now talking about what they did last weekend. Aurelia has just introduced that one of her friends hurt her and that she did not want to spend time with her in the same bar, and hence went to another bar, *au cerf* (l.01). The excerpt begins with Mia asking what this friend did (l.02), in overlap with Aurelia.

Excerpt 4_porte_2018-02-26

```
01 AUR: je [suis allée au cerf,        ]
              went       to ((bar name))
02 MIA:    [qu'est ce qu'elle a fait?] (°autant°)
            what did she do              (as much)
03 AUR: (0.7) hh. c'est compli*↑qué (.)
              it is complicated
04 AUR: je ∞sais pas ∞si je veux# ♲dire♲ maintenant,=
                                          ♲
                                         #fig. 4
05 AUR: =mai:s# (.) tss.
          but
              #fig. 5
06 MIA: ah oké.
        oh okay
07 AUR: #je vais juste fermer la porte parce que:. (2.0) ∞♲(0.7)♲
         I am just going to close the door because
              #fig. 6
08      ∞(1.9)
        aur walks toward her chair
09 AUR: donc oui je suis allée au ce:rf¿
        so  yes I went       to ((bar name))
10 MIA: &hm-mh&
        mia starts back
```

Figure 4   Figure 5   Figure 6

Aurelia's reaction in line 03 projects a dispreferred response, with its delayed start (see the pause at line 03) and her big inbreath, the assessment *c'est compliqué* ('it is complicated'), and then the way she mitigates her refusal to answer with *je sais pas si* ('I don't know if'). She is also pointing at the camera as a potential account for not wanting to say something personal while being recorded (Figure 4). Interestingly, Aurelia is simultaneously getting up and heading towards the door of the room while producing this refusal to elaborate. In line 07, she begins a side sequence in which she explains why she is standing up and walking away from Mia. Mia is no longer in her visual space; therefore, Aurelia cannot use her gaze to ensure mutual understanding of what is happening.

While walking away, Aurelia again produces the package *parce que* + silence, but without mutual gaze and without embodied completion other than continuing to walk away and closing the door as commented verbally. This excerpt strongly differs from the first ones: in addition to having no embodied completion, it is also the only one where *parce que* is produced with a falling intonation. The turn in line 07 is highly implicit and the last verbal element is *parce que*. It projects a recognizable reason, which does not need to be verbalised. It also highlights the fact that there is some reason for her to close the door. Mia and Aurelia probably share epistemic access to the reasons why it is necessary to close the door; in similar situations, Aurelia usually verbally mentions that it is too noisy (excerpt 5) or too cold (excerpt 6).

Excerpt 5_là-bas_2017-10-02

```
AUR:  je vais fermer là-bas parce que
      I am going to close there because
NAT:  =oui oui=
      yes yes
AUR:  =il y a beaucoup de bruits aujourd'hui
      there is a lot of noises today
```

Excerpt 6_ici_2017-11-13

```
AUR:  je vais fermer ici parce que (xxx),
      I'm going to close here because
      (14.0)
AUR:  ça va avec le froid?
      are you alright with the cold?
```

In other words, the meaning of the *parce que* turn is highly inferable from the context, and Aurelia frees herself of the constraint to complete (Chevalier 2008). Both Aurelia and Mia have become used to the use of this pattern, constructing and recognizing its meaning *in situ*. A common ground has been established over time, impacting the way speakers perform and understand their practices in a recipient-designed way (Deppermann 2015). Mia does not treat Aurelia's verbally incomplete turn as problematic, as she stays seated and gazes at Aurelia's empty chair (Figure 6). She does not turn back to look at Aurelia. In line 09, Aurelia uses the resumption marker *donc* ('so') and recycles her preceding turn in line 01 as backlinking device (Sacks 1992; Schegloff 1996), orienting to progressivity in her discourse. It is only at this point that Mia turns back to look at Aurelia while producing a continuer (l.10).

4.2.3. Summary

The package *parce que* + silence discussed in excerpts 3 and 4 strongly differs from the package *parce que* + embodied completion discussed earlier. Here, *parce que* still projects identifiable items – or actions – but Aurelia does not complete these in an embodied way, which does not provoke any problem in topic progressivity. This package performs a new type of interactional action,

that is, referring to the experience or knowledge shared between the interlocutors.

Incomplete *parce que* clauses have been shown to deal with references to private topics (excerpt 3) and interactional history and shared knowledge and habits (excerpt 4). Aurelia and Mia were able to manage an incomplete turn without conversational trouble. The increasing tendency to treat incomplete turns as unproblematic tends to mirror the practices observed in first language interactions (Chevalier 2008). Mia and Aurelia develop an increasingly better understanding of the use of *parce que* and incomplete turns. Mia treats what follows *parce que* as locally relevant, be it an embodied completion or a silence referring to interactional or personal history.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Examining the emergence, routinization, and development of the use of a linguistic pattern can lead us to a better and more encompassing understanding of the development of L2 speakers' interactional competence. In this study, I chose to examine the use of a highly interactional and recipient-designed practice, namely the use of incomplete turns and, relatedly, the understanding of these incomplete turns. I tracked the development of a specific pattern within two different multimodal packages (*parce que* + embodied completion vs *parce que* + silence), produced by an L2 speaker on her path from a beginner to intermediate proficiency level.

The longitudinal comparison of Aurelia's production of verbally incomplete *parce que* clauses showed that she uses this format from the beginning of the recordings, at first mainly to introduce a bodily enactment of an affective negative evaluation (excerpts 1 and 2) and then, to refer to personal (excerpt 3) or interactional (excerpt 4) history.

The first two excerpts have been examined in terms of recipient design, exploring how mutual understanding was achieved through the embodied completion of a high-grade negative assessment, where the bodily enactment has a compensatory function. Aurelia's linguistic repertoire is smaller at a beginner level than at a more advanced level. Indeed, the use of saliant embodied completion can be a resource that she uses to provide high-grade negative assessments during the first months, through the package *parce que* + embodied completion.

In the last excerpts, she uses the *parce que* + silence to invoke shared knowledge and history. Aurelia's use of *parce que* relies a lot on the context of production, but its locally relevant construction and understanding are achieved without using embodied completion to *ensure* mutual understanding. Aurelia's practices develop according to her communicational needs and emerge from pattern that are already routinized.

This trajectory can lead to two interpretations about Aurelia's linguistic and interactional competence development: first, it seems that Aurelia builds on the linguistic resources she already masters (here *parce que*) to accomplish new actions that correspond to new interactional needs. At a beginner level, she needs to express assessments in a high-grade manner, but with a smaller linguistic repertoire, she relies on the package *parce que* + embodied completion. At a more advanced level, she needs to manage new interactional situations, such as talking about personal history or referring to shared history, and then starts to use the package *parce que* + silence.

The second interpretation is about the longitudinal quantitative development of the pattern. In Table 1, I showed that Aurelia used the pattern of interest almost exclusively during semesters 1 ($n = 9$) and 2 ($n = 8$). These cases correspond to the package *parce que* + embodied completion as illustrated in Section 4.1. Aurelia uses incomplete turns and embodied completion often at the beginning of her learning trajectory as a way to perform high-grade negative assessments. She still performs high-grade negative assessments, but one interpretation is that she has developed new linguistic resources to perform them, meaning that she relies less on embodied completion. This hypothesis needs to be addressed on a more representative sample of the data.

In all excerpts, Mia was present, enabling us to also track longitudinal change in the reception of these verbally incomplete clauses. It is particularly interesting to compare the first and last excerpt, in which Mia and Aurelia are interacting in a dyadic setting. In the first excerpt, Mia orients toward the 'incompleteness' of Aurelia's turn, by offering an appropriate verbal completion. Even if Aurelia's turn was recognizable as pragmatically complete, Mia still offers a syntactic completion, maybe as a way to check her understanding. In the last two excerpts, Mia treats Aurelia's incomplete *parce que* clauses as unproblematic, orienting toward the progressivity of talk. In excerpt 3, Mia nods quickly, just after Aurelia produces *parce que*. This stresses the fact that Mia recognizes Aurelia's incomplete turn as pragmatically complete. In excerpt 4, Mia also treats Aurelia's incomplete turn as unproblematic, by waiting for Aurelia to continue her storytelling sequence.

Systematically tracking the interactional use of a pattern of language use and its understanding by the same participants is a way to show how the development of interactional competence is inextricably linked to the larger process of socialisation (Deppermann 2015; Berger & Pekarek Doehler 2018). Mobilizing one's second language brings additional challenges when the participants have no previous knowledge of each other's language practices and habits. Speakers develop abilities to perform interaction in a more context-sensitive and recipient-designed way and they develop linguistic and interactional resources to perform them.

REFERENCES

Antaki, C., Houtkoop-Steenstra, H., & Rapley, M. (2000). "Brilliant. next question...": High-grade assessment sequences in the completion of interactional units. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33(3)*, 235-262.

Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Tracking change over time in storytelling practices: A longitudinal study of second language talk-in-interaction. In S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner, & E. González Martínez (eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 67-102). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Chevalier, F. H. (2008). Unfinished turns in French conversation: How context matters. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41(1)*, 1-30.

Chevalier, F. H. (2009). The facework of unfinished turns in French conversation. *Discourse Studies, 11(3)*, 267-284.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1996). Intonation and clause combining in discourse: The case of *because*. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 6(3)*, 389-426.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2004). Prosody and sequence organization in English conversation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & C. E. Ford (eds.), *Sound Patterns in Interaction* (pp. 335-376). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2011). When turns start with because: An exercise in interactional syntax. In A. Meurman-Solin & U. Lenker (eds.). *Connectives in synchrony and diachrony in European languages, 8.* Helsinki: VARIENG. Retrieved from http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/index.html

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2012). Turn continuation and clause combinations. *Discourse Processes, 49(3-4)*, 273-299.

Debaisieux, J. M. (1994). *Le fonctionnement de 'parce que' en français parlé contemporain: description linguistique et implications didactiques.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Nancy 2.

Debaisieux, J. M. (2004). Les conjonctions de subordination: mots de grammaire ou mots du discours? Le cas de parce que. *Revue de sémantique et pragmatique, 15/16*, 51-67.

Deppermann, A. (2015). When recipient design fails: Egocentric turn-design of instructions in driving school lessons leading to breakdowns of intersubjectivity. *Gesprächsforschung-Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion, 16*, 63-101.

Deppermann, A., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal conversation analysis – Introduction to the special issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 54(2)*, 127-141.

Ferrari, A. (1992). Encore à propos de parce que, à la lumière des structures linguistiques de la séquence causale. *Cahiers de linguistique française, 13*, 183-214.

Ford, C. E. (1994). Dialogic aspects of talk and writing: Because on the interactive-edited continuum. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 14(4)*, 531-554.

Ford, C. E., & Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 4(1)*, 31-61.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. Everyday Language: *Studies in Ethnomethodology, 97*, 101-121.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32(10)*, 1489-1522.

Groupe Lambda-I (1975). Car, parce que, puisque. *Revue Romane, 10*, 248-280.

Hancock, V. (1997). *Parce que*: un connecteur macro-syntaxique. L'emploi de parce que chez des apprenants de français langue étrangère et des locuteurs natifs. *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère, 9*, 117-145.

Hazel, S., & Mortensen, K. (2019). Designedly incomplete objects as elicitation tools in classroom interaction. In D. Day & J. Wagner (eds.), *Objects, bodies, and work practice* (pp. 216-249). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hayashi, M. (2005). Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica, 156*, 21-53.

Inbar, A., & Maschler, Y. (2023). Shared knowledge as an account for disaffiliative moves: Hebrew ki 'because'-clauses accompanied by the palm-up open-hand gesture. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 56(2)*, 141-164.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117-142). Abingdon: Routledge.

Keevallik, L. (2013). The interdependence of bodily demonstrations and clausal syntax. Research on *Language and Social Interaction, 46(1)*, 1-21.

Keevallik, L. (2017). Linking performances: The temporality of contrastive grammar. In R. Laury, M. Etelämäki & E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Linking clauses and actions in social interaction* (pp. 54-73). Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Keevallik, L. (2018). What does embodied interaction tell us about grammar? *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 51(1)*, 1-21.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35(3)*, 277-309.

Levinson, S. C. (2012). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.). *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 101-130). Malden: John Wiley.

Li, X. (2016). Some discourse-interactional uses of yinwei 'because' and its multimodal production in Mandarin conversation. *Language Sciences, 58*, 51-78.

Moeschler, J. (1987). Trois emplois de parce que en conversation. *Cahiers de linguistique française, 8*, 97-110.

Moeschler, J. (2009). Causalité et argumentation: L'exemple de parce que. *Nouveaux Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 29*, 11-148.

Mondada, L. (2014). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 65*, 137-156.

Mondada, L. (2018). Multiple temporalities of language and body in interaction: Challenges for transcribing multimodality. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 51(1)*, 85-106.

Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics, 27(2)*, 195-219.

Park, I., & Kline, J. (2020). Incomplete utterances as critical assessments. *Discourse Studies, 22(4)*, 441-459.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 9(1)*, 3-24.

Pekarek Doehler, S., Polak-Yitzhaki, H., Li, X., Stoenica, I. M., Havlík, M., & Keevallik, L. (2021). Multimodal assemblies for prefacing a dispreferred response: A cross- linguistic analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021. 689275

Pekarek Doehler, S., Keevallik, L., & Li, X. (eds.) (2022) The grammar-body interface in social interaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.875696

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Skogmyr Marian, K. (In prep.). Compétence d'interaction en L2 et processus de socialisation: une étude longitudinale.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, *9*, 219-229.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), Structures of social action: *Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation: Volume I*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after the next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, *97(5)*, 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53(2)*, 361-382.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (1991). Paratactic because. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *16(4),* 323-337.

Simon, A. C., & Degand, L. (2007). Connecteurs de causalité, implication du locuteur et profils prosodiques: Le cas de *car* et de *parce que*. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *17(3)*, 323-341.

Skogmyr Marian, K. (2021). Assessing without words: Verbally incomplete utterances in complaints. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, online.

Skogmyr Marian, K. (2022). *The development of L2 interactional competence: A multimodal study of complaining in French interactions*. New York: Routledge.

Steensig, J., & Asmuß, B. (2005). Notes on disaligning "yes but" initiated utterances in German and Danish conversations. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction* (pp. 349-373). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stoenica, I., M. & Fiedler, S. (2021). Multimodal practice for mobilizing response: The case of turn-final *tu vois* 'you see' in French talk-in-interaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 659340.

Wagner, J., Pekarek Doehler, S., & González-Martínez, E. (2018). Longitudinal research on the organization of social interaction: Current developments and methodological challenges. In S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner & E. González-Martínez (eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 3-35). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wang, X. (2023). Changes in the Functions of Teachers' Syntactically Incomplete Utterances [X shi 'be'] and Students' Orientation in Chinese-as-a-Second-Language Classrooms. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, *117*, 81-105.

Zufferey, S. (2012). "Car, parce que, puisque" revisited: Three empirical studies on French causal connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44(2)*, 138-153.

Appendix

Talk transcription conventions (based on Jefferson 2004) and multimodal transcription conventions (based on Mondada 2018)

[]	Onset/end of overlap
=	Latching
(0.5)	Mesured pause
(.)	Short pause (up to 0.2)
mo-	Cut-off
:	Lengthening
. , ?	Falling/continuative/rising intonation
>mot<	Speeded up, comparing to the surrounding talk
mot	Emphasis
↓ ↑	Lower/higher pitch
MOT	Loud
°mot°	Soft
£mot£	Smiley voice
((sound))	Transcriber's comment
(autant)	Dubious transcription
✿--*--♛	Gesture delimitation
. . . .	Gesture preparation
, , , , , , , , , , ,	Gesture retraction
-->>	Gesture continues after the end of the excerpt
✿	Aurelia's head movement
*	Aurelia's facial expression
♛	Aurelia's arm movement
∞	Aurelia's body movement
&	Mia's head movement
◊	Mia's arm movement
§	Natascha's arm movement
#fig.	Exact moment when the screenshot was taken