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ABSTRACT

In an English-speaking country, non-native adult English speakers have many opportunities to engage in ESL discourse with native English speakers, especially in the form of oral communication. However, non-native adult English speakers in general possess less English linguistic capital (a type of cultural capital) (Bourdieu, 1986) than native English speakers, which can cause communication inequality that eventually may impede communication flow and efficiency as well as participatory motivation. The purpose of the study was to explore non-native adult English speakers’ perspectives regarding participatory legitimacy in the U.S. ESL discourse. Participatory legitimacy is thought to emerge from the underlying power relationships between native and non-native English speakers in the scope of discursive proficiency and socio-cultural status.

The study, based upon a case study of six non-native adult English speakers of varied ethnicities and linguistic backgrounds, analyzed the interaction dynamics of the participating non-native adult English speakers with native English speakers. The major data set was collected from semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and participatory observations of communicative activities both inside and outside an adult ESL classroom. It should be noted that the outside observations were viewed as supplementary.
The research questions investigated several features of ESL discourse: (1) cultural-reflective discourse and gender discourse: the interactions between participants’ original culture and the target culture forces through which the participants’ cross-cultural experiences were explored; (2) standard-English-only-discourse: issues of World English regarding the factors of English ownership and the domination of Standard English; (3) academic discourse: the comparison of participants’ communicative performance and social interaction in ESL and EFL classrooms; (4) counter-discourse: the phenomenon of counter-discourse to resist the power imposition of native English speakers.

The study revealed that the six participants developed their social identities through a pattern of cultural accommodation and reconciliation to gain a sense of self participatory legitimacy. The participants were aware that the ideology of Standard-English-only often led to a distressing communicative mindset in which they were merely English users instead of English managers, which constrained their self-recognition as legitimate speakers. However, the non-native English adult speakers had a tendency to challenge the inequality of the discourse by means of counter-discourse, first language use and coping strategies including ignoring, silence, deflecting, and passing. Furthermore, it was found that the ESL classroom in the U.S. seemed to be a superior place for learners to practice oral communication compared to the EFL classroom in their home countries in terms of equality of student-teacher interaction. The students’ communicative performance in the
ESL classroom did not fully reflect the ground of prior learning experience and communicative performance in the EFL classroom.

The study suggested the need for future investigation as it provided a contextualized data of language use regarding the issue of power and cross-cultural literacy, but it was not designed for generalizing the results. It can contribute to ESL teachers’ teaching of bi-lingual/multi-lingual/minority students and their efforts to empower ESL students to begin to assume a critical attitude toward literacy practices related to their English knowledge and skill development.

Pedagogical implications included the need to heighten ESL teachers’ awareness of classroom practices through which each ESL learner’s language participation advantages or disadvantages might be based on his/her social and cultural background; the importance of developing methods to teach authentic usage of oral communication; and the desirability of ESL teachers’ completion of professional subject-matter training, a requirement for some initial ESL certification, and it is also an obligation for on-the-job continued professional development.
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Language is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power. One seeks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished. Whence the complete definition of competence as right to speak, that is, as right to the legitimate language, the authorized language, the language of authority. Competence implies the power to impose reception (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 648; Thompson, 1984, p. 46-47).

Rationale

The practice of English as a Second Language (ESL) can be pursued any time, in any formal or informal communicative setting involving English discourse, in which it is often exercised in the form of speaking. In a country where English is a primary or official language, non-native adult English speakers are provided with many oral communication opportunities with native English speakers in all kinds of social activities outside the classroom and to some extent within ESL classrooms.

The researcher understands the general definition of oral communication to be an instant two-way discourse focusing on the exchange of thoughts and values, where language is practiced in an instinctive, lively, and efficient way with the help of facial, vocal, or gesture expressions. In this study, the researcher assumes that, for most non-native adult English speakers, English oral competency is the most crucial and ultimate challenge throughout the course of learning. Non-native adult English speakers’ self-
satisfaction and self-fulfillment in the practice of English are realized from time to time through their sense of success in real-time communication in English. When they are able to command an audience during a conversation, they feel encouraged to continue practicing English. They become confident that they understand the other party’s dialogue in various contexts and that their own speech is understood and appreciated. Of course, these beliefs may or may not reflect actual reality; that is, their interlocutor may have differing beliefs.

From the perspective of critical theory and post-structuralism, oral communication is much more than verbal discourse; it is a discourse of social-cultural exchanges that are constructed in a complex framework of hierarchical systems in which issues of power, subjectivity, and equality all come into play. Weedon (1997) maintained that discourse is a structuring principle of society through which power is exercised. Through discourse, subjectivity and individual ways of thinking are constructed. Language is related to the issues of power, injustice and inequality in the broader/macro social critical and political domains (Pennycook, 1994). Also, Thompson (1984), drawing on the philosophy of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), suggested that language is a means by which power hierarchies impose a “cultural arbitrary” (a form of symbolic violence) that is “embedded in the system of power relations between groups and classes” (p. 57). During communication, a ‘cultural arbitrary’ occurs whenever one’s values, beliefs, perceptions and decisions are forced upon others. The sense of participants’ legitimacy must exceed the sense of a prevailing ‘cultural arbitrary’ in conversation for a meaningful or successful oral communication or discourse to take place. This means that each and every participant must construct for himself or herself, consciously or unconsciously, at least a
certain degree of participatory legitimacy in the course of communication. The concept of participatory legitimacy was inspired by the work of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) on social linguistic competency and Lave and Wenger (1991) on learning as situated activity. To achieve participatory legitimacy, each participant must reserve or maintain a certain subjectivity which is equal to the characteristics of social identity (McNamara 1997 & Peirce 1995) and means "identities, behaviors, understandings of the world" (Gavey, 1989, p. 464), in the use of language. Or they must establish some kind of counter-discourse (Terdiman, 1985) to impose a counter 'cultural arbitrary' upon the other participants in the discourse. In other words, the participants must reshape themselves and become the subject of the discourse, instead of being subject to the discourse when they speak with others (Norton 1995, 2000). In conclusion, the power of the 'cultural arbitrary' between discourse participants must be balanced, and inequality of participation must be reduced or diminished.

In ESL discourse, social-cultural exchanges are often complicated by language and cultural barriers among the discourse participants. Non-native adult English speakers in general possess less English linguistic capital (a type of cultural capital) (Bourdieu, 1986) than native English speakers. The power of their language and the 'cultural arbitrary' non-native adult English speakers can bring to English conversation are weaker or less significant than those which they can summon using their first language (L1). Steps to empowerment must be constructed for non-native adult English speakers to recognize themselves as legitimate speakers of English within ESL discourse. This concept is critical for non-native adult English speakers to continue and make possible the pursuit of a life-long career of English learning.
The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of power hierarchies on the participatory legitimacy of non-native English speakers during their ESL discourse in social activities and personal interactions in the United States. The discourse settings focus specifically on the oral communication between native English speakers and non-native adult English speakers both inside and outside the ESL classroom. Better understanding of such impacts will facilitate analysis of the ways in which cross-cultural adult English speakers locate their subjectivities (social identity) in order to determine whether their speech and participation are legitimate within cross-cultural communication markets (in the ESL context).

This study is conducted in the United States of America, one of the largest multicultural societies in the world, where abundant opportunities for ESL discourse exist for non-native adult English speakers. These speakers consist primarily of immigrants and foreign students. In the United States of America, the values of liberty and equality in education have been widely addressed and discussed with respect to social class, gender, race and ethnicity. However, little research has focused on the area of cross-cultural communication regarding the issues of power, subjectivity and equality. The reason that this researcher was inspired to employ the concept of cross-cultural communication is that this study values a social context that influences the construction of non-native adult English speakers’ negotiable power relationships with native English speakers. Such relationships are crucial to the determination of non-native adult English speakers’ subjectivity (social identity) and communicative inequality, which are intimately related to the establishment of legitimacy during participation in the ESL discourse.
In the following section, the researcher provides background information for the study. First, in the description of English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL), the concept of English serving as a multidimensional communication system, with ‘World Englishes’ as an example, has been introduced. This leads to the observation that English is used as a mechanism underlying the foundation of social construction. From this insight has arisen interest in transforming and displacing the unequal power relationships between native English and non-native adult English speakers. This is the area on which critical and post-structuralist theories focus, and they are the subject of the introductory section of the theoretical framework. Second, the researcher relies on Bourdieu’s claim that oral competency in English quickly makes apparent the exercise of power and cultural arbitrariness, which is closely connected to the construction of legitimacy within ESL discourse. Finally, the researcher attempts to formulate a gap statement, first through an overview of the related studies and by elucidating why this study should be conducted and addressed.

Background of the Study

In past years, many ESL and EFL educators have been oriented toward the awareness of English as having a multidimensional effect on the second/foreign language learners’ world-views. These scholars acknowledge such concerns as the autonomous, non-neutral, defining nature of language acquisition (Pennycook, 1997), the mono-lingualism ideology reflected in the issues of English-only or Standard English (Christensen, 1990; Wiley and Luke, 1996), ownership (Widdowson, 1994), and resistance to the imperialism and hegemony of English (Tsuda, 1997). Scholars have positioned English in a new paradigm of ESL/EFL teaching and learning, e.g., ‘World Englishes’ (Kachru, 1992) or
an ‘International Language’ (Pennycook, 1995). Furthering these works, Mufwene (1997) discussed the historical development of legitimate or illegitimate English varieties, raising the question of which English varieties should be recognized as legitimate. These ideologies seem to be very carefully constructed and nurtured to transform the milieu and scenario of ESL/EFL teaching and learning. However, such theories/concepts appear to lack relevance for the non-native adult English speakers located within Western cross-cultural ESL discourse. Consequently, they have not quite emerged as empowering ideologies. This argument is supported by the fact that there is limited empirical data and scientific support to demonstrate the effectiveness of these concepts. For instance, Brown and Peterson (1997) mentioned that, notwithstanding the abundant work on the concept of World Englishes, rigorous research to demonstrate empirically the perspectives and values of World Englishes is significantly absent. Still, the idea of World Englishes intrigues this researcher, an adult non-native speaker who has struggled with ESL discourse in the U.S. The following concerns have come to her mind in a way that shapes her study: To what extent, in the ESL context, are non-native adult English speakers aware of the theoretical characteristics of different English varieties? What linguistic capital do adult non-native speakers bring to the ESL discourse to engage in English communicative intelligibility? Do they think consciously or unconsciously that certain aspects of their pronunciation, syntax and diction construct their identity and place them in the U.S. social order? Who has ownership of English? Do they know that exercise of certain kinds of cultural arbitrariness results in the practice of certain forms of English being constituted as legitimate and having higher exchange value? These thoughts drive the researcher to examine the manner in which power is wedded to ESL discourse and
how it impacts upon ESL adult learners’ subjectivity in the establishment of legitimacy. The concept of World Englishes has inspired the researcher to examine these very issues.

This study intends to assess the dynamics of ESL discourse between natives and non-native adult English speakers by receiving first-hand participant accounts regarding social interaction, which are indicative of conversational or communicative skill, and by collecting data based on the observation of classroom and authentic life social behavior.

Two assumptions inform this approach: first, that oral expression and communicative skill in English constitute the most straightforward and efficient way to present the discursive knowledge of language use in the specific and concrete situations in which are embedded the relationships among language, power, subjectivity and equality.

Second, Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of the establishment of competence is appropriated, which posits the awareness of the speaker’s right to speak, and “the power to impose reception” (p. 648). Although Cummins (1996) disputed the assumption that conversational fluency is the most convincing indicator of the naturalness of English proficiency, for the purpose of the study it is the most revealing method for exploring in depth the relationships among language, power, and subjectivity in ESL discourse. Bourdieu provided an essential theoretical foundation for the exploration of the almost insurmountable obstacles of the native and non-native dichotomy.

Finally, there is a significant amount of related research devoted to studies exploring socio-cultural perspectives with respect to how non-native language learners construct their status. They include cross-cultural learners’ literacy behavior and development (Long, 1998; Parry; 1996; Scollon & Scollon, 1995), practices in the learners’ classroom regarding power or cultural norms (Auerbach, 1993, 1995; Ellis, 1996; Li, 1998), the
construction of learners’ identity or self/other awareness (Goffman, 1963; Schecter & Bayley, 1997; McNarmara, 1997, Norton, 1997, 2000; Rymes & Pash, 2001; Toohey, 2000), the interrelationship between discourse and power or discourse and the construction of language/speakers’ legitimacy (McKay and Wong, 1996; Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Heller, 1995, 1996; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 1996; Ellis, 1997; Kumaravadivelu, 1999; Chick, 2001, Sparks, 2002). However, this project assumes that the cross-cultural non-native adult English speakers should be still further empowered and legitimized in the ESL context. Based on qualitative research through case study, the researcher explores issues related to how cross-cultural non-native adult English speakers, possessed of their own English linguistic capital, operate within the social conditions of communication in the ESL context with native English speakers. Such communication is influenced by the constrained exercise of power, the imposition of identity, and the arbitrariness of the target culture so as to reflect the different degrees of authority of the social hierarchy. Studies of these phenomena are surprisingly absent or poorly addressed in the literature. This study is keen to make up the gap.

In the next section, the researcher discusses the paradigms used to view society as a whole and the research project in particular. These paradigms include critical theory and post-structuralism, categorized as post-positivism, because this researcher regards ESL discourse as a social construction in which there emerges the possibility of change and relocation resulting from unequal power relationships between English native and non-native speakers. The paradigms are of great assistance in clarifying and detailing the domination of mainstream English within ESL discourse because they provide insight into the issues of power, discourse (knowledge), relativism, empowerment, undoing
(deconstruction), reversal, relocation, transformation and change. Further, with the introduction of these paradigms, the researcher explains an element of post-structuralism, the concept of the hyperreal, to examine the meaning of legitimate and native speakers in the ESL discourse. This strengthens the study by facilitating, empowering, and encouraging participants’ (non-native adult English speakers’) reflexivity and unmasking taken-for-granted, possibly unequal power relationships and the concerns of subjectivity.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study examines non-native adult English speakers’ participation style, motivation, and tendencies, as well as their social identities and self-perceptions in ESL discourse during social activities and personal interactions in the United States. In particular, the focus is on communicative interactions between native and non-native adult speakers of English. The concept of participatory legitimacy is developed and analyzed from the perspective of power hierarchies. This researcher has chosen two new paradigms of post-positivism, (1) the critical approach and (2) post-structuralism, as lenses through which to view this study. Two reasons account for this choice: the first concerns characteristics of the two paradigms and the second is related to how several ESL and EFL researchers have applied these two paradigms in ways that support this study’s theoretical position.

First, the characteristics--critical theory and post-structuralism have in common the ideas of praxis as history; provisional (temporary) and multiple realities and subjectivity; relative meaning; action with reflection; discourse with knowledge; power with resistance; change and replacement. These characteristics are factors essential to the creation of society. However, post-structuralism is one sub-strand of critical theory; it
separates from critical theory epistemologically—in the nature of knowledge (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Post-structuralism holds that the structures of power and knowledge are always connected. Knowledge exists where power is functioning, and is used to struggle for legitimation (Foucault, 1984; Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995). Also, post-structuralism uses deconstruction as a strategy to unveil the supposed truth by “undoing, reversing, and displacing taken-for-granted oppositions that structure texts…” (Schwandt, 1997, p.122).

Second, applications of critical theory and post-structuralism to ESL/EFL—when discussing language pedagogy, critical approaches are inclined to put emphasis on the issues of power and control within language. Learning to use a language engages not only learning about the language itself, but also learning its social context; as a result, both can be changed (Benson, 1997). Pennycook (1999) proposed that “a critical approach to teaching English as a second language (TESOL) is the inclusion of means of transformation” (p. 335). In addition, according to post-structuralism, the person’s subjectivity is socially/historically determined. Subjectivity is multiple, de-centered and contradictory and is produced symbolically by discourses (Weedon, 1997; Norton, 2000; Genishi, 1999). Such a realization of subjectivity/identity is an example of site and subject struggle (Norton, 2000; Weedon, 1997), enabling non-native adult English speakers to empower themselves in their struggle to create the opportunity to speak English. Based on the evidence above, these aspects of the two paradigms are specifically appropriate to this study dealing with the legitimacy of speakers of English within ESL discourse, especially when related to certain social-cultural concerns of power, subjectivity and equality. In the larger picture, this helps to account for the growth of a
persistent concern with the ESL learners’ condition in English acquisition in terms of social, cultural, and political perspectives.

In the following section, the researcher discusses more fully critical theory and post-structuralism, including their aspects and properties, to further illuminate their application to this study. Amplification of this introductory information is provided in Chapter Three in the review of related literature.

Critical Theory

The Theory of Paulo Freire’s ‘Pedagogy of the Oppressed’. In education, the idea of critical approach is significantly impacted by Freire’s (1970) philosophy that libertarian/problem-posing education develops students’ critical consciousness and creative power. This philosophy emphasizes that people should be regarded as conscious beings, and that learning consists of acts of cognition instead of transfers of information. Freire emphasizes that liberation is a praxis, an action and reflection of people. This concept motivates the oppressed to seek their liberation. Problem-posing education means that education is the practice of freedom.

Critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy refers to addressing the concerns of schooling and inequality by the adoption of humanistic methods of teaching and learning, to enable people to become more fully aware of their human condition. It is also interested in transferring the reality of authentic thinking to communication (Freire, 1970; Hones, 1999; Pennycook, 1994).

For example, based on Freire’s concept of “critical intervention in reality” (p. 68), Hones (1999) employed critical pedagogy to rethink L2 teaching. In his approach to L2
learning, the goal of critical pedagogy is to help L2 learners become fully human by making educational use of the reality around them.

Post-structuralism

Post-structuralist theory conceptualizes the connections between language, individual consciousness and social interaction. The main focus is on how power is exercised and the possibilities for change. The following are some key points of post-structuralism.

(1) Reflexivity is central to the critical consciousness of what people are writing, thinking and doing (Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995).

(2) Readers have their own interpretation of the text, which may have little to do with the author’s intention. Barthes believes that writing is always apt to produce a ‘zero degree’ of sense; there is no stable text, self and human consciousness (Barthes, 1968; Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995; Genishi, 1999). This suggests that text meaning is never stable, fixed and representational.

(3) Deconstruction is regarded as an offshoot of post-structuralism, opposed to western rationalist thought. Truth is doomed to be accepted as related only to certain theoretical frameworks or social/cultural practices. Appignanesi and Garratt (1995) believed that the idea of deconstruction is “to peel away like an onion the layers of constructed meanings” (p. 79).

(4) A discourse serves as a means to deliver knowledge to participants. It can transmit this knowledge to individuals or to whole societies. As a result, the discourse providing this knowledge, delivered by those in power, also constructs “the truth” (as most people believe it to be), a system of socially legitimated thought, so that it offers a genuine
epistemology for understanding the world (Foucault, 1984; Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995).

(5) In Foucault’s work ‘The Subject and Power’ (1982), he suggests that power is embedded in the creation of human subjectivities, through which the exercise of power is legitimate. Power is something that is lived, not possessed (Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995, p. 86).

In the next segment, the researcher uses the post-structuralist theory of the ‘hyperreal’ in order to rethink the position of legitimate speakers within ESL discourse. Ideally, these concepts assist non-native adult English speakers to engage in self-reflexivity and reverse the predominant ideas (the hegemony of western English and the privileged position of native English speakers within ESL discourse), thereby empowering non-native speakers.

The Position of the Study

*There is no Perfect Legitimate English Speaker*

--the Viewpoint of the Hyperreal

For one aspect of the post-structuralist paradigm--the hyperreal, Baudrillard (1994) suggested that images representing real things sometimes seem to become more real than the things themselves. For example, TV programs and movies, in particular, replace the reality that they are supposed to represent. Also, the existence of Disneyland makes people believe that there is a real model (outside Disneyland) upon which it is based. In this regard, Disneyland is a clear example of the “hyperreal”--a model without origin that creates an image to replace reality (the real world), and makes this image seem more true and real than the reality (Baudrillard, 1994, p. 1).
The concept of the hyperreal can be applied to the English acquisition context. Within the ESL context, does there exist an ideal/legitimate English speaker? This study contends that there is no real or perfect English speaker. Because of the unequal power relationship between English native speakers and non-native speakers and the privilege of western English, the study assumes that many non-native English speakers commonly locate Western native English speakers in the category of hyperreal. That is, many non-natives regard the hypothetical ideal/legitimate English speaker to be more real than actual western English speakers. This is a hyperreal analogy explaining that English natives of western countries appear to represent ideal/legitimate English speakers who in reality do not exist (See Chart 1.1). This analogy is (a) from non-native English speakers’ perspectives; (b) represents the images of western native English speakers, who are assumed to be in the category of hyperreal; (c) represents ideal/legitimate English speakers who are idealized versions of actual western English speakers. Two possibilities may explain the above assumption. The fact that non-native English speakers have ‘recognized’ (regarded) western native English speakers as ideal/legitimate speakers is an example of acknowledgment of legitimacy. In reality, the fact that non-native English speakers have ‘mis-recognized’ (mistakenly identified) western native English speakers as ideal/legitimate speakers is an example of cultural arbitrariness (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984).
Based on the hyperreal model, the meaning of native and legitimate speakers in ESL discourse is reconsidered. This comes from the researcher’s self-reflexivity, combining the theories she is interested in, her own intercultural English learning experience and acculturated change, shaping what she is going to become. In the U.S., the researcher is seen as an immigrant oriental woman who is a student. However, influenced by the post-positivist paradigm, particularly critical theory and post-structuralism in the U.S., she is gradually preparing herself to guard against the conventional one-dimensional image and disentangle her thought, which has been buried under the domination of social construction in Taiwan.

On the one hand, immersing herself in the fusion of binary (Eastern/Western) cultures, she strains herself to the limit to understand the deep macrocosmic ideology covering the overall social practices of human lives, especially her own, which differs from her own
previous cultural experience. On the other hand, as a non-native English speaker in the U.S., the researcher struggles against almost insurmountable obstacles (the authority of western English and the advantage of native English speakers within ESL discourse) to achieve an oral proficiency that is as close as possible to that of native speakers in order to assert her own identity and challenge the social power hierarchy. This corresponds to the process of ESL language acquirers making an effort to be legitimate peripheral participants (Lave and Wenger, 1991) and adjusting themselves to interaction with skilled native English speakers in order to have positive involvement in the community (ESL discourse). The learning process is constructed and confronted during the social practices. Self-reflection reveals that the position of the researcher is not that of an outsider in ESL discourse in the U.S., but the researcher empathizes with the meanings of the participants’ interpretations.

Beyond understanding the application of the post-structuralist theories of hyperreal, the researcher hopes the readers will appreciate the non-native adult English speakers’ attempts to find their niche and assume legitimacy in linguistic exchange with native English speakers.

Definition of Terms

1. Cultural Arbitrary

A cultural arbitrary occurs whenever one’s beliefs, decisions and values are forced upon others during the process of communication. It is wedded to the system of power relations between groups (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Bourdieu, 1991; Thompson, 1984). Language is a means of imposing a cultural arbitrary.

2. ‘Discourse’ and ‘discourse’
According to Gee (1996), ‘discourse’ refers to a connected fragment of language. A ‘discourse’ is constrained inside a ‘Discourse’ in a larger sense. A ‘Discourse’ is a kind of identity kit, including adequate address and actions for behavior and speech, in order to express one’s social role. That is, Discourses are ways of presenting oneself and behaving in the world, or styles of life that integrate values, words, beliefs, attitudes and social identities, as well as body language and clothes. Discourse provides the hierarchies for categorizing people’s social order and individuals and creates all kinds of knowledge and meanings. Click (2001) suggested that Gee’s ‘Discourse’ referred to ways of using language in order to constitute people’s identities and the manner in which power is used in social settings. In this project, ‘discourse’ represented Gee’s (1996) ‘Discourse.’ This was the only meaning used for the researcher’s purpose. There was no need to distinguish between ‘discourse’ and ‘Discourse’ in the study.

3. Language Capital

Based on social-cultural foundations, as a type of cultural capital, language capital is developed through nurture attributes and process (i.e., environment), rather than natural attributes (e.g., genetic inheritance) (Bourdieu, 1986). Language capital is enhanced by numerous factors, such as development of a critical attitude and consciousness, mastery of communicative tools, and active involvement in oral conversation and social interactions.

4. Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) (Lave and Wenger, 1991)

Newcomers can adjust themselves and learn gradually to take on the community practice. This is a necessary process when learning is regarded as a kind of situated activity and constructed during social practices.
5. Linguistic Habitus

This refers to the individual’s disposition to speak in particular ways (Bourdieu, 1991) due to early influences such as the family.

6. Subjectivity/Social Identity

Subjectivity refers to people’s identities, behaviors, and ways of understanding their relationship to the world, and includes conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions (Gavey, 1989; Weedon 1997). In addition, McNamara (1997) paralleled the concept of subjectivity and social identity in the area of social cultural perspectives in TESOL. He suggested that Peirce’s (1995) definition of social identity is equal to the characteristics of subjectivity.

7. Symbolic Violence

Lin (1999) discussed Bourdieu’s definition regarding symbolic violence as “the imposition of representations of the world and social meanings upon groups in such a way that these representations are experienced as legitimate” (p. 395). Symbolic violence is usually disguised and gentle. The exercise of symbolic violence is concealed consciously by the failure of the school system (Lin, 1999). In addition, within the process of communication, symbolic violence is veiled through the practices of power, tendency and domination functions. When these practices are exercised, symbolic violence is exercised. The practices of power, tendency and domination functions are most likely to be exercised only if they are recognized as legitimate or mis-recognized as the ‘cultural arbitrary’ by people within this system (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984). Lin (1999) provided an example of English education in Hong Kong. Only English is recognized as a mono-linguistic and legitimate language. In Hong Kong,
the symbolic imposition of the concept that ‘English-medium schools = good schools’ is mis-recognized as a ‘cultural arbitrary.’

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of power hierarchies on the participatory legitimacy of non-native adult English speakers during their ESL discourse in social activities and personal interactions in the United States. In particular, these discourse settings emphasize the oral communication between English native and non-native adult speakers of English inside and outside the ESL classroom. Based on critical and post-structuralism theories developed in the area of cross-cultural communication and social interactions, the researcher seeks to construct and define the concept of linguistic legitimacy during the use of English in conversation between native and the non-native adult speakers of English.

This study attempts to explore power relationships that exist between native and non-native adult English speakers within ESL discourse across their social, cultural and language backgrounds. Issues of equality and subjectivity (social identity) are disclosed and analyzed in combination within ESL discourse across those dimensions.

Specifically, as for the subjectivity of non-native adult English speakers in the U.S., this study aims to investigate how their social identities change in English discourse, and to discover how those changes influence their participatory patterns, motivation, and tendencies in the practice and learning of English. Ultimately, as for the issue of equality, the researcher intends to advocate awareness of the practices of symbolic domination, which covers the related concerns of linguistic choice, social order and unseen interstices in cross-cultural communication. ‘Interstices’ refers to the situations within structures of
society where language practices are not tightly determined (are not strictly enforced) (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Heller, 1995)

Participatory observation and open-ended interviews were conducted to include ESL speakers of different profiles, examining their perceptions and behaviors in English oral communication. The study hopes to initiate discussion and further research on how to empower non-native English speakers in their acquisition of cross-cultural oral communication.

**Research Questions**

In order to diagnose effectively the participatory legitimacy of the non-native adult English speakers, the research questions were designed to elucidate the framework underlying the dynamics of varied discourses embedded within American ESL discourse to determine the individual participant’s positioning within the hierarchical power relationships of the American social environment. Inspired by the contextualized perspectives to explore the interrelation of discourse (Mckay & Wong, 1996), these multiple-discourses provided fruitful sites, including cultural-reflective discourse, gender discourse, standard English-only discourse, ESL academic discourse and counter-discourse (See Chart 1.2), to frame the four research questions. Also, the underlying framework of this study is ‘new literacy approaches’ (Hudson, 1998); this notion suggests that literacy practices are wedded to the ideology of the constructions of history, power, culture and control, which direct the realization of what adequate literacy should be.

In question 1, on the basis of gender discourse and cultural-reflective discourse, the researcher argues that gender is a kind of cultural practice that shapes the gender patterns
used in the ESL discourse and affects the dynamic of the construction of social identity. The mutual interactions between the practices of the participants’ original culture and target culture forces are discussed. All of these phenomena are intended to explain the encounters participants regard as most worthy of consideration throughout their cross-cultural experiences.

As for question 2, in counterpoint to the requirements of standard English-only discourse, the researcher explores the related concerns of World Englishes. Through the concept of the symbolic domination of standard English, participants’ specific linguistic phenomena and tendencies, as well as their positioning with respect to power relations with native English speakers, are elucidated.

For question 3, on the foundation of ESL academic discourse, the researcher mainly was inspired by Kumaravadivelu’s philosophy (1999) concerning the class scenario as an integral part of the larger society where many forms of domination and resistance are reproduced. By including the academic discourse, the researcher hopes to fulfill the main purpose of addressing holistically assumptions about the dynamics and multiple forms of ESL discourses in order to explore the concerns of participants related to participatory legitimacy, power and social identity. Also, the research attempts to compare the EFL/ESL academic contexts in terms of participants’ conversational performance and to identify the inter-connections between them.

Question 4 is designed on the basis of counter-discourse to explore how participants judiciously make use of their L1s, create a counter-discourse and develop other strategies to negotiate their ethnicity and linguistic position and resist native English speakers’
power imposition. The research attempts to elucidate how the struggle of power-resistance is foregrounded.

Chart 1.2 The Multiple-Discourses Embedded in American ESL Discourse

**Research Questions**

1. What cross-cultural experiences do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to encounter most frequently in their social interactions in an ESL setting?

2. What beliefs about communicating in English do non-native English-speaking adult learners report about the topic of World Englishes?

3. What do non-native English-speaking adult learners report when they are interviewed about their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics that they recall from their previous EFL classrooms? What do non-native English-speaking adult learners demonstrate in their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics when they are observed in their current ESL classroom? What connections are revealed when the two learning contexts are compared?
4. What behaviors or strategies do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to use most frequently when interacting with native speakers of English to avoid power imposition of native speakers?

The Significance of the Study

This study is important to help uncover possibilities and limitations of ESL education. It focuses principally on the significance of the socio–cultural setting and influences on communicative interaction within ESL discourse. The discussion of this issue and subsequent findings may help to compensate for the shortcomings of linguistic structuralism, a theory of communication that stressed the internal structure of communication systems but ignored the contextualized use of language (Pennycook, 2001). This perspective expands the definition of discourse to include social-cultural exchanges and to introduce to ESL and EFL practitioners the non-static, flexible, ever-changing nature of oral expression. In this study, this kind of ESL discourse demonstrates that the degree of participatory legitimacy is dependent upon the non-native adult speaker’s conception of his/her subjectivity (belief, identity, values, and way of interpreting the world). Insights found in this study may also facilitate ESL educators’ construction of the ESL classroom to help students adapt to an authentic social life.

Limitations of the Study

(1) The main limitation of this study is the lack of generalizability. The six non-native adult English participants do not represent all non-native English speakers. This study does not attempt to explain all aspects related to the built-in linguistic capacity to articulate expression but intends to capture the embodiment of social, cultural, and political features influencing the recognition of individual communicative competence in
the ESL context. The roles played by power relations and the assumptions of different subjectivities (social identity) are also examined.

(2) As far as the data collection is concerned, these participants may be limited in the ability to describe in their English their perceptions regarding their English and social participatory beliefs, tendencies and acts. As for the other data collection observational activity, participants’ social activities outside the classroom and within ESL classes were observed. However, outside the classroom observations were limited to three observed social activities of participants because of the constraint of time and location.

(3) In addition, the use of the particular theoretical framework, critical theory and post-structuralism, could rule out the possibility of shedding light on different interpretations on the same data set through the perspectives of other theoretical frameworks. Readers unfamiliar with critical theory and post-structuralism may not be receptive to the framing of this study.

(4) Finally, the reason for using ‘native English speaker’ and ‘non-native English speaker’ was to make a distinction between the ‘old-timers’ (Lave Wegner, 1991), users of English as a first language who were nurtured in an English-based culture in the U.S., and the ‘new-comers’ (Lave Wegner, 1991), users of English as a second or foreign language who were nurtured in a non-English-based culture in their home countries. At the same time, it is recognized that the dichotomy of native and non-native may perpetuate the hypothetical concept of perfect or expert English users, which tends to over-simplify the characteristics of the dimension of speakers with varied levels of English proficiency. Many non-native speakers of a language may be as proficient as native speakers in many dimensions of the target language; therefore, the native vs non-
Assumptions

(1) The U.S. ESL discourse’s dimensions included other sub-discourses, cultural-reflective discourse, gender discourse, standard English-only discourse, ESL academic discourse and counter-discourse, in which, within a highly contextualized inter-actional and socio-cultural environment, the non-native adult English speakers’ daily communication takes place.

(2) During discourse interaction, it is assumed that the native English speakers and non-native adult English speakers experience unequal power relationships. That is, the non-native adult English speakers constantly struggle to negotiate communicative meanings in the discourses, and feel “the tension between unequal linguistic exchange and distribution of power; literacy practices are embedded in and negotiated between discourse communities” (Sparks 2002, p. 64).

(3) Cultural arbitrariness (a kind of symbolic violence) involves non-native adult English speakers and native English speakers. At first, the researcher assumed that cultural arbitrariness, a state of recognition, prevailed over the non-native adult English speakers’ perceptions regarding contexts, role-playing and communicative behaviors before actual discourse took place. Later, the researcher came to realize that native English speakers’ imposition of cultural arbitrariness and the non-native English adult speaker’s sense of participatory legitimacy both play important roles in determining whether it is all right for non-native adult English speakers to speak. These phenomena shaped the non-native
adult speakers’ awareness of cultural assumptions and differences, self and other groupings, decisions about ownership of English, development of social characteristics, and resistance to power, all of which affect the comfort level of non-native English speakers and their assumption of participatory legitimacy within ESL discourse.

(4) ESL teachers should offer a high quality of teaching not only to assist non-native English speakers to master English skills, but also to empower them to internalize the inquiry leading to the “emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in the reality” (Freire, 1970, p. 68) of their social world. That is, ESL teachers should strive to provide a scaffold for non-native English speakers’ English learning. They should also seek to promote awareness of the learners’ own reality as human beings, encouraging them to act on the knowledge they receive and recognize the potential inequality in the values of gender, ethnicity, capacity, and social position. This assumption is an avenue toward addressing the main theme of the critical theory in the study, issues of empowerment.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

“It is a political question since language has served as an instrument of political and cultural control whenever two cultures meet. It is a social question since certain forms of speech are admired, prestigious, codified and promulgated while others are accorded low esteem, stigmatized, ridiculed and avoided. It is an economic question since many feel that speaking power or some variety of Standard English is required for success in middle-class America” (Trabasso & Harrison, 1976, p. 9).

Several bodies of related literature have informed this study of non-native adult speakers’ perspectives on participatory legitimacy during their ESL discourse with native English speakers in the United States. Such a discourse of social-cultural exchanges is constructed in complicated framings of hierarchical systems in which issues of power, subjectivity, and equality all come into play.

Therefore, this chapter presents a review of literature related to: (1) theoretical frameworks of the study: the issues of discourse, power and subjectivity and their applicability to fields of English and other languages as L2; (2) research related to concerns of the issues of linguistic legitimacy; (3) the transformation from inequality to equality: the empowerment of non-native English speakers through a critical approach to foreign/second language education and the validation of multiple varieties of English.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

This section addresses (1) the issues of discourse, power, subjectivity and equality, as well as (2) their applicability to fields of English and other languages as L2.
Discourse, Power, Subjectivity and Equality of Critical Theory and Post-structuralism

Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggested that “the term critical theory is (for us) a blanket term denoting a set of several alternative paradigms….Indeed, critical theory may itself usefully be divided into three sub-strands: post-structuralism, postmodernism, and a blending of these two” (p. 109). Post-structuralism is one strand of critical theory, and the boundary between critical theory and post-structuralism is almost blurred. In this section, the researcher has drawn from literature that directly addresses the connection between discourse, power, and subjectivity rather than the wide spectrum of critical theory and post-structuralism. This study posits that the concerns of power and the adult non-native English speaker’s subjectivity and social locations are constructed through the exercise of their discourse in the ESL context. This influences the extent to which their participation is legitimated in ESL discourse.

The Relationship of Power, Subjectivity, Equality and Discourse. In the following, the researcher addresses literature that discusses the relationships between discourse, power and subjectivity. This is the point of departure for this study. In addition, the researcher surveys literature in the ESL and EFL fields in order to support and verify the choice of paradigms in this study.

According to the precepts of critical theory and post-structuralism, a discourse of social-cultural exchanges develops with a framework of hierarchical systems. Within this system, issues of power and subjectivity are inherent and influential. Based on Foucault (1972), language is located in discourse that categorizes individuals and creates knowledge and meaning. Discourse refers to “a way of constituting meaning which is specific to particular groups, cultures, and historical periods and is always changing”
(Gavey, 1989, p. 464). Discourse includes language and other signifiers, such as acoustic images and pictures. It also is an interconnected system of statements centered around common values, being the products of social practices and power, but not of personal sets of ideas (Hollway, 1983). Discourse is reproduced as social instructions and ways of thinking, serving as a means to deliver knowledge--a system of thoughts being socially legitimated--so that it offers a genuine epistemology for understanding specific concerns (Foucault, 1984; Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995). Within a discourse, power relations shape the social structures and individual interactions. Generally speaking, the dominant/powerful discourse (the discourse which most people believe) is normal and accepted, creating the power and authority to appeal to individuals’ common sense and constructing legitimacy and truth (Gavey, 1989). In sum, power influences participants’ relations and constructs individual participatory legitimacy within discourse. Once the participant constructs and achieves a certain degree of participatory legitimacy, he/she can impose decisions, values, beliefs, and perceptions on other participants within this discourse; that is, the successful imposition of a “cultural arbitrary” occurs (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, Bourdieu, 1991, Thompson, 1984), which often is wedded to the location of power among the participants.

The study of ESL discourse employs Foucault’s concept of power: “… power isn’t what some possess and others do not, but a tactical and resourceful narrative. Power is in the texture of our lives--- ‘we live it rather than have it’ (Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995, p. 86). This Foucauldian power, as opposed to institutional/coercive power, is controlling but enabling and imposes identity, truth and laws on people. It operates through individuals or group relations. Power does not exist on the isolation. Only when power is
applied to influence another’s action, does power exist. It is integrated into the social system and exercised through the interaction of individuals and groups (Foucault, 1982). Further, such power controls the system of positioning practices, offering a set of hierarchical classifications to categories of individuals (Foucault, 1972). Power arranges individuals’ subject positions within society.

In order to elucidate the meaning of power, Foucault employed a metaphor, comparing the struggle of power-resistance to a chemical catalyst that reveals how power relationships work. Foucault’s strategy of antagonism is the result, used to emphasize awareness of power: “they [the struggles between the dominant and dominated] are an opposition to the effects of power which are linked with knowledge, competence and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge” (Foucault, 1982, p. 781). This applies to this ESL discourse project, accurately describing adult non-native English speakers’ struggle for the native speakers’ legitimacy of linguistic competence (their privileges of knowledge) during social interaction with native English speakers. Also, this is what this study assumes, that power-resistance prevails between adult native English speakers and non-native English speakers within the interaction of ESL discourse.

According to critical theory and post-structuralism, when one achieves a certain degree of participatory legitimacy, a certain kind of participant’s subjectivity is developed and maintained. Subjectivity is constantly reconstructed in discourse. Weedon (1997) defined the idea of subjectivity as “the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to world” (p. 32). This is different from the humanist construction of discourse
emphasizing the fixed and coherent essence of subjectivity. Regarding the relationship between discourse, power and subjectivity, Weedon believed that discourse is a structuring principle of society as a whole through which power is exercised to construct individual ways of thinking and subjectivity. For instance, the subjectivity of feminism for many women is still marginalized and powerless, and is thereby incapable of empowering these women (Gavey, 1989). In addition, the forms of individual subjectivity “change with shifts in the wide range of discursive fields” and the person “is always the site of conflicting forms of subjectivity” (Weedon, 1997, p. 32). Within critical theory and post-structuralism discourse, subjectivity is constantly reconstructed. Based on Weedon (1997), the nature of language makes fixed meanings of gendered subjectivity impossible.

In sum, based on Foucault (1972, 1982) and Weedon (1997), power is implanted into the social structures and exercised through the interaction of individuals and groups. Further, such power not only dominates the system of positioning practices, but also offers a set of hierarchical categories to differentiate individuals. For example, power arranges participants’ subjectivity within the discourse, which in turn triggers the issues of participatory equality. Inequality may jeopardize the free exchange of thought and cause an unbalanced flow of ‘cultural arbitrary’ (the delivery of or the imposition of beliefs and perceptions (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984) in a discourse.

This study describes the meaning of language and signifier within the critical theory and post-structuralism discourse, taking as a point of reference Derrida’s philosophy of ‘différance.’
Derrida’s Philosophy of ‘Différance’ and Discourse. According to the system of semiotics, a signifier refers to a perceptible image and the ‘signified’ is the meaning that is called forth in the receiver’s mind as a result of the stimulation of the signifier.

Signification combines signifier and signified to create sign (an entity that carries information) (Schwandt, 1997; Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995). For example, a sign (e.g., “cradle”) links a signifier (a perceptible image, i.e., a word or a picture) and a signified (a concept or a meaning, e.g., a small bed for a baby). But in post-structuralism (deconstruction), “the meaning of a sign is never produced in this kind of stable, referential relationship. Rather, the signified is but an instant in a never-ending process of continuous signification; an infinite referral of signifier to signified” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 122). To further explore the meaning of post-structuralist (deconstructive) semiotics, Derrida (1973) developed the idea of ‘différance’ which discusses language, knowledge and meaning and is conducive to interpreting the correlations of deconstructive semiotics. Summarizing Derrida’s philosophy, Weedon (1997) explained the concept of ‘différance’: “meaning is both the product of differences between signifiers and is always also subject to deferral. Différance is what makes the movement of signification possible and ensures that meaning can never be fixed” (p. 102).

‘Différance’ consists of concepts of ‘identity, difference and deferral’ used to explain the meaning of signifier (a word or a picture). Identity means that one part of a signifier’s meaning is certain and fixed, while difference represents the concept that the other part of the signifier’s meaning is hesitant and undecided. The influence of difference makes the signifier’s meaning constantly deferred and unstable so that the final signified (meaning) is never reached (See Chart 2.1). The deferred meaning is “never exhaustive and [always
postponed]…can always be traced…further back again…” (Appignanesi & Garratt, 1995, p. 79). Derrida desires to reveal the assumed/hidden under-layer of meanings of the text. However, the exploration of meaning is not unitary but endless deferral.

Utilizing the concept of ‘différance’ to view the construction of discourse, the researcher is inspired to undertake a complex engagement with the topic under consideration, especially with the aspect of language meaning and the signifiers that constitute discourse. Discourse includes language and other signifiers, such as acoustic images, graphics, and pictures. Derrida’s philosophy tends to take apart the system to explore and analyze the function (meaning) of linguistic units. Bases on the concept of ‘différance’, the meaning of language within discourse is dynamic and never fixed. “Thus meanings conveyed by language are not fixed as social facts, and poststructuralists assert there are no essential truths, only multiple truths” (Genishi, 1999, p. 289). This concept supports the contention in this ESL discourse study that there cannot be a single, official, and legitimate English which corresponds to the multiple reality of World Englishes. This topic will be discussed in a later section.

In sum, Derrida’s work provides information that this researcher finds helpful in reconsidering non-native English adult speakers’ involvement with English natives. Is there any complete certainty that communication can occur within ESL discourse, according to critical theory and post-structuralism? Can natives and non-natives find perfect representation for transmission of their knowledge and elucidation of issues important to them within ESL discourse? Or is communication between English native and non-native speakers precluded by continual change because the representation of
meaning in language or in other signifiers (pictures and graphics) is, by nature, multiple and varied? Derrida’s work represents a relevant avenue of investigation for this study.

"Difference + Deferral = Différance"

---language is not stable→ yes could refer to yes (or no) →no could refers to no (or yes)

Chart 2.1 Derrida’s (1973) Concept of Suspension and ‘Différance’ of Language Meaning in Post-Structuralism
The Applicability of Power, Subjectivity, Equality and the Analysis of Discourse to Fields of English and Other Second Languages

In the next section, the researcher reviews related studies on power, subjectivity and equality to explore the construction of ESL and other discursive practices in second languages (L2s). This literature moves the spotlight beyond the sole individual ESL or other L2 learners to encompass the context in which communicative interaction occurs.

The reason for choosing these works is that they find the relationship among power, subjectivity, equality and discourse to be the most crucial factor for learner constructions of second or foreign languages. They piqued this researcher’s interest in exploring the social-cultural aspects of second language acquisition relating to the issues of power, subjectivity and discourse, under the paradigm of critical theory or post-structuralism.

Subjectivity and Power. According to critical theory and post-structuralism, subjectivity is multiple, de-centered and contradictory and is produced symbolically by discourses. A human being’s subjectivity is socially/historically determined (Weedon, 1997; Norton, 2000; Genishi, 1999). McNamara (1997) suggested that Peirce’s (1995) definition of social identity corresponds to the characteristics of subjectivity, including (1) the notion of a repertoire of social identities (the multiple nature of the subject), (2) the transformation of social identity associated with changes in the inter-group contexts in which social identity is negotiated (subjectivity as a site of struggle) and (3) the conflict perspective on inter-group relations adopted in the poststructuralist theory (subjectivity as changing over time) (Peirce, 1995; McNamara, 1997). Foucault (1982) suggested that power makes an individual subject and “imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him” (p. 781).
Employing socio-cultural theory and post-structural feminism, Norton (1995, 2000) argued that Canadian female ESL participants’ experiences of English acquisition were constructed socially, culturally and politically. The study mainly addressed the issues of subjectivity (identity) and unequal power relationships as they impacted the construction of discourse between female ESL participants and native speakers (Norton 1995, 2000). Similarly, triangulating the frameworks of socio-cultural, critical and post-structural paradigms, Toohey’s ethnographic work (1996, 2000) investigated ESL minority kindergarten students’ construction of subjectivity (identity) related to the power of classroom social order and structures. Also, based on Foucault’s (1978) idea of circulating power, Genishi’s study (1999) demonstrated that pre-kindergarten second language (L2) students’ subjectivity (identity) shifted according to varied topics and students’ cultural backgrounds. Genishi (1999) concluded that power was strategic and dynamic but not static, and was an important factor in developing individuals’ social interaction. Also, power offers a set of hierarchical categories that dominate the system of positioning practices for individuals. Also, the shift of power among teachers, students and students’ families illustrates Foucault’s (1978) idea of circulating power: through social interaction and relations, power is seen as dynamic and is reconceptualized as circulating. Such relations of power (usually unequal) among teachers, L2 learners and their families are likely to empower or marginalize L2 learners’ language acquisition depending upon the extent to which involvement and participation in classroom decisions are encouraged. Such involvement balances the distribution of power among the teachers, learners and family members.
Counter-Discourse and Subjectivity. Through the use of counter-discourse, ESL participants can shift their subjectivity (identity) (Toohey, 2000; Norton, 1995, 2000). Norton (2000) stated that “a person might resist the subject position, or even set up a counter-discourse (See Terdiman, 1985) which positions the person in a powerful rather than marginalized subject position” (p. 127). As a result, being the subject of specific discourses, people can identify their own interests in discourse. Norton (1995, 2000) explored the fact that ESL female participants sensed their subordinate identity, and tried to change their subject position (identity) while involved in English learning through the articulation of counter-discourse. Norton’s ESL female participants gained more opportunities to speak English in this manner. For example, by building counter-discourse, one participant shifted her working identity to authoritative mother in the family. Formerly, in the work place, this participant was perceived only as an immigrant woman with poor skills in English. When she changed the discursive topic to the issue of motherhood (counter-discourse), she created a stronger identity for herself. Her topic of motherhood was of interest to curious English speaking natives, which won her more chances to practice English. Similarly, Toohey (1996, 2000) observed kindergarten ESL learners’ social relations in an ESL classroom. One boy said to a girl, “You are a fish.” The girl responded to him, “And you are a bear.” When subordination occurred, this female kindergarten ESL learner engaged in counter-discourse to create for herself a desirable identity and deflect or resist other classmates’ attempts to dominate her.

‘Subject to’ or Subject of’ and Discourse. Two meanings of ‘subject’ are discussed by Foucault (1982): “subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power
which subjugates and makes subject to” (p. 181). Also, the different perspectives of ‘subject to’ and ‘subject of ’ are key concerns of Norton’s (1995, 2000) idea of social identity and L2 acquisition. In Norton’s findings, her ESL participants tried to reshape themselves in order to become ‘the subject of the discourse’, instead of being subject to the discourse, when they spoke English with the target language speakers. For instance, in the beginning, one participant maintained her marginalized subjectivity (identity). She failed to participate in discourse with English native speakers because she lacked knowledge of native speakers’ topics. But, by speaking of her European culture to co-workers, she succeeded in establishing a significant, multicultural discussion, thereby increasing her own social power so that she could gain more respect from the target speakers. Within this discourse, she achieved positive involvement and became the subject of the discourse.

‘Legitimate Peripheral Participation’ and Subjectivity. Also, the notion of ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is employed frequently to understand the construction of subjectivity (identity) within the discourse or community. Through this notion, Toohey (1996, 2000) explored kindergarten ESL learners’ situated participation in English classrooms from the development of their novice identities to the identities of full participants. Situated participation emphasizes the connection between learning and the social situation in which it takes place, and examines what social engagements can offer a satisfactory environment for learning to happen (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As for the pivotal concept of ‘legitimate peripheral participation’, it is an inevitable process which enables newcomers to gradually become involved in a new learning environment. It is regarded as a situated activity---the engagement with social
activities. The learning process is constructed during such social practices. By means of this process, newcomers can adjust themselves gradually to community practice. For example, the new language acquirer is like a legitimate peripheral participant who practices with skilled speakers. Above all, peripheral participation of newcomers refers to their positive involvement in the community operation. In this regard, “peripherality suggests that there are multiple, varied, more- or less-engaged and –inclusive ways of being located in the fields of participation defined by a community….In this sense, peripherality, when it is enabled, suggests an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement” (p. 35-37).

Eventually, peripheral participation may accomplish the goal of full participation. In legitimate peripheral participation, the newcomers of the community are like apprentices who play several roles simultaneously, such as

…status subordinate, learning practitioner, sole responsible agent in minor parts of the performance, aspiring expert, and so forth--each implying a different sort of responsibility, a different set of role relations, and a different interactive involvement.

(p. 23)

Language, Meaning and Subjectivity. Individuals’ subjectivities may determine the particular meanings of what they articulate within discourse. Using the notions of poststructuralist communication, Genishi (1999) indicated that the perspectives of subjectivity, language, and meaning are never fixed. In an attempt to demonstrate that poststructuralism can explain children’s L2 development, she mentioned two L2 classroom research studies that examined subjectivity, power, and meaning within the theories of social construction. In the two pre-kindergarten classrooms, children’s L2
development developed within the contexts of social relationships. In the first classroom, children’s subjectivity (identity) shifts depended on the different discourse topics (families, community and school life), while the language meaning shifts were based on who was speaking and what the topics were. In the second classroom, the teachers illustrated the complexities of L2 acquisition by way of indicating how children’s different social, cultural and historical knowledge and backgrounds determined language meaning. Apparently Genishi was referring to the common situation where spoken and written textual meanings vary greatly according to learners’ local, cultural and community usage and understanding. Finally, Genishi (1999) verified Derrida’s concept of ‘différance’ regarding the construction of discourse: the meaning of language is dynamic and never fixed and endless deferral occurs within discourse. Also she supported the suggestion that there tends to be no fixed and static meaning during communication within discourse. In sum, Genishi led the way for the research trend that regards post-structuralism (Derrida’s concept of ‘différance’) as a lens through which L2 discourse can be viewed.

These studies are particularly relevant to this study’s research questions and theoretical framings. They provide in-depth insight into the research questions as well as the analysis of discourse under the selected social factors of power, subjectivity and equality. They also sustain this study’s employment of critical theory and post-structuralism as the lens through which the collected data is analyzed.

In the next segment, the researcher reviews research related to the issues of linguistic legitimacy. This review extends the concerns of power, subjectivity and equality within discourse and further expands discussion to the macro-faceted issues of individual
linguistic capital and habits, language/social practices and resources, and the eligibility of language for legitimacy. This review reflects the core concerns of the ESL discourse study: the perceptions of linguistic legitimacy by participants and surrounding issues.

The Issues of Linguistic Legitimacy

The current study introduces Bourdieu’s social theory and some factors that are influential regarding the construction of linguistic legitimacy. The researcher combines discussion of these concepts because quite a few scholars base their research on Bourdieu’s social theory in order to critique and produce studies related to issues of construction of linguistic legitimacy.

At first, regarding Bourdieu’s social theory, several scholars believed that some of Bourdieu’s views had serious limitations and disputed their value, in particular, Bourdieu’s concepts of the constraint and reproduction of social structures and communication. They suggested instead the concept of social and political transformation (Lin, 1999; Collins, 1993). This debate will be further addressed in the final part of the literature review: the transformation from inequality to equality. This lively argument encouraged the researcher by allowing her to realize that positive change can correct unequal dialogue structures within ESL discourse. Despite critics’ contentions, some of Bourdieu’s philosophy, such as the concepts of ‘recognition, mis-recognition and legitimacy’ is employed to explore the main theme of this study as it relates to the construction of linguistic legitimacy. In addition, the definitions of linguistic competency, linguistic habitus and cultural capital can provide valuable information for understanding participant background in communicative interactions. The philosophy also addresses the
focus of this study --- the fact that communicative competence is socially and culturally constructed.

Second, the researcher discusses and summarizes some aspects impacting the construction of linguistic legitimacy from the related literature. These factors include (a) the struggle to define legitimate language, and (b) symbolic domination of a specific language.

Bourdieu’s Social Theory

The study reviews literature that addresses aspects of Bourdieu’s social theory, including the reproduction of communication and social structure, the definition of linguistic competency and cultural (linguistic) capital and linguistic habitus. These aspects are directly related to this study’s focus on the social communication and oral competence of adult non-native English speakers. The wide diversity of Bourdieu’s other social theory is not explored.

Bourdieu’s Insights on the Reproduction of Communication and Social Structure

According to Bourdieu, the construction of legitimate/dominant linguistic practice is accomplished through the exercise of symbolic violence. This results in the reproduction of communication and social structure. In a sense, symbolic violence is a medium of social reproduction. Lin (1999) interpreted Bourdieu’s symbolic violence as “the imposition of representations of the world and social meanings upon groups in such a way that these representations are experienced as legitimate. This is achieved through a process of mis-recognition” (p. 395). Bourdieu’s theory of recognition/mis-recognition facilitates comprehension of the phenomenon of symbolic violence. Recognition refers to the notice and appreciation of certain practices of power, tendency and control in any
specific institution, while mis-recognition refers to the fact that these practices are actually being imposed surreptitiously. The concept of mis-recognizing certain practices that are arbitrary, and thereby recognizing them as legitimate makes this the most important philosophy in the effort to elucidate the reproduction and domination of communication and social structure (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984).

Furthermore, Bourdieu’s concept of the cultural arbitrary describes the forced acceptance of given values during the symbolic violence process. Cultural arbitrariness is wedded to the structure of power relations between classes or groups (Thompson, 1984). A cultural arbitrary is imposed whenever one participant’s perceptions, beliefs, values and decisions are forced upon the other participants during communication. Reviewing Bourdieu’s concepts, Thompson (1984) suggested that “if symbolic violence is the imposition of a cultural arbitrary, then such violence is also implicit in the hierarchies of language and ways of using language” (p. 57). In sum, being disguised and gentle, the symbolic violence is concealed within the process of communication. Symbolic violence is allowed to occur because the practices of power and domination circulate fully during communication.

Three illustrations of the above principles.

First, the researcher assumes that a certain variety of English (e.g., western English) functions as a means of censorship and represents an established criteria that is used to measure and censor English speakers’ performance. This symbolic imposition of ‘a certain variety of English as a standard for censorship is recognized as legitimate (or is a mis-recognized as cultural arbitrary) (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) wherever English is spoken. Second, Thompson (1984) raised other examples. In order to be admitted to a
university, working-class students engaged in improving their regional accents in order to emulate the ‘correct scholarly English.’ The symbolic imposition of ‘mastering the correct scholarly English in order to be admitted to the university’ is recognized as legitimate (or is a mis-recognized cultural arbitrary) within this institution. Finally, Lin (1999) provided a third example: in a unified linguistic market, such as Hong Kong, only English is recognized as legitimate. In Hong Kong, the symbolic imposition ‘English-medium schools = good schools’ is a mis-recognized cultural arbitrary. Usually, such reproduction of the verbal language and contextualized expression result from the determination of social and cultural conditions (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984; Bourdieu, 1986, 1991; Lin, 1999). This corresponds to Bourdieu’s (1986) elaboration of sociological pursuits: nurture (environment) is deemed more important than nature (genetic inheritance) in the development of the individual’s language capital.

Generally speaking, the educational system is the principal location for exercising symbolic violence and envisaging the imposition of a cultural arbitrary. Thompson (1984) concluded that the reproduction concept of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), suggests that the education system is regarded as “an institutionalized agency for the exercise of symbolic violence, where the latter is understood as the imposition of a cultural arbitrary.” (p. 57). Thus, symbolic violence is likely to be built into the education system in a manner that forces the replication of the unequal distribution of resources in society.

The Definition of Linguistic Competency. Bourdieu’s concept of practical language competency is related to the establishment of effective communication a propos linguistic capital. This refers to individuals’ capacity to express themselves adequately in
a certain context. The meaning of legitimate speakers is elucidated as the right to speak as well as the power to impose reception (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Bourdieu, 1991; Thompson, 1984). An individual’s accent, vocabulary and grammar can produce a certain value indicative of their social identity, thereby reflecting significantly the qualities of their linguistic capital. To explain linguistic capital, Bourdieu drew an analogy between the usage of language and the economic marketplace. In this respect, Thompson (1984) viewed Bourdieu’s position regarding social practice as not reducible to the economic model. Instead, Bourdieu broadly used economic terminology/concepts to analyze the processes of general fields, such as politics and literature, which construct social practices.

**Cultural (Linguistic) Capital and Linguistic Habitus.** Bourdieu (1986, 1991) employed the terms ‘field’, ‘market’, and ‘game’ in referring to the social contexts in which positions are determined by the distribution of social, economic, cultural and symbolic capital. This study focuses on the discussion of cultural capital. Language is a form of cultural capital having a high exchange value. This is true of certain types of embodied cultural capital, including linguistic capital. Certain types of cultural knowledge are accepted and appreciated within a given social context. Similarly, within a certain linguistic ‘market,’ one variety of language might be the most popular and accepted.

Bourdieu created the theory of ‘linguistic habitus’ to facilitate his interpretation of the relationship between individual linguistic disposition and the distribution of cultural (linguistic) capital in the linguistic market. According to this theory, if an individual’s linguistic habitus corresponds to society’s preferred language, he/she possesses inherent advantages in the area of cultural (linguistic) capital. Also, he/she benefits from
familiarity with society’s legitimate linguistic practice as it is played out in specific contexts. Bourdieu explained ‘linguistic habitus’ by suggesting that an individual’s inherent disposition to speak in a certain way was the product of early influences such as community and family. Individual linguistic capital is integrated into or incorporated within individuals and becomes a kind of habitus (Bourdieu, 1986; Wacquant, 1989). It is a set of dispositions composed of capital and resources, a sort of cultural baggage. Linguistic habitus is formed through human beings’ socialization and is influenced by the family’s social position (Lin, 1999, Zolberg, 1986). Therefore, when the individual develops a specific linguistic habitus that is similar to an articulated and valued language, such a linguistic habitus is likely to facilitate linguistic exchange. As a result, it is an effective attribute for the acquisition of language and is socially advantageous. For example, if an English speaker’s individual ‘linguistic habitus’ (e.g., accent) is close to what is spoken at preferred schools or in elite society, he/she is likely to have greater opportunities to function effectively in the school’s learning setting and achieve greater social mobility.

In sum, Bourdieu’s theory of the social context of communication infers a form of social stratification of speech and legitimate linguistic practice in specific contexts. It is embedded in coercive configuration/recognition of certain legitimate speech varieties and speakers through the exercise of asymmetrical power. The criteria of certain linguistic competencies are reproduced as an imposed form to be acquired by language learners.

Factors Influencing the Construction of Linguistic Legitimacy

In this section, this researcher addresses some aspects impacting the construction of linguistic legitimacy. They cover (a) the struggle to define a legitimate language, and (b)
symbolic domination of a specific language. This section of the review reflects the central concerns of this ESL discourse study: participants’ perceptions of linguistic legitimacy and associated issues. It will further expand the discussion to the concerns of power, subjectivity and equality within the larger global discourse. This discussion will extend to the final section, ‘the transformation from inequality to equality,’ which empowers non-native English speakers with the concepts of ‘World English’ and critical applied linguistics.

**The Struggle to Define the Legitimate Language**. In the work of Soo (1990), the most compelling concerns are: Do Malaysians believe that their English is different from the British variety of English? Do Malaysians count on their English as a legitimate product of their own culture and identity? Does Black English have its own legitimacy or does it exist only as a dialect of English (Reagan, 1997)? Similarly, Heller (1996) discussed the social arrangements and consequences of linguistic practices in a French-language minority high school in Ontario. His findings show that the ‘standard’ form of French is the better variety for creating opportunity for social mobilization and identifying speakers as legitimate francophones. Ostensibly, these debates explain the ambivalent attitudes to second, foreign language and bilingual education. Also, these contestations of language sanctioning reveal the social, historical and political struggle for domination and associated resistance to certain legitimate linguistic practices.

A growing body of research is concerned with the issues of linguistic legitimacy—the authorization of a particular linguistic system that is most highly valued by a community. Initiating this concern, Reagan (1997) raised the powerful questions ‘what is a real language, and what is not a language?’ in educational discourse. This may further extend
to the issue of ‘who can decide what is regarded as legitimate knowledge in an educational setting?’ (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996). The practice of foreign/second language seems to be constrained within a context of asymmetric structures. These unequal structures are likely to limit foreign/second language learners’ access to the target language (the foreign/second language they are encountering).

The determination of linguistic legitimacy is affected by linguistic, social and cultural factors. Reagan (1997) believed that the criteria used to distinguish the so-called ‘legitimated’ from ‘illegitimate’ language are not standardized and defensible. Usually, the criteria are a reflection of unavoidable, extra-linguistic (e.g., social and cultural) factors. For example, Black English and Standard English are two different varieties of English. They share the same linguistic position, but not the same socio-linguistic status (Reagan, 1997). As a result, for most speakers of these two different English varieties, their preference is not merely an issue of the choice of English variety, but also a statement of the speakers’ cultural rights and social positions. Reagan’s concept provides evidence that supports the view that the practice and legitimacy of language are socially and culturally constructed; the factors impacting this construction are tied to social and cultural reality. The concerns addressed above reflect multiple dimensions of linguistic legitimacy.

Another related concern of linguistic legitimacy is the construction of cultural (linguistic) capital. The more linguistic capital people possess, the more chances of success they have in a society in which this legitimate language dominates. Linguistic capital is defined as “fluency in, and comfort with, a high-status, world-wide language which is used by groups who possess economic, social, cultural and political power and
status in local and global society” (Morrison & Liu, 2000, p. 473). The thesis of linguistic capital is connected to the notion of cultural capital. It refers to the collection of non-economic forces, such as cultural background, social advantage and linguistic facility (Bourdieu, 1986). Morrison and Liu (2000) suggested that, in Hong Kong, the concept of linguistic capital is likely to be apposite in shedding light on the issues of the prevalence of ‘Putonghua’ (Mandarin), the growth of Chinese as a medium of instruction, and the struggle over the practice of English or Chinese-medium education during the post-colonial era. Through acquisition of linguistic capital of the mainstream society, language learners legitimate the production of power and redness their unequal social position as a method of access to higher social promotion and mobilization.

As for the location for the construction of linguistic capital, Heller (1996) suggested that “by looking at bilingual classroom discourse this allows us to see how people draw on their linguistic resources to accomplish their aims” (p. 156). Heller believed that analysis of discourse reveals that education (the classroom) is the most crucial site in the construction of sanctioned language capital. This finding corresponds to the concept of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977): the educational institution is an important site for production of symbolic domination. Generally speaking, the acquirement of sanctioned language capital underlies the imposition of symbolic domination. Once acquired, the sanctioned language may be used as a weapon for the symbolic domination of those who do not possess such capital. The issue of symbolic domination is discussed further below.

**Symbolic Domination of a Specific Language.** The term symbolic resources refers to certain kinds of linguistic skills, professional information and cultural knowledge
(Bourdieu, 1991). Prevailing symbolic resources (e.g., usually legitimate languages) are likely to cause symbolic domination within the symbolic market. According to Bourdieu (1991), the symbolic market is constructed by certain situations, such as job and education settings. Within the symbolic market, people tend to attain to material resources (e.g., money and real estate) once symbolic resources are achieved.

However, when these symbolic resources are greatly popular and accepted as a method of obtaining advantages in the symbolic market, they become a form of symbolic domination. In this regard, Heller (1995, p. 373), influenced by Bourdieu (1977), defined the concept of symbolic domination as “the ability of certain social groups to maintain control over others by establishing their view of reality and their cultural practices as the most valued and, perhaps more importantly, as the norm.” For example, English is the dominant symbolic resource of the linguistic market in Hong Kong. This tendency and practice results from the government’s social selection policies and its historical relationship with China (Lin, 1996). Lin asserted that the difference in people’s social standing and power was based on their use of English, Cantonese, or the mix of both. Also, the code switch between Cantonese and English envisages that the students with limited English competency, make efforts to survive within the English-dominated education system. As a result, this phenomenon probably causes concern regarding language learners’ accommodation or resistance to social structures and language practices in Hong Kong. Also, within the practice of these languages, this production of asymmetrical power constructs interpersonal inequality due to varying degrees of English/Cantonese competency.
In addition, the government or school administrators are likely to implement symbolic domination through implementation of language requirements for government employment and curriculum and instruction in general or language classrooms. The studies of Heller (1996) and Martin-Jones and Heller (1996) suggested that in certain linguistic contexts, dominant groups tend to control the language teaching curriculum and materials, the particular media of language instruction, the method of language learning, and the teaching practices of the language classroom, as well as the possibilities of official employment. As a result, the language teachers and learners locate themselves within laws and institutional structures, the enforcement of which succeeds in implementing linguistic domination. For instance, Martin-Jones and Heller (1996) suggested that the procedure of ‘turn-taking’ in the language classroom makes decisions concerning who can speak, when, and in what language. This controls the positioning of most of the students within the language classroom and confirms symbolic (linguistic) domination. Furthermore, Heller (1995), who discovered that by means of language choice and code-switching (e.g., in Ontario, the exchange or intertwining between English and French), the exercise of symbolic domination impacted language learners’ ability to wield or resist power from the program structure, curriculum content and language practice.

Heller’s findings (1995) reflect the influence of Foucault’s power theory, which always connects the issues of knowledge and language competence. Foucault maintained that “power is always linked to resistance: Where there is power, there is resistance” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 91). Resistance to symbolic (linguistic) domination is common. Despite the fact that language practices in schools or social contexts are liable to be
completed and articulated, the strong possibility of some forms of resistance against the imposition of this language practice exists. The exercise of language domination is accompanied by resistance, and the resulting condition allows for the creation of interstices. The term ‘interstices’ refers to the situation within structures of society where language practices are not tightly determined and strictly adhered to (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Heller, 1995). For example, English-speaking Canadians studying French insisted that time should be divided, believing that French speaking should be practiced only within the official class time. They believed that English speaking should be allowed at all other times—even though their French teacher objected. In another example, an English speaker attempted to get a bilingual (English/French) official to communicate with him in English during her office hours (testing whether the French-only rule applied at such times). Interstices are a common form of resistance found in the practice of foreign/second language implementation.

The Transformation from Inequality to Equality

This section provides an overview of literature related to the transformation from inequality to equality: the empowerment of non-native English speakers through a critical approach to foreign/second language education and the validation of multiple varieties of English. This review addresses related research concerning theories for reducing the control of certain politically and socially dominant groups over languages and language-related issues. In particular, the study draws from literature that directly describes ESL and EFL education rather than the entire field of language education.
Critical Approach to Foreign/Second Language Education

From the perspectives of critical the approach, the use of language is not descriptive (value-free); instead, it is prescriptive (value-laden), specifying preferred forms and usage. This refers to the fact that languages are much more than their linguistic characteristics. They are social, cultural and political exchanges that are used and constructed within a complicated framework in which issues of culture, gender, ethnicity, power, subjectivity, and equality all are involved. Therefore, language education is not a neutral activity but a political one, as maintained by the critical approach.

Within foreign and second language education, the critique of second language acquisition (SLA) is of importance because current SLA theory tends to discuss the domain of psychology, instead of the social, cultural, political and physical domains where language learning takes place (Pennycook, 1999). Here the critical approach to foreign/second language education appears. Differing from positivistic traditions, it adopts the critical position of normative practice. For example, Pennycook (1994) contended that such a critical approach to research stands in opposition to that of mainstream research in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The orientation mainly aims its inquiry at transforming the disadvantaged participants of foreign/second language education in order to empower them. This transformation would consist of making students aware of conditions such as western cultural hegemony, the imposition of standard English, privilege of certain ethnicities, teacher-centered classrooms, and gender bias in English language learning. Therefore, viewing TESOL research as a political agenda is an urgent concern.
In the following segment, the study reviews three key perceptions regarding the critical approach to foreign and second language education, including Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed, Pennycook’s critical applied linguistics, and the idea of transformation of non-native learners and teachers from a disadvantaged position to a situation of equality and empowerment in the context of foreign and second language education.  

Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed. In education, the critical approach has been significantly impacted by Paulo Freire’s (1970) philosophy that libertarian/problem-posing education develops students’ critical consciousness and creative power. This libertarian/problem-posing education is viewed as superior to traditional ‘banking education.’ The following discusses the characteristics of banking education and libertarian/problem-posing education. Banking education means that students are like receptacles, memorizing the narrative content mechanically presented by teachers. It contains one of the characteristic of the “ideology of oppression” (p. 58), negating education as a process of inquiry. To some extent, banking education arouses contradictions between teachers and students through its unequal interaction/practices. Some important features of this approach are: (1) the teacher knows everything and students know nothing; (2) the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his/her own professional authority, which he/she sets in opposition to the freedom of the students; and (3) the teacher is the subject of the learning process, while the students are objects. However, libertarian/problem-posing education emphasizes that people should be regarded as conscious beings; education is made up of acts of cognition instead of transferals of information. Liberating education is a kind of learning situation in which the cognizable object can mediate between the teacher and student so that they may
resolve their contradictions. In addition, Freire emphasizes that liberation is a praxis (a process of action and self-reflexivity) that contributes to the motivation of the oppressed to seek their liberation.

To sum up, “banking education” is similar to the concept of education as a practice of domination, while problem-posing education means that education is a practice of freedom. Banking educational methods cannot be used to achieve liberation from the oppressor.

Pennycook’s Critical Applied Linguistics. Pennycook (2001) revised the concept of ‘applied linguistics,’ proposing instead ‘critical applied linguistics,’ a stronger version of applied linguistics in foreign/second language acquisition. Critical applied linguistics is a way of thinking and doing, “a praxis which is a continuous reflexive integration of thought, desire and action” (Simon, 1992 p. 49; quoted in Pennycook, 2001). Arguing against the shortcomings of ‘decontextualised context’ (Pennycook, 1994) and disagreeing with Williams’ (1992) idea that language is located in a static society, he suggested that language should be considered in relation to the issues of power, injustice and inequality in the broader/macro social critical and political domains. In particular, he emphasized the concept of “an historical understanding of how social relations came to be the way they are” (p. 6). In addition, through awareness and emancipation, critical applied linguistics focuses on the possibilities of change in social oppression and inequality.

Pennycook’s (2001) application of the over-arching term ‘critical applied linguistics’ opens the door for other fields, such as critical theory, feminism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism and anti-racist pedagogy, that challenge and greatly enrich the possibilities...
for discussing linguistics. This newer paradigm for foreign/second language education is different from the current and mainstream paradigm. However, Pennycook does not fully agree that critical applied linguistics includes the areas of critical discourse analysis, critical language awareness, critical literacy and critical pedagogy. For instance, he believes that critical pedagogy is used in quite a few fields of education that do not completely correspond to the domain of second language acquisition (SLA).

In addition, Pennycook (2001) invoked the concept of the ‘politics of translation’ by agreeing with Venuti’s (1997) suggestion that the translations of texts into other languages should be based on an ethics that respects linguistic and cultural differences. For example, the authentic sense of words in the original language should always be preserved rather than imposing meanings that are associated with another culture. This action could be likely to diminish the dominant hegemony of English. In this regard, English translation is related to the concerns of class, gender, social context and differences of applied linguistics.

In sum, foreign/second language education is encouraged to employ the self-reflexive position of problematizing the practice of critical applied linguistics in applying skeptical thought to naturalized daily and taken-for-granted issues, such as the inequality of the native/non-native relationship, ethnicity, social class and gender concerns. This discussion should be conducive to exploration of the connection between foreign/second language acquisition and social, critical and political domains.

The Idea of Transformation. Social and political transformation is the central idea constituting a critical approach. Such transformative endeavors tend to help dominated groups gain insight into the existing cultural/political coercion, thereby empowering them
to emancipate themselves from a situation replete with injustice (Freire, 1970; Rivera, 1999; Pennycook, 1994, 1997; Lin, 1999; Collins, 1993, Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). The concept of transformation is employed in Pennycook’s study of TESOL research. Pennycook (1994, 1996) advocated the transformation of mainstream English education in order to empower the marginalized student (e.g., non-native speakers) to change the conditions of social inequality; this is the implementation of pedagogical inclusivity. Pennycook (1999) stated that “a critical approach to TESOL is the inclusion of means of transformation” (p. 335).

In this segment, the concern with transformation covers the discussion of (1) the extent of the limitations of Bourdieu’s reproduction of social structures and communication of social theory, (2) the use of critical participatory research, (3) empowerment of non-native-speaking teachers, (4) as well as discussion of the gender issue in order to improve the condition of non-native language speakers.

First, the idea of transformation is in opposition to Bourdieu’s concept of the constraint and reproduction of social structures, including inborn cultural capital (habitus), hierarchical socio-cultural status, and advantaged ethnicity. With this context, people are caught in a pessimistic, deterministic and reproductive social structure. For instance, the power of English increases by degree around the world. This phenomenon is exacerbated by the effects of habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). Habitus refers to a system of embodied attitudes that generate behavior in accordance with structural principles. For example, children are endowed with habitus by means of socialization in their families. However, language learners’ habitus, for example, ethnicity, linguistic and socio-cultural inequality is likely to be transformed through the critical approach to TESOL pedagogy.
Lin’s (1999) study confirmed the concepts of the transformation in English (second language) education in Hong Kong. Lin’s findings verified Collins’s philosophy: foreign language teachers’ creative practice can transform students’ disadvantaged/inferior social world. She was concerned about students’ cultural disadvantages, and urged TESOL practitioners to explore creative, discursive efforts/strategies in order to transform English learners’ inferior social world.

Second, by using participatory research, Rivera’s (1994) investigation indicated that community-based education/language programs encourage participants to be concerned with oppressive social inequality and aim at constant social transformation.

Third, within the ESL/EFL environment, the empowerment of non-native-English-speaking teachers may be an indirect way of impacting non-native students. This may facilitate improvement in their position by providing them with an effective, competent, and relevant learning environment led by an instructor capable of relating closely to them because he/she shares the same cultural background. Seen in this light, it may be stated that empowerment of non-native English teachers also empowers non-native English students. In this regard, based on critical praxis, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) explored the unequal, disadvantaged position of non-native-English-speaking teachers when compared to that of native speaking instructors. They hoped to assist non-native-English-speaking teachers to overcome the powerlessness of their discourses in order to achieve the empowerment of non-native-English-speaking teachers. When empowered, they were able to construct their own identities with respect to language teaching and learning contexts.
Fourth, the transformation of unequal gender is an issue of great concern within foreign/second language teaching and learning. Based on both Wong’s (1994) dialogic approach--the research process of “discussion, writing, reflection and more discussion” (p. 11)--and the problem-posing approach of Freire (1970), Frye (1999) discussed the critical participatory education of immigrant women. He was concerned with their empowerment and their rise from inferior positions in the target culture which marginalizes and oppresses them. Through creation of a non-threatening environment, these women can be enabled to practice and achieve critical literacy. Similarly, Rivera (1999) focused on the application of critical pedagogy to explore female ESL learners’ practice of bilingualism and biliteracy in equal social contexts. Most important, Rivera suggested that the use of learners’ native language be used in the educational process “not only as an aid to learning English but also as a terrain of knowledge and a field of possibilities that linked students’ experiences to collective action” (p. 485).

In sum, the critical approach to foreign/second language in English practices concerns itself with inequitable contexts where language teaching/learning occurs and tries to change the inequitable conditions which are connected to the educational, social and political domain. The critical approach should be transformative, that is, answerable to the politics of social change, moving from social inequality to empowerment of foreign/second language teaching and learning.

The Validation of Multiple Varieties of English

In extending the above concept of social and political transformation to foreign/second language acquisition, the meaning of the validation of multiple varieties of English--‘World Englishes’-- is discussed in order to elucidate the concept that provided the
background for this study. For this reason, and because of its specific linguistic relevance to this study, the concept of ‘World English’ is singled out from the critical approach discussed above, even though it is a derivation of this school of thought.

People in many countries are willing to devote themselves to learning English as their foreign/second language to meet a variety needs, such as passing exams, being well-prepared in skills for their careers, and study in an English-speaking country. Nations that speak English (English as one of the official languages) seem to be better positioned in terms of political stability and economic prosperity. As a result, English is prevailing all over the world. For example, Ho (1992) points out that English has been adopted as a leading language because it is widespread in all aspects of international communication and other facets of modern life. In many countries, English is a leading language in bilingual education. Ho (1992) observes:

As Singapore wishes to maintain its sovereignty against strong influence from neighboring Malaysia and China (with whom most of the Singapore residents are ethnically affiliated), the government chose English not only because of its international status but more importantly to promote interethnic unity (p. 65).

In the case of Singapore, English has a privileged status in its ability to enable people to overcome difficulties and achieve well-established social and economic life styles. Thus, English-speaking cultures appear to be more prestigious than local cultures. The invasion of a long-term ascendant language dominator represses indigenous non-native learners’ original language and local cultural autonomy. With the ascendance of English to a totally dominant position, second/foreign language learners (especially in non-western countries) may need to better understand how the invasion of ‘Standard English’
may change their position and greatly influence their local culture. Similarly, Tsuda (1997) believes that in the international context, with the super-imposition of English, which is the taken-for-granted language, people are expected to speak English; at the same time, other languages become isolated from international communication and relegated to a lower status. He further explains that the worst impact of the domination of English is the “Americanization of global culture [that] is happening today” (p. 23). As the non-English speaking countries and non-natives need to be emancipated from the oppression of legitimate Standard English (mainly Western English), the concept of ‘World Englishes’ has emerged and received wide support.

According to Kachru (1992), ‘World Englishes’ is distinguished from ‘standard English’ in its recognition of the diversity of a language and the ways in which language creates socio-linguistic reality. ‘World Englishes’ as a paradigm creates a different English teaching scenario; it ushers in the development of autonomous structural linguistics roughly corresponding to the historical move away from positivism. That is, according to the positivist philosophy, there is only one ‘truth’ that can be inferred from the imperialism of ‘Standard English’. However, in post-positivism, lots of ‘facts’—World Englishes—exist. In this regard, Lather (1986) suggests that ‘the facts’ underlying the concept of values, theories and social constructions have an immortality as contrasted with truth claims. Such a progressive shifting of paradigms represents a new awareness of Western chauvinism and the realization that the so-called ‘standard English’ is not an exclusive vehicle. It should not hold the only truth for English education. The concept of the ‘multiple reality of Englishes’ suggests tolerance of many possibilities and the acceptance of more complexities of voice for different English varieties. In addition,
Pennycook’s (1994) work helps to explain the ambivalent attitudes regarding English learners’ language choice (use of local language or English) as well as the issue of linguistic (English) superiority. As he has noted, because of the emergence of and increasing prevalence of the ‘worldiness’ of English, English language learning should be considered within the local cultural and political contexts of use. The concept of World Englishes provides increasing individual freedom of local culture to extend the limits of learning and can support the liberation of the language learner’s community, giving the learner a sense of individual and ethnic identity.

However, Tsuda (1997) was concerned that “the use of World English may generate… hierarchical structure among different varieties of English, probably with American or British variety at the top of that hierarchy” (pp. 25-26). Therefore, whether the American or British variety of English is equated with greater power, individual prestige and status is a central issue. However, the concept of ‘World Englishes’ raises the possibility of significant communication issues. Due to the complexity of various forms of English, is it possible that various-type English speakers might experience breakdowns in communication? Can the structural integrity of English be sustained in spite of the use of many varieties of English? Further study will be needed to address these questions.

Finally, this trend of ‘World Englishes’ in relation to the study of English as second/foreign education facilitates emancipation of those without voice in international communication, thereby abolishing the western-centered linguistic imperialism of English. English educators can help to rescue non-native English speakers from the oppressive feelings of colonization and English language imperialism.
Conclusion

In this chapter, the literature review has discussed the major areas crucial to this ESL discourse project. While not comprehensive, this review offers relevant coverage of: (1) critical theory and post-structuralism in discourse, power, and subjectivity in formulating and contextualizing the theoretical framework of the research questions. This discussion is also employed in the analysis of data collected and represented in the course of the process of this research; (2) issues in the construction of linguistic legitimacy and Bourdieu’s social theory, which under-gird the main themes of the study and speak to the purposes of the struggles of non-native English speakers; (3) and finally, the critical approach to foreign/second language education and the validation of multiple varieties of Englishes, addressing the subject that prompted this researcher’s interest in this field.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

Once we recognize that just as there is no neutral education there is no neutral research, we no longer need to apologize for unabashedly ideological research and its open commitment for using research to criticize and change the status quo (Lather, 1986b, p. 67).

This study explores non-native adult English speakers’ perspectives regarding their participatory legitimacy within ESL discourse in the U.S. Participatory legitimacy is a function of power hierarchies and cultural arbitrariness. The discourse settings focus solely on the oral communication between English native and non-native adult English speakers. In this study, this researcher considers what the participants think and say about the concept of ‘legitimate speaker,’ as well as their behavior as cross-cultural ESL learners, to be a product of how they interpret the world around them.

The position of this researcher is not a neutral one. She has intended to make non-native adult English speakers aware of their unequal power status as cross-cultural English learners in ESL discourse, thereby enabling them to criticize this situation.

A qualitative approach was used to characterize the nature of the non-native adult English speakers’ behaviors, tendencies, subjectivity (social identity, behaviors, understandings of the world) (McNamara, 1997, Peirce, 1995, Gavey, 1989) and self-perception within ESL discourse.
This methodology chapter consists of three sections. First, the researcher introduces some primary characteristics which are related to this study, two of which have considerable impact on the study--dialectical inquiry and the emic and etic approaches. Second, the rationale for employing a qualitative methodology is discussed. Third, the researcher discusses the research design, including the case study approach, the sampling process, data collection procedures, procedures and methods to analyze the data, and the write-up. Finally, the researcher examines the issue of trustworthiness as it relates to the methodological decisions of this study.

Characteristics of the Qualitative Approach

This study was conducted using a qualitative approach. Qualitative research designs are typically not intended to prove or test a theory. Wainwright (1997) suggested that a qualitative approach can be “characterized as the attempt to obtain an in-depth understanding of the meanings and definitions of the situation presented by informants…” (p. 1-2). It is an inductive approach (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). In the following, this researcher discusses some basic characteristics of the qualitative approach, such as its assumptions about the nature of the world, the purpose of qualitative approach, the character of the research methods, the role of the researcher, data analysis and reporting of the findings tracked and developed by this project.

First, the assumptions of the qualitative approach about the nature of the world are based on naturalistic phenomenological philosophy (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). This philosophy believes that there are social facts with a dynamic reality or multiple realities. Altheide and Johnson (1994) stated that qualitative researchers deal with contextual and tacit knowledge of post-positivist multi-vocality. Multiple realities are
acquired through individuals’ interpretations of interactive, multifaceted and shared social experiences (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Dynamic reality is captured using the method of prolonged engagement (Padgett, 1998).

Second, the purpose of the qualitative approach is better comprehension of complex social phenomena and situations obtained from listening to participants’ perspectives. The researchers’ work is usually exploratory and interpretive in nature. They are likely to utilize their findings “to build theory from the ground” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 102). For this researcher, acceptance of the concept of multiple realities was influential. Also, this study attempts to contribute to the exploration of differences by revealing characteristics of participants’ experiences within ESL social contexts. The goal of understanding social phenomena from the participants’ perspectives is realized by analyzing the participants’ description of their complex experiences in this study. As a result, this project seeks to describe and explain participants’ actions, beliefs, and feelings regarding their ESL discursive interactions with English native speakers.

Third, the nature of research methods and processes in a qualitative approach are more changeable, holistic, emergent and context-bound. The qualitative research process tends to be flexible and emergent, with specific focus, design, analysis and interpretation development (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Qualitative research tends to transmit the participants’ messages in a holistic manner through the employment of thick description (Padgett, 1998). In addition, as Denzin and Lincoln (2000) observed,

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transfer the world. They turn the world into a series of representations,
including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recording and memos to the self. (p. 3)

How does a design emerge? Based on Lincoln and Guba (1985), the research should engage in continuous data analysis. Every new act of investigation considers everything that has been learned so far (the emergent nature of data). That is, in the naturalistic paradigm, research design must be emergent. This study corresponds to qualitative research methods and processes in that it is context-oriented, flexible and employs an emergent design in its attempt to understand the participants’ construction of participatory legitimacy in ESL discourse.

Fourth, in addition, qualitative researchers immerse themselves (e.g., interviews, observations) in the complexity of the situation that they are studying. The qualitative approach tends to be characterized by context sensitivity. Because of the researchers’ involvement in the research settings during data collection, they are regarded as instruments (Padgett, 1998, Leedy & Ormrod, 2001), although well-trained and well-prepared instruments equipped for the task of data collection (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Lather (1986b) suggested that a researcher’s self-corrective stance may make it possible to avoid forcing observational phenomena into predetermined interpretive schemes, and that taking a self-critical attitude to the research assumption is significant for the qualitative researcher. In this study, the researcher was immersed in the situation that was studied. Also, she sought to practice self-reflexivity, examining her personal and theoretical commitments to see how they acted as resources for conducting this project in particular ways.
Fifth, furthermore, a qualitative approach employs inductive analysis and interpretive narratives for reporting its findings. Leedy and Ormrod (2001) suggested that during inductive analysis the qualitative researchers “make many specific observations and then draw inferences about larger and more general phenomena” (p. 103). In terms of reporting findings, qualitative research reports are created through the process of creative analytic practice (CAP) and aim to evoke readers’ emotional responses. This type of writing is not produced after research (Richardson, 2000), but created during research. The write-up is a creative and dynamic process. The writing genre has been enlarged to include conversation, drama, fiction and poetry. In addition, the qualitative approach often takes subjectivity into account for analyzing data and the write-up procedure (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). This project applied the inductive method to discover, observe and make inferences about participants’ interaction with English native speakers within ESL discourse. The findings have been reported by using interpretive description and individual quotes. The findings report is likely to represent this researcher’s positioning, revealing who she is as a researcher and allowing the future reader to interpret it as he/she will. This results from the researcher’s allowing her sense of subjectivity into this research project.

The summary above discusses the fundamental characteristics of the qualitative approach with respect to this study. In the following segment, this researcher describes two other characteristics of qualitative research--dialectical inquiry and the emic and etic approaches--which explicitly influence this study.

The Use of Dialectical Inquiry. This researcher was led by the idea of dialectical thinking to resolve the divergent responses and interpretations that emerged during the data
collection process. Dialectical inquiry is derived from the concept that realities and knowledge are constructed through individuals’ social interactions. The process of dialectical inquiry was applied to reconcile the conflicting information the researcher and participants yielded during the interviews. Manzo et al. (1992) explained that dialectical thinking means the disposition to view issues through multiple perspectives in order to reach the most reasonable and economical reconciliation of contradictory information.

Dialectical thinking is not a debate but a form of analytical reasoning, and the dialectical interchange is used to reconcile the different viewpoints of interviewers and participants. In this regard, based on Guba and Lincoln (1994), “the variable and personal (intramental) nature of social constructions suggests that individual constructions can be elicited and refined only through interaction between investigators and respondents” (p. 111). Also, the purpose of employing dialectical inquiry should be to transform the ignorance and misunderstanding of participants’ original responses into more sophisticated and informed data. As a result, the researchers and participants are likely to extract a consensus for the meaning of data. The researcher engaged in a dialogue with the participants to analyze their pre-conceptions relating to English usage, identity and the process of adaptation to new culture experiences in the ESL discourse of the U.S.

In the following section, the researcher discusses the meaning and choice of emic (inside, experience-near) and etic (outside, experience-distant) approaches. Balancing these two approaches should help the researcher to grasp the participants’ perspectives and practices in their community, thereby ensuring that these findings connect with, and transfer to, academic expression.
The Combination of Emic (Inside, Experience-near) and Etic (Outside, Experience-distant) Approaches. This researcher attempted to balance the employment of emic and etic approaches in order to appropriately elucidate the findings, realistically and academically, regarding participants’ perspectives, feelings and behaviors. The concepts emic and etic are derived from the linguistic terms phonemic and phonetic (Schwandt, 1997). Emic means “the local language, concepts or ways of expression used by members in a particular group or setting to name their experience” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 35). Etic refers to “the scientific language used by the social scientist to refer to the same phenomena” (p. 35-36). Based on this definition, an etic approach tends to be context stripping. But there is no purely emic project, because a researcher needs to make editorial and academic decisions in preparing or reporting his or her study. These two terms are currently used in distinguishing between inside and outside perspectives in qualitative research, although the distinctions are relative.

Similarly, Geertz (1983; quoted in Schwandt, 1997) stressed the concept of ‘experience-near’ and ‘experience-distant’ as a refinement of the distinction between emic and etic, in order to grasp the perspective of those who are researched (insiders). On the one hand, an experience-near concept means that participants use nature/local language to communicate their immediate feelings and thoughts. Participants can also understand others who use the same concepts. They use the experience-near concept to communicate with each other. On the other hand, an experience-distant concept refers to specialists’ use of scientific or academic terminology to communicate their academic findings. Therefore, use of only experience-near concepts causes the researcher’s writing to suffer from excessive use of the vernacular in describing immediate researched
experiences, while use of experience-distant concepts tends to isolate the researcher in a world of abstracted academic jargon. Concerning this issue, Vidich and Lyman (2000) posed these questions: “By which values are observations to be guided? How is it possible to understand the other when the other’s values are not one’s own?” (p. 41)

In this study, the researcher selected six non-native adult English participants from diverse cultural backgrounds. This study has hoped to describe these participants’ perspectives regarding their right to speak as legitimate speakers. This description includes participants’ approaches, tendencies, motivation as well as their social identities and self-perceptions in ESL discourse. In addition, the manner in which these findings could be developed, communicated and connected adequately to the body of academic literature was crucial for this study. For effective communication with the participants, this researcher used the emic approach to describe her study’s purpose and to design colloquial, comprehensible and explicit interview questions in order to collect valuable and validated data. Use of the emic approach, however, should not preclude realization of the academic goals of this study. This researcher maintained a dialogue with participants in order to analyze their pre-conceptions concerning social identity, English usage, and acculturation experiences in ESL discourse. The researcher employed the etic approach while adding theoretical framing for the purpose of providing different analytical viewpoints. Honan et al. (2000) suggested that putting theory into the data discussion contributes to the analysis of qualitative materials. Such ‘analytical codes’ should be interwoven with the methodological ‘descriptive codes’ in order to contribute to lively text writing. For example, Foucault’s (1982) idea of circulating power through social interaction and relations was deemed a means/lens for reading the participants’ data about
cross-cultural attitudes in this ESL discourse project. Amplification of this information is provided in the data analysis and write-up sections.

In conclusion, the researcher suggests that the ideal compromise for this study of ESL discourse was to juxtapose an emic (inside, experience-near) approach with an etic (outside, experience-distant) approach. The use of the emic (inside, experience-near) helped the researcher to communicate with and grasp the participants’ perspectives in order to collect validated data. Simultaneously, the researcher sought to connect what participants saw, felt and thought with a variety of theoretical framing, mainly in the ESL field. This enabled the researcher to function as a facilitator of analysis, presenting her findings and writing academically through the use of the etic (outside, experience-distant).

**Rationale for Using the Qualitative Approach**

The reasons for employing a qualitative approach in this research project are explored in the following section.

First, in chapter one, this researcher introduced critical theory and post-structuralism as lenses through which to view this study. These two paradigms require the qualitative approach. Aspects of these two new paradigms, such as multiple reality, reconstruction and deconstruction of inequality, and operation of power through discourse (in struggles for legitimacy) offer insight into the English non-natives’ perspectives on their participatory legitimacy in ESL discourse. They are a means to study empowerment and participant reflexivity and to uncover pre-determined, possibly unequal power relationships and the construction of subjectivity. These factors are closely related to the construction of communicative legitimacy in ESL discourse. Concepts related to the two
paradigms correspond in many respects to the qualitative approach’s assumptions about the nature of the world, for example, the belief that there are social facts with wide, complex, and multifaceted realities.

Second, this project emphasizes the importance of context-dependency, relying on understanding, findings, descriptions and shared interpretations during the process of participant recruitment, data collection and analysis. The techniques and characteristics of the qualitative approach can provide the tools and flexibility necessary for this project. This researcher follows McMillan and Schumacher’s (1997) conviction that participants’ behaviors are strongly impacted by the settings in which they occur. Prolonged engagement in the field with individuals is vital for data collection. As a result, context-bound information and generalizations were developed. For example, when recruiting participants, this researcher acted as not only an ESL learner but also a professional in the TESOL field in order to share with and listen to potential participants’ articulation. The researcher took ethical concerns into consideration in order to guarantee the participants’ privacy. And she also took responsibility to respect their desires, values, and rights pertaining to their definitions of the concepts of linguistic legitimacy, and to their thoughts on utilizing English in conversation with native speakers in ESL discourse. In addition, the researcher was conducting a study of field research. She served in the role of the interviewer. She engaged in a long-term personal bond with the participants to explore their perceptions of power hierarchies, which intimately influence the construction of participatory legitimacy within the ESL discourse. As for the observational activity, the researcher was not a distant and detached scientific observer—her subjectivity played a central role both in the authentic setting of the ESL classroom.
and in social activities outside the classroom. As a result, first, the researcher obtained insight into the formation of the participants’ social identities, for the ESL classroom mediates between them and the ESL discourse of the larger social world (in the U.S.) Second, the researcher could observe how participants’ English literacy practices and oral communication were embedded into the ideology of the construction of history, culture, power and control outside the authentic society of the ESL classroom.

Rudestam and Newton (1992) suggested that “the researcher is regarded as a person who comes to the scene with his/her own operative reality” (p. 38). It is central to understand, acknowledge, and share participants’ (others) own underlying values, assumptions and expectations. Moreover, the researcher consistently engages in self-corrective and self-reflexive behaviors throughout the research. This project is value-laden because the researcher’s subjectivity was taken into consideration from the stage of warm-up and preparation through preliminary fieldwork, design decisions, and interpretive and textual decisions.

Third, most importantly, the prominent concepts of ‘strong objectivity’ and ‘objectively subjective’ support qualitative research as the methodology for this study, which explores the factors leading to the construction of legitimate speakers in ESL discourse. The two ideas correspond to the purpose of this study to take the participants’ positions and empower their stance as non-native English speakers. In order to be rigorous in accomplishing the designed goal of research, Harding (1993) proposed the concept of ‘strong objectivity’ in contrast to scientific rationality and objectivity. It is derived from the idea that researchers should take the participants’ position/viewpoint (especially that of the marginalized community) so as to get a perspective on their own
socially situated project. In this regard, she emphasized that the connection between the researcher (subject/agent/self) and the researched (object/others) places the focus on critical explanation, thereby producing knowledge for marginalized people. The concept of ‘objectively subjective’ was raised by Reason and Rowan (1981, cited in Lather, 1986), to help understand the pursuit of trustworthiness in post-positivist research. The concept of ‘objectively subjective’ is situated in the exploration of fact as a social construction. The ideas of ‘strong objectivity’ and ‘objectively subjective’ direct this project toward a broadly organismic picture--the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

To sum up, qualitative designs “investigate behavior as it occurs naturally in non-contrived situations” (McMillan & Shumacher, 1997, p. 40). That is, no manipulation of experience occurs in qualitative research designs. Finally, the characteristics of the qualitative approach serve to satisfactorily explain the interests, tendencies and findings of this study.

**Qualitative Research Design**

In this section, the researcher considers (1) the application of case study, (2) the sampling process, (3) data collection procedures, (4) the procedures and methods applied to analyze the data, and (5) the issue of trustworthiness as it relates to the methodological decisions of this study.

In the following segment, this researcher discusses the application of case study, including the inspiration for its use and the advantage of employing case study to facilitate examination of the participants’ opinions concerning the establishment of legitimacy during participation in ESL discourse.
The Application of Case Study

‘Case study’ means that a particular event/program/individual is studied in considerable depth for a certain period of time and the purpose is not to generalize the results of case studies to other situations. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997), ‘case study’ can focus on different groups in a program, for example, demographic groups (black/white or male/female). The purpose of the ‘case study’ is to make sense of one phenomenon, such as an educational process or entity. ‘Case study’ is conducive to investigation of one person or situation in depth over time. Therefore, the ‘case study’ was a very useful method for this ESL discourse study because of its flexibility and adaptability to a wide range of contexts and foci. Further, in the instances of multiple case studies, “researchers study two or more cases--often cases that are different in certain key ways--to make comparisons, build theory…” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). This researcher was interested in exploring non-native English adult speakers who were from diverse cultural backgrounds and who had different experiences of literacy, regarding their participation patterns, motivation, and tendencies, as well as their social identities and self-perceptions in American ESL discourse. Therefore, six non-native English adult participants were selected from one Adult Education Center. Three participants were selected from Intermediate Level 3; they are natives of Turkey, China and Ivory Coast. Three participants were selected from Advanced Level 5, they are natives of Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and South Korea.

In this study, the researcher assumed that the cultural differences and the local cultural patterns/identities of the six non-native English adult participants would provide significant depth to explore viewpoints extensively. These viewpoints reflect their diverse
voices speaking to the concepts of cross-cultural English communication, and its influence on the construction of power relationships with native English speakers. Such relationships are crucial to the determination of their subjectivity (social identity) and intimately related to construction of legitimacy during participation in ESL discourse. However, the work of Parry (1996) and Norton (1997) reminded this researcher to focus not only on the cultural patterns and identity of the participants, but also on their various individual self-perceptions. Parry (1996) suggested that socio-cultural linguistic researchers should not be over-reliant on participants’ cultural backgrounds in making decisions about what their cultural communities represent. That would easily lead to simplistic cultural determinism. They should be concerned about participants’ individual variation. Similarly, theories of cultural identity may not do justice to the heterogeneity of certain cultural groups (Norton, 1997). Regarding this issue, Chapter Four provides a discussion of participant profiles, backgrounds, and demographic details, which provides a foundation for their responses to the interview questions. In sum, the application of the case study was expected to facilitate the achievement of the purpose to elucidate the determination of social participatory legitimacy in the U.S., inside and outside of the ESL classroom.

The Sampling Process

In the following section, sampling is discussed, including (a) gaining access to the site, (b) snowball sampling, (c) the concerns of politics and ethics during the sampling process and (d) this researcher’s log for gaining access to the site and sampling procedures.
Gaining Access to the Site. In this ESL discourse project, the Education Center of a public school, located in Midwestern United States, was the target site. Within this Center, the Department of Adult and Community Education provides an array of programs to help students develop workforce skills and attain academic goals, conferring certificates, diplomas, and licenses. Through literacy and workforce education, the key mission is to support the concept of learning for a lifetime.

In this Center, the Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program offers basic literacy skill development designed to meet the needs of adult learners so that they can increase their family literacy skills, workplace literacy skills, and, in the case of speakers of other languages, their English skills. The ESOL program has been offered since 1970 and was reorganized in 1985. The program is competency based, and its main goal is to assist adult learners to gain knowledge and coping skills in order to live in a new cultural environment and to improve their use of English by enhancing their four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The ESOL program conducts entrance tests to place students in classes according to their English proficiency in both oral and written skills. There are five levels of English proficiency in the program: Beginning Literacy (Level 1), Beginning (Level 2), Intermediate (Level 3), High Intermediate (Level 4), and Advanced (Level 5). The criteria used to categorize ESL learners’ English proficiency level are based on the Basic English Skills Test--Oral Interview Section. The rubrics cover the categories of vocabulary, sentence structure, articulation, fluency and comprehension—all used for placing ESL learners from Level 1 to Level 5 (See Table 3.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPL /Score</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Sentence Structure</th>
<th>Articulation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>limited vocabulary</td>
<td>grammatical errors make communication less than intelligible</td>
<td>serious pronunciation problems</td>
<td>no functional communicative ability</td>
<td>difficulties in understanding basic conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0-7)</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>isolated words and simple learned phrases</td>
<td>many word order errors but can achieve simple speech</td>
<td>frequent repetition necessary in order to be understood</td>
<td>long pauses in communicative interaction; basic oral communication abilities with some difficulties in situations related to immediate needs</td>
<td>understands when speech is slow and frequently repeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8-46)</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>appropriate but limited word usage</td>
<td>some word disorder and grammatical errors; most communication is intelligible but a few meanings are obscured</td>
<td>listeners should pay attention in order to better comprehend and decrease misunderstanding</td>
<td>can satisfy some classroom discussion, social demands and survival needs; asking and answering questions with significant effort; handling some communicative tasks</td>
<td>understands most social interactions spoken in a slower-than-normal way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47-53)</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>proper and broader word choice</td>
<td>fewer word disorders and grammatical mistakes; mostly clear speech</td>
<td>pronunciation and intonation are nearly clear but with infrequent lapses</td>
<td>can satisfy most routine survival needs and social demands</td>
<td>can follow almost all conversations spoken at ordinary speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54-65)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>advanced usage of words and idioms</td>
<td>word order and grammatical rules are correct</td>
<td>pronunciation and intonation are clear or native-like in delivering paragraph-length discourse</td>
<td>can satisfy survival needs, routine work and social demands; handling a variety of communicative tasks; active participation in most conversation</td>
<td>can follow complicated oral and written instructions in familiar and some unfamiliar situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(66+)</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Correlation of Student Performance Levels and Test Scores--the Adaptation of the Adult Education Center’s Rubrics for ESL Student Placement Level
Snowball Sampling. The sampling process employed a purposeful sampling technique called snowball sampling. In the following, the two key procedures used to identify the core participants are discussed, as is the recruitment process to obtain a total of six non-native English adult speakers.

The researcher applied a purposeful sampling technique called snowball sampling to select six cases for in-depth examination of meaning. Qualitative methods typically focus in-depth on relatively small samples that are selected purposefully (Patton, 1990). Also, in qualitative research, because of the limited sample size, generalization is not a concern. Rather, participant referrals are the basis for choosing the sample. For these requirements, the features of snowball sampling are useful in obtaining the key information-rich participants.

In snowball sampling, a chain of recommended participants typically emerges initially as many possible sources are recommended, then results in some core cases that are identified by several participants. This kind of sampling is typically used in situations in which the individuals do not constitute a specific group but, rather, are scattered throughout a population. This strategy is also used when participants are hard to access directly but are identifiable through a network (Patton, 1990; Rice & Ezzy, 1999).

In this study, two key procedures were followed to identify the six participants.

First, one coordinator and an ESL teacher in the North Adult Education Center nominated two ESL teachers, one each from Intermediate Level 3 and Advanced Level 5 teaching levels. These recommendations were considered central although these two ESL teachers were not considered direct participants in this study. Their recommendations for the potential participants were helpful in the search for ESL participants who would be
information rich regarding the experiences of cross-cultural literacy and interaction with native English speakers. The decision to select participants from Intermediate Level 3 and Advanced Level 5 was governed by one important principle—the need to select non-native English adult participants from two different levels of oral proficiency in English, and was based on the following considerations: (a) In a sense, this selection was influenced by Bourdieu’s (1977; 1991) discussion of communicative language competency that makes obvious the exercise of power and cultural arbitrariness, which are both directly related to the construction of legitimacy in language usage. Bourdieu also spoke of the issue of individual linguistic capital, which refers to the individuals’ varying capacities to express themselves appropriately in a certain social/cultural context. In this study, each level (Intermediate and Advanced levels) of ESL participants represents a group with a certain amount of linguistic capital. The selection of participants at two different oral proficiency levels should facilitate this study’s examination of the broader picture of the linguistic capital possessed by a certain number of non-native adult English speakers representing heterogeneous cultural ethnicity. (b) Non-native adult English speakers from Beginning Literacy Level 1 and Beginning Level 2 were excluded from this study. Based on the adaptation of this Adult Education Center’s rubrics for student placement level, this researcher would have failed to collect validated data from students at these levels owing to their very limited English communicative fluency and comprehension. (c) In research question two of this study, due to the comparison purposes, two levels are sufficient to compare the linguistic capital of communicative ability in social situations of ESL academic discourse, one of the ESL discourses, and explore how the participants reflect the characteristics of self-confidence.
and motivation. Intermediate Level 3 and Advanced Level 5 can provide a clear and distinctive comparison which would not be apparent in a comparison between Intermediate Level 3 and High Intermediate Level 4, or High Intermediate Level 4 and Advanced Level 5.

Second, the snowballing methodology was initiated by obtaining the views and opinions of the ESL coordinator and two ESL teachers in this Center. According to Patton (1990) and Rice and Ezzy (1999), the snowballing process is gotten under way by asking well-situated people questions like the following: “Who knows a lot about…? To whom should I talk?” Therefore, the researcher asked those who had frequent contact with the potential participants, namely, the ESL coordinator and the two teachers, similar questions, such as, “Do you know any non-native adult English speakers…?”; “Who knows a lot about the relationship between language, culture and identity?”; “Who is struggling with culture shock in the U.S.”; “What students are very concerned about their non-American accent when they speak English in the U.S.”; “What students have had very impressive or unforgettable experiences regarding communicative interaction with English native speakers?”; “Which students are very interested in the relationship between their first language (L1) and English?”; “Who makes comparisons between English education styles in their home country and the U.S.”? These questions facilitated the identification of potential participants who were information-rich enough to contribute to this study. The nominations were then condensed into a smaller number of core participants in the search for the ‘best’ or ‘most experienced’ information-rich, cross-cultural adult English speakers from the two levels of English proficiency—i.e., Intermediate Level 3 and Advanced Level 5. This is one level of snowball sampling.
The researcher then visited the core participants to explain the research and to seek their consent to participate. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, the expected duration and the possible benefits of the study. Then, giving more detailed information, the researcher explained that the project would attempt to understand how the participants regarded themselves as accepted English speakers and as participants in U.S. English speaking contexts and that special focus would be placed on settings where oral communication takes place with native speakers of English. The potential participants were informed that the researcher would interview and observe the participants to collect data, that there would be three semi-structured interviews, ten ESL academic observations, three observations of authentic social activities outside the classroom and document analysis during a half-year period. Also, the interviews and observations would be audio-taped for analysis purposes. Finally, they were told that all participants’ identities and collected data would be kept confidential.

This researcher hoped to learn to accept the richer and more complex multiple-realities of the individual participants. Because of the selection of a limited-sized sample in this project, generalization from the samples to a larger population is not attempted. Both male and female participants from a variety of ethnic backgrounds are represented in this study. Three participants were natives of Turkey, China and Ivory Coast, selected from the Intermediate Level 3; three participants were natives of Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and South Korea, selected from Advanced Level 5. Their ages ranged from 25-50. These participants had been in the U. S. more than 1-3 years. This period made likely the fact that these participants were still developing social participation and identity as English speakers in the U. S. ESL discourse.
The Concerns of Politics and Ethics During the Sampling Process. From the time the researcher began the preliminary fieldwork of accessing the site and planning the sampling, she took into consideration key political and ethical concerns. These concerns involved long-term, brain-storming, diligent and scrupulous procedures. They were honed throughout the whole process of interpretive and textual writing decisions. The researcher’s role was political because she used power to make decisions about why, what, and how she conducted the inquiry. These politics of decision-making were embedded in the emergent and context-bound qualitative research process, which is not neutral. For example, what assumptions does she make and what methods will she employ? How will the participants be selected? How is the data going to be interpreted in order to reach conclusions? These political considerations were catalysts in the construction of this project. They also gave direction to the researcher’s effort to explore power relationships between English natives and non-natives in order to investigate how legitimate speakers were constructed. Recognition of this reinforced the researcher’s determination to understand the participants’ concerns and voices. For English non-natives, the behaviors of speaking English occur in the contexts of the ESL classroom, and in families and other institutions which are varied discourses embedded within the American ESL discourse. These behaviors involve individual (English non-natives’) and interpersonal (English natives’ and non-natives’) histories. All of these phenomena influence the process of social participation and what ‘speaking English’ means to non-natives. When the researcher started to recruit the participants in this Adult Education Center, the Level 3 ESL teacher said to her: “You (the researcher) should come to advocate and recommend your own study.” This led the researcher to put this project into
practice. After the researcher introduced her study to the Level 3 class, one of potential non-native adult English participants asked her: “Where are you from?” The researcher responded: “I am from Taiwan.” Then this ESL speaker responded, “American people can understand your English [the researcher’s English]. Your English is different from other Asian people’s English. My English is different from your English, either.” He turned his head to talk to his native English-speaking instructor, and said: “Hi, teacher, see, we speak different types of Englishes. We have different accents.” This complimentary expression made the researcher feel anxious and guilty. Simultaneously, in her mind, she told herself: “Oh, my friend, my situation is similar to yours. I am only one of the ESL learners, too, making an effort to achieve an oral proficiency that is as close as possible to being an American-like English speaker.” The researcher has really attempted to find out what these non-native adult English participants are struggling with in the U.S. The researcher started to assume responsibility for the insights that her project might inspire in these non-native adult English participants. How does she see her participants? To what category of English non-native people or group do they (including the researcher) belong in the U.S.?

In addressing the study’s ethical concerns, the researcher followed Creswell’s (1994) suggestions, by explicating the objectives of the project and clearly informing participants about data collection devices and activities, including interviews, observation and document analysis; assured the use of anonymity by replacing their true names to guarantee their confidentiality; made sure they understood their consent to participate in the study; and emphasized their right to review the transcripts of interviews to confirm their accuracy.
These kinds of processes located this researcher in multiple roles while shaping this study. She served as a postmodernist researcher, an ESL volunteer teacher, an English non-native and cross-cultural immigrant. Her multiple roles are applied to the study, reinforcing its purpose while she searches for the participants’ authentic voices. Working as a postmodernist researcher, she is interested in how the function of power affects non-native adult English speakers while constructing their participatory legitimacy within ESL discourse. She loves to deal with contextual data and participants’ multi-vocality. The academic admonitions echoed repeatedly, “Where is your authentic voice? Don’t constrain your research within the boundary of a restricted square;” “How can one help the English non-natives, to some extent, to reverse the pre-determined power relationships with natives? How can one facilitate certain levels of transformation throughout the research process?” She also hopes for an open and personalized dialogue to make this project reveal more hidden or interesting views. As an ESL volunteer teacher, she is not merely attempting to position herself securely between political policy and language teaching. She is also trying to help English non-natives to empower themselves, build their self-images and develop individual values within intricate political ESL discourse. She attempts to adjust her curriculum decisions and teaching practices to reinforce ESL learners’ motivation. Being a non-native English speaker, she is increasingly self-reflexive concerning the nature of English literacy within the cross-cultural context, and what the variety of American English and other diverse English accents mean to her. Has the researcher changed in some ways from her EFL (English as a Foreign Language) background to the ESL (English as a Second Language) context in the U.S.? In the conservative Taiwan society of the 1980s, language acquisition was
inclined to the idea of ‘knowledge is power’; learning English was pursued to pass the international examination, but students did not know how to use English well in an authentic context. The English native or native-like accents were admired and established as a goal to which students aspired. Upon her arrival in the U.S., it seemed that she was somehow illiterate in this new ESL context. She was so awkward in her use of the English (L2) she had learned in Taiwan. The researcher is equipped with empathy for these participants. This experience served as a strong incentive for examining how cross-cultural non-native adult English speakers transform competence into a right to speak and power to impose reception (Bourdieu, 1977). However, in the U.S., a great appreciation for the liberal construction and practice of social language in English emerged. At the same time, the researcher explored many compatible theoretical perspectives, such as critical theory and post-structuralism, to heighten her awareness of the possibility of emancipation from the requirement that one speak with a native or native-like accent. This shifts the definition of English literacy to different scenarios for her. As a new immigrant with permanent residence status, the researcher senses changes in her Taiwanese cultural expectations through new social interactions. When she speaks English, she is concerned with the fact that her particular accent represents a certain social position and social identity. This drives her to explore the participants’ ethnic origins and the individual factors that impact on their behaviors, subjectivities and self-perceptions within ESL discourse. These reflective discussions of the researcher’s multiple roles serve as the sound foundation to uphold the ethnical concerns of this study.

The following is the researcher’s log of activity for gaining access to the site and identifying the participants. The log (See Table 3.2) helped to coordinate more effectively
the process of recruitment and the scheduling of fieldwork and offered a means for self-reflexivity as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/25/02</td>
<td>I started the snowballing process through asking one friend who is an ESL learner a question like the following: “Who knows a lot about non-native adult English learners with diverse cultural backgrounds?” My friend, Sue, recommended that I should contact her former ESL teacher, Helen. She is well-situated and well-informed about the ESL field. I e-mailed Helen, an ESL teacher at the Beginning Literacy Level 1 in the Adult Education Center, to ask about the possibility of visiting the Center to gain access to the entry site.</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/02</td>
<td>I visited this Center and talked to the ESL coordinator, Ken, regarding my research, the attempt to conduct research and the details of the potential entry. I told Ken that I would have to get Human Subject approval before starting the study. Upon passing the Human Subject review, I will start this investigation. Also, Helen shared ideas about her teaching and recommended two other ESL teachers, Christina (Level 3) and Jane (Level 5).</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/02</td>
<td>I called Christina and Jane, and made appointments with them.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/02</td>
<td>I visited Christina, who is a teacher of Intermediate Level 3. In order to help me understand her ESL program, she offered some information with respect to the placement test to locate students and the policy to promote them to higher-level classes. She also recommended some potential participants.</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/02</td>
<td>I visited the teacher of advanced Level 5, Jane. She gave me some suggestions for the sampling and promised to recommend some potential participants.</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/03</td>
<td>I made a short presentation to the non-native adult English learners in the Level 3 and the Level 5 classes. This recruitment procedure was very successful. I explained the purpose and significance of my study, and the procedures to be followed, the expected duration of their participation. By asking their consent, several students then volunteered. Christina and Jane were very supportive during this process.</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/03</td>
<td>I started interview and observational activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Researcher’s Log for Gaining Access to the Site and Sampling Procedures
Data Collection Procedures

The three types of methods for data collection are (1) semi-structured interviews, (2) participatory observation, and (3) document analysis. These methods are continually modified through a process of self-reflexivity which will offer detailed discussion in the section entitled ‘self-reflectivity in data collection.’ The following section discusses each of these data collecting procedures.

Semi-Structured Interviews. Each participant was interviewed three times over a half-year period. Each interviewing session was 50 minutes. For these interviews, the researcher used the semi-structured method, and the interviews were audio-taped so that accurate analysis would be enhanced. The participants could ask to have the recorder stopped at any time during the interviews. In this project, the interview questions are related to the non-native English participants’ ESL participatory experiences with English native speakers, their social identity as accepted English speakers in the U.S., the role shift from their own cultural setting to that of the U.S. and the influence of their L1 on English acquisition. It was continuing development to construct these interview questions in this ESL discourse project. Issues that hopefully surface in the interviews are socio-cultural aspects of power, subjectivity and equality, all of which are intimately related to the constitution of legitimacy during non-native English speakers’ participation in ESL discourse. The researcher developed her thoughts by constructing mock questions, reshaping them several times. These questions are presented as follows: What are the participants’ most impressive cross-cultural experiences? How does power shape the projection of participants’ social identity revealed in ESL interactions? How does the participants’ sense of self impact their self-confidence and motivation in social
interaction? How do the ESL interactions show participants’ efforts to cope with struggles to define and use accepted and legitimate English? During ESL discourse, do non-native adult English speakers show themselves to be legitimate conversants? What are their experiences of conversational performance in the ESL and EFL contexts?

Finally, these larger questions gave rise to the following:

**Interview Questions**

1. What is your L1? How many languages are used in your country? Is English taught in your country? (a) Is your L1 language system very similar to or different from English? How has your L1 affected your ability or motivation to learn English? (b) Why did you choose to study English in the U.S.?

2. Did your thinking about American culture change after you experienced it? In what ways? Has American culture influenced any change in your behavior since you first arrived? If so, did this change affect your participation in conversation with native speakers?

3. Can you describe the requirements of the gender role, either male or female, in your country?

4. Can you describe some unforgettable experiences you have had since you have been in the U.S.?

5. What social status do you think you have here? When you talk with native speakers of English in the U.S., how does the way you speak English present to them ‘who you are’?

6. (a) When you speak English with native speakers in the U.S, does the image you have of yourself change? Does this self-image affect your communicative interaction with native English speakers? How? (b) What image do you think English speakers have of you? Does this thought affect your communicative interaction with native English speakers? How?

7. When you talk to native English speakers, who decides what subjects are discussed? Explain with an example, if possible.

8. Do you think that the English you speak is the same as that of native speakers? If not, how is it different? Whose is the Standard one? Can you explain why?

9. Do you want to learn the kind of English variety that native speakers speak? Why or why not?
10. Who owns the English language? Why?

11. Do you think your own English accent is understandable and accepted by English native speakers? Why or why not? Please describe a situation where your English was misunderstood.

12. In a social group situation of the U.S. where English is the primary language, do you tend to be fairly quiet or do you make a special effort to participate? Can you explain why?

13. With which native speakers are you comfortable speaking English? Why? Do you ever feel uncomfortable speaking English with a native speaker of English? Can you explain what causes the discomfort?

14. What does it mean to have good oral English skills? Please explain in terms of English accent and intonation, conversational content, knowledge of grammar.

15. During participation in English discourse, do you usually have a chance to talk? Do the native speakers of English usually listen to you? Why or why not? Can you describe a situation in which a native speaker of English did not seem to want to hear what you wanted to say? Please describe the situation.

16. What were your English learning experiences in your own country? What is the main purpose of learning English in your country? In particular, how about at the college level?

17. Did you enjoy learning English in the college of your country? Why or why not? Please explain the reasons.

18. Can you describe the situation of the college English classroom in your country? (a) How many students were in your class? (b) What kind of teaching materials or books did your English teachers use? (c) Did you speak your L1 in English class? (d) What language did your English teachers use for teaching? (e) Could you choose your own seats?

19. What are your English teachers’ teaching styles and instructional methods in the college English classroom in your country?

20. Did you have a passive or active English classroom atmosphere in the college of your country? Why?

21. In your social activities, can you usually communicate with native speakers of English based on what you have learned in the ESL classroom? Why or why not?
22. What situations make you uncomfortable, or what kind of resistance do you encounter inside yourself in your conversation with native speakers of English (either inside or outside of the ESL classroom)? When you feel excluded from a conversation, what do you do and what goes through your mind?

23. What kinds of opportunities do you have to speak your L1? What do feel when you speak in your L1?

24. While speaking your L1 with your friends who are of the same background as you, do you change to English if an English speaker is present? Why or why not?

25. When you do not understand or feel uncomfortable when native English speakers talk to you, what is your reaction?

The interview process must consider principles of the issues of trust and rapport rather than hierarchical position between the researcher and researched. The building of trust and rapport can facilitate the interview process. Janesick (2000) mentioned that “access and entry are sensitive components in qualitative research, and the researcher must establish trust, rapport and authentic communication patterns with participants” (p. 384). Also, the researcher hoped to minimize the unequal power relationship and empower the inter-subject relationship with these participants in order to facilitate the interview process. She followed the suggestion of Fontana and Frey (2000) that, in the attempt to establish a relationship between the researcher and the researched, the elimination of the traditional hierarchical situation is essential to minimize the status difference and the sense of the respondent’s subordinate position in the collection of data. In the following, the researcher gives a general description of the interview experiences of this study.

During the interview process, the researcher promised to keep the interview confidential so as to make the non-native adult English speakers comfortable enough to disclose their U.S. ESL interactional experiences in detail. In the first interview, the interview was initiated by soliciting general background information of the participant.
Then the focus shifted to use of the identified questions to elicit participants’ authentic voices. The researcher wanted to keep every conversation on track to prevent deviation from the main topics in this semi-structured dialogue, as well as to keep alive the possibility of collecting related or potential follow-up information that had not been anticipated. This was expected to assist her in determining the extent of the boundaries of the research topic as well as to facilitate the choice of a flexible methodology for this ESL discourse project. When participants experienced trust and harmonious relations in the interview, it was easier for them to reveal the nuances and meanings of their interactions with native English speakers in their U.S cross-cultural experiences. This lent itself to credible data. Most of time, the participants shared what was in their minds—critical events in their lives during their participatory experiences in ESL discourse. Every interview was regarded as an on-going task and follow-up preparation for the next interview. However, sometimes the researcher still felt a dilemma—what boundary line could she cross over? How far should the researcher probe into the responses of these non-native adult English speakers? For example, some questions were subtle for them. They showed some degree of confusion, but finally they understood and came up with the answers. The researcher needed to exercise extra patience to find out what was inside their minds. Generally speaking, they were information-rich, frank and responsive to the questions. For example, one participant shared her true voice, saying,

I am afraid that they (native English speakers) are not going to understand me. I am not scared to speak with natives. But, probably, a little of problems of dignity… for myself… Because I want to do things perfectly, but I cannot speak perfect English.

Another participant described his own embarrassing experiences because of his unclear English pronunciation. He mentioned:
I asked one bus driver the direction and the way of bus transfer. I ask him about which bus goes to ‘Main Street.’ But maybe I speak [spoke] too fast and put two phonetic sounds together, ‘Main Street’ sound like ‘many streets’ or ‘many trees.’ That bus driver did not make sense and left.

During the interviews, the researcher tried to write down field notes, including participants’ facial expressions and body language during their responses to some key questions. Actually, this was a challenge because the development of thoughts in English slowed down the researcher’s attention and response. The audio-taping record became the most indispensable supplementary method for recovering the on-going conversations. When the researcher analyzed and categorized her interview data and field notes, the audio-taped records helped her to double check whether her interpretation and reorganization was correct. The researcher also asked these participants to assist in reviewing the transcripts of the interviews to confirm their accuracy and suggest changes.

**Participation Observation.** In this project, the researcher conducted (1) ten observations in the Intermediate Level 3 ESL class where three participants, Luc, Asli and Ying, were enrolled and ten observations in the Advanced Level 5 ESL class where three participants, Maria, Marco and Ming were enrolled, and (2) three authentic social activities which were out of the classroom observations.

Based on Gold (1958, cited in Angrosino & Mays de P’erez, 2000), sociological ethnographers make implicit reference to a typology of roles that might characterize nationalistic research: (1) complete participant; (2) the participant-as-observer (3) the observer-as-participant; and (4) the complete observer. Before conducting the observation, the researcher seriously considered how she would locate herself during the observational process because the research field, the two ESL classrooms and some
social contexts, were always the subjective and inter-subjective world and authentic settings. As for the role of the researcher, she served as an observer-as-participant. This was because, while she did not intend to be merely a distant observer, she still wanted to maintain some respectful distance (e.g., having more empathy than sympathy), and to intrude only minimally. The researcher believed that to some extent, the sense of empathy served to increase reciprocity with the participants and could empower the study. Her role as a non-native English speaker facilitated the construction of empathy. As a matter of fact, a sense of sympathy results in emotional impetus and can detract from the study, causing the researcher to lose sight of the fact that inquiry is a matter that involves appraising the researchers’ values. In addition to observation, the role of participation can facilitate the collection of insider, native and first-person accounts (Schwandt, 1997).

As for the observation of the two ESL classes, the researcher hoped to collect the data as well as the vision derived from the two ESL classes and to recognize the participants’ specific social processes. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) suggested that school seems to play a key position in the production and reproduction of social identities and the imposition of arbitrary power in unequal relations. The ESL classroom community can be seen as a microcosm of the ESL society in the U.S. Therefore, the ESL classroom participation can be assumed to mirror the participation of ESL students in the larger U.S. society. The academic discourse of the ESL classrooms in this project mediated “between the individual and the larger social world” (Norton, 1997, p. 420). The researcher intended to examine the issues as follows: Did participants reject coercive power around such issues as curriculum, classroom procedures, pace of the class, use of certain texts
and the participants’ construction of their own meaning? What might constitute compelling justification for ESL teachers’ lesson preparation with respect to increasing participants’ social participation both inside and outside of ESL classes? In addition, to better grasp the classroom setting, understanding of the participants’ demographic information, the classroom seating arrangements, and curriculum schedule was helpful in facilitating classroom observation. The researcher’s presence may have influenced the classroom operation greatly even though she only partly participated in some of the classroom activities. It is possible for observer effects to contaminate the collection of data. Therefore, it is of ultimate importance to allow regular observation of the same class so that the non-native English speakers (participants) get used to the researchers’ involvement. This is necessary for participatory and collaborative research.

As for the authentic social context observations, the researcher observed grocery shopping, dining in restaurants and coffee shops, and visits to a park recreation center, representatively. The purpose of the observations was to acquire insight into the development and construction of the non-native English adult speakers’ social identity. The researcher wanted to view the process of the formation of the participants’ social identity and to observe how this process shaped the participants’ perspectives on the construction of participatory legitimacy during their interactions with English native speakers. The ESL discourse of the U.S. power served to categorize non-native English adult speakers’ positions within the standard American English discourse. However, the outside classroom observations conducted were limited to three observed social activities for each participant. The researcher applied very limited data information because her intention was to use the data only as supplementary material. It was assumed that data 96
from the semi-structured interviews compensated for the constraint of not using the
external observations more extensively. Position in this sense is linked to power issues in
authentic social contexts--those with more knowledge have more power. This researcher
observed whether non-native adult English speakers shifted ground during their English
interaction as they begin to assume a critical attitude toward their own English
knowledge and related literacy practices.

In addition, several concerns exist: Can the researcher’s role be accepted in such a
context-bound setting? How can the researcher obtain insight into selected relevant
matters concisely? Will academic training facilitate the researcher’s observation process?
Can the researcher keep on the right track to observe the participants’ daily, seemingly
trivial (but possibly significant) actions effectively? In conducting observational research,
the researcher should focus on the observation of individuals and their ever-changing
relationships instead of the patterned and coherent characteristics of the group
(Angrosino & Mays de P’erez, 2000).

The researcher tried to scribble notes of the field experience and her internal dialogue.
This was beneficial in determining which phenomena of the fields were worth recording
and documenting systematically. Also, taking notes helped the researcher narrow down
the focus by degree and facilitated greater access to observational purpose. Also, the
researcher made audio recording of the observations in order to capture the complexity of
the observation and to supplement the researcher’s limited capacity (Angrosino & Mays
de P’erez, 2000). The employment of audio-taping helps in (1) recalling the missing
details; (2) filling in the blur of memory gaps; (3) assuaging the researcher’s feelings of
In the next section, an example (See Chart 3.1 and Table 3.3) of the observation field notes from the Intermediate (Level 3) class is described.

**Example: Observation Field Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Adult Education Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>2/26/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>1:30-3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer:</td>
<td>Ling-Miao Yeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants observed:</td>
<td>Three participants: natives of Turkey, China and the Ivory Coast along with their interaction with the ESL teacher, Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>Intermediate Level 3 integrated skills (listening and speaking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blackboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc (Ivory Coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3.1 Intermediate Level 3 Classroom Setting and Seating Arrangement
### Setting

#### Context
Class started. The classroom was still chaotic. The ESL teacher, Christina, tried to deal with classroom management, asking students to open the text-book to page 334: the topic was ‘expressions of quantity: all of, most of and some of.’ She read the title and asked “Are you ready?” With a curious facial expression, the participant from Ivory Coast simultaneously asked her a question: “What is ‘quantity?’ I don’t know what is ‘quantity?’ Does it mean ‘almost?’” Christina answered: “It depends on how you use that. It really narrows down…Well, I don’t want to spend a lot of time on it.” The participant from Ivory Coast did not give up and said “Hi, teacher, the pronunciation of ‘quantity’ is [̩kantētay] in French, which is not like [kwantət]. He turned his head to another ESL learner (Ben) who was a French native speaker, too, and said to the whole class, “Ben is very quiet today.”

### The Researcher’s Reflexive Notes/Internal Thoughts
I was excited. I could feel the classroom as a communicative environment/context. The ESL classroom existed in hegemonic configuration and seemed to keep changing from moment to moment. I wondered to what extent I would be able to document the clear, detailed evidence of this specific ESL classroom process. Surely, I believe that this kind of context is impossible to describe by using quantified language. Christina categorizes the participant from the Ivory Coast as ‘an acoustic English learner.’ Most of the time, he pays a lot of attention to hearing what and how the ESL teacher pronounces, comparing it to French pronunciation. Many times, he asks Christina “Do you understand French? Why don’t American people speak French?” In this ESL classroom practice, Christina had made the decision to use a curriculum/text and a certain instructional style and to set the pace of the class. She did not want to continue to explain the meaning of ‘quantity.’ This announcement enabled her to impose her power on this participant and other ESL learners. To some extent, this made this participant embarrassed and caused him to lose his participatory legitimacy. He resisted this imposition by creating a counter-discourse to show the ESL teacher and other classmates his new social identity as a skilled French speaker, but not a less skilled English speaker. This helped him to raise his position and construct for himself a certain degree of participatory legitimacy in this discourse. At the same time, he tried to recruit other French speakers to support his resistance. This participant spoke French as a kind of resistance.

---

Table 3.3 The Observation Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>The Researcher’s Reflexive Notes/Internal Thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>I was excited. I could feel the classroom as a communicative environment/context. The ESL classroom existed in hegemonic configuration and seemed to keep changing from moment to moment. I wondered to what extent I would be able to document the clear, detailed evidence of this specific ESL classroom process. Surely, I believe that this kind of context is impossible to describe by using quantified language. Christina categorizes the participant from the Ivory Coast as ‘an acoustic English learner.’ Most of the time, he pays a lot of attention to hearing what and how the ESL teacher pronounces, comparing it to French pronunciation. Many times, he asks Christina “Do you understand French? Why don’t American people speak French?” In this ESL classroom practice, Christina had made the decision to use a curriculum/text and a certain instructional style and to set the pace of the class. She did not want to continue to explain the meaning of ‘quantity.’ This announcement enabled her to impose her power on this participant and other ESL learners. To some extent, this made this participant embarrassed and caused him to lose his participatory legitimacy. He resisted this imposition by creating a counter-discourse to show the ESL teacher and other classmates his new social identity as a skilled French speaker, but not a less skilled English speaker. This helped him to raise his position and construct for himself a certain degree of participatory legitimacy in this discourse. At the same time, he tried to recruit other French speakers to support his resistance. This participant spoke French as a kind of resistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 3.3 continued

| The ESL teacher, Christina, mentioned that British English is different from American English. English is spoken with different accents. For example, the accent of Ohio people is different from that of New Yorkers. She said, “Well, I speak NBC Broadcast standard English, basically without accent.” | In this ESL classroom, the ESL teacher served as a facilitator to mediate between these participants and the larger U.S. social world. This ESL teacher asserted that NBC Broadcast standard English is the only criteria to follow and pursue. This message impacted the foundation of my participants’ formation of their identity as ‘non-standard and with accent’ English speakers and their beliefs concerning construction of participatory legitimacy during their social interaction with English natives in the U.S. I obtained insight into the formation of students’ social identity. This strengthens my belief that the participants have been provided with a model of legitimate English that is beyond their ability to achieve. |

The Document Analysis. McMillan and Schmacher (1997) suggested that documents “are written or printed materials that may be official or unofficial, public or private, published or unpublished, prepared intentionally to preserve a historical record or prepared to serve an immediate practical purpose” (p. 466). Also, document research is a kind of analytical research which tends to be non-interactive. Documents help the researcher gain wider and in-depth understanding of ESL/ EFL teaching regarding participants’ conversation performance in terms of group dynamics. For example, in this study, the possible texts could be textbooks, periodicals, journals, newspapers and teaching handouts, which might represent the ESL/EFL teacher’s tendencies in the development of teaching materials in fulfillment of the curriculum aims. The researcher raised several concerns in her examination of the adequacy of the above materials,
including (1) the goals and objectives (targeted users and needs), (2) the implementation of appropriate syllabus type, (3) the theoretical framework.

As for other materials, the syllabi are useful in understanding the degree of achievement of learners’ aims and satisfaction of their needs. The time schedule of the school and classroom can help to reconstruct the concept of the participants’ real classroom situations. The journals or essays of English teachers or students can reflect the feelings and attitudes of authentic classroom life and patterns of classroom interaction. All these appeared to be documents very rich with information from which the researcher could glean more categories for this study.

**Self-Reflexivity in Data Collection.** Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that research design is likely to be emergent. The action of data collection is confirmation of the theories or techniques. This is the tendency of the naturalistic paradigm. After conducting some of the interviews and participatory observations, the researcher learned some lessons in research design that had not been foreseen at the outset of this study. In the beginning, the researcher could not fully envisage her interactions with the participants. However, progressively, what is learned at a site is always dependent on these interactions. The researcher consistently adjusted her inquiry devices and strategies, and some interview questions in response to what she was learning in the research field. This helped her to better undertake the fieldwork, and to develop and warrant the phenomena of ESL discourse. As the inquiry proceeded, the themes of the research became more focused.

For example, during one interview, a participant suggested that native English speakers should not take for granted that non-native adult English speakers can
understand everything they say, and should try to face them kindly, patiently, flexibly and positively. However, this participant encouraged English native speakers to correct his intonation and accent when they communicated with each other. In terms of ‘power and subjectivity’, on the one hand, this participant intended to be treated nicely and equally. He resisted power imposition and asserted his dignity as a non-native English speaker. On the other hand, he urged that English native speakers correct his intonation and accent. In this regard, he accepted the power imposition for English correctness by listening to what a native speaker suggested. He became subject to an ESL discourse identity that assumed he was a less competent English speaker. This participant’s response offered an insight that the researcher had never considered at the birth of this study--the concept of ‘resistance’ always mingles with ‘power and subjectivity’ to influence participatory legitimacy within the ESL discourse. Their relationship is subtle, unfixed and complicated. The researcher adjusted her inquiry plans and strategies to respond to what she had learned in this field site. This is an emergent design. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) explained that for an emergent design, “…each incremental 
research decision depends on prior information. The emergent design, in reality, may seem circular, as processes of purposeful sampling, data collection, and partial data analysis are simultaneous and interactive rather than discrete sequential steps” (p. 393). The researcher followed the procedure of emergent design for data collection strategies and problem reformulation. For example, she expected to see participants’ pessimistic reaction to their gradual adaptation into U.S. society owing to their non-native social identity and less-skilled English. After her first interview activity, she quickly realized that she had made an inadequate assumption regarding the attitudes of participants toward
their gradual adaptation. Almost all of the participants were greatly willing to become socially involved and interact personally with English natives. The researcher’s original plan called for three interviews with participants every two months. However, indications were that there was no need to adhere to the original interview schedule because there was no gradual adaptation phase that needed detailed chronicling. Therefore, in addressing the problem of reformulation, the researcher changed to focus on the factors that contributed to the participants’ positive communicative participation in the U.S. In the beginning, she focused on the international relationships not only between English native speakers and English non-native speakers, but also among English non-natives (participants’ English non-native friends or classmates) who were from different cultural backgrounds. After doing some data summary, she shifted the focus from broad to narrow, concentrating solely upon the interactions between English natives and non-natives (participants), because this is what the researcher was really interested in. Reformulation and reframing have made this project more comprehensive and have led to the main themes of this research becoming more focused.

Following the data collection is a discussion of the procedures and methods for data analysis. This section will be presented in Chapter Four of the dissertation proper.

**Procedures and Methods of Data Analysis**

The method of data analysis is described in two parts. First, the six selected cases are presented and discussed through analysis of their general profiles. The project presents partial narratives of the six participants who are interviewed and observed. Second, the case analyses will be discussed. In this part, the researcher also discusses data management, coding, the preliminary data analysis, and the techniques for data analysis.
General Profile of Collected Cases

For the section of case general profile, the researcher offer demographic background information and other data of the six cases. This information was collected through semi-structured interviews and observations. In order to protect the participants’ confidentiality, pseudo names were used. The purpose of this introduction is to elucidate demographic background information of the individual cases, providing contextual knowledge which is relevant to the discussions of the case analyses. Individual ethnicity and cultural context should also provide greater insight into the participants’ L1 background knowledge, their history of English education, the purpose for migrating to the U.S., and their expectation of social interaction with native English speakers. However, the researcher did not rely only on the six participants’ cultural background to draw conclusions about what their cultural communities stand for. Their individual variations were taken into consideration.

Findings of the Case Analyses

The researcher has synthesized and intertwined a combination of discourse analysis of the individual cases and the findings resulting from cross case comparison, which covers the cross-sectional and longitudinal viewpoints. The narrative outcome of the case analyses is framed in order to answer the four researcher questions. These simultaneous interconnections have been gleaned through the technique of the combination of case-by-case and cross case analysis so that the researcher can clearly demonstrate the dynamics of the data findings.

In the following, (1) a discussion of data management, coding and preliminary data analysis, and (2) an introduction to the four techniques for data analysis, the warrant of an
assertion; theoretical framing as a facilitator of analysis and synopsis and frequency distribution included.

Data Management, Coding and Preliminary Data Analysis. In order to analyze data, an important principle is to manage the data systematically. For example, based on interviews and observations, the researcher can take several steps to appropriately manage data.

Initially, the interview tapes were inventoried by recording the participants’ names, date and other relevant information. The researcher then transcribed the taped material. Secondly, to manage the observational data, the researcher can inscribe the participants’ names and observational locations, date the field notes and log reflexive and internal thoughts in research notebooks or in a computer database. Numbers can be assigned to represent the participants as a means of maintaining their confidentiality.

After the data is collected, the preliminary data coding is often the most difficult challenge. The initial data coding puzzle may trap the researcher in a ‘text sea.’ How can the researcher assemble the segments identified under one main topic to make further interpretations? The researcher may apply a codebook as a means of organizing text to facilitate future data retrieval and analysis (Crabtree & Miller, 1992).

The researcher can make segments of text useful--make the data ‘talk to and communicate with’ the specific research. At first, in an attempt to discuss the main themes of this ESL research project, the researcher tried to develop broad categories of information with respect to some concerns of the related literature, such as the construction of linguistic legitimacy, the symbolic domination of language, the philosophy of world English, and the concept of empowerment in the ESL and EFL
fields. This was expected to maximize the possibility of discovering more noteworthy
codes, which she might take for granted or view as tacit knowledge (Altheide & Johnson,
1994). Then, the researcher repeatedly perused these texts and data. This facilitated
identification of some frequently occurring themes/ideas/patterns in order to develop a
list of codes and sub-codes for categorizing the data. For example, based on research
question one, partial codes, sub-codes and exemplars for the coding and preliminary data,
were constructed in the following manner. One of the main codes called ‘Cultural
Comparisons and Distinct Social Character” and its sub-code entitled ‘Identification of
Self and Other Groups’ were identified. Then, one additional sub-code entitled ‘Cultural
Shock’ was emergent, providing a deeper understanding of the data and revealing deeper
insights for codebook development (See Chart 3.2).

In addition, the use of colored highlighter pens was one simplified approach utilized.
The codebook could be modified and adjusted to some extent, to correct for English
language deficiencies.
Example: (code and preliminary data analysis) (also partially shown in Ch 4)

Cultural Comparisons and Distinct Social Character

(sub-code) Identification of Self and Other Groups

data: We [Hispanic people] are kind of a polite people. We are interested in everybody else. We try to say everything in the right way politely. But American people are more direct and cold…I brought my culture here.

(sub-code) Cultural Shock

data: Teachers in my country [Turkey] are very rigid. They want students to obey rules. They don’t talk [say] to students “good job;” they don’t want to spoil the child. I go to my son’s school [in the U.S.], when students got the scores 60 out of 100, still “good job.” [American teachers] always talk [say] to students “good job” “good job.” No, it is not a “good job.” I was shocked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-codes</th>
<th>Found in Lines of Transcript</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of self and other groups (i-s-o-g)</td>
<td>138-139, 162-173</td>
<td>Cultural Comparisons and Distinct Social Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shock</td>
<td>9-221, 365-369 448-461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3.2 An Example of Coding and Preliminary Data Analysis

The next section addresses four techniques for further data analysis. It was anticipated that the intertwining employment of the four techniques hopefully would contribute to dynamic and lively text writing.

Four Techniques for Data Analysis

This study applied four beneficial techniques to conduct qualitative data analysis: (1) the warrant of an assertion; (2) theoretical framing as a facilitator of analysis; and (3) synopsis and frequency distribution (Erickson, 1986; Honan et al., 2000). These techniques enabled the researcher to explore situated characteristics and multiple interpretations of the ‘truths’ of the non-native English adult speakers’ experiences in different ESL discourse contexts.
The Warrant of an Assertion. After the data is coded, a warrant of an assertion identifies and asserts a frequently occurring theme or pattern, then documents the theme or pattern by means of quotes from the data (e.g., two or three sentences). The researcher intended to keep the language of the participants intact and not to paraphrase but, rather, to present an exact transcription. Following a quote, there is some interpretive commentary. Based on the content of the quote, the researcher has elaborated and interpreted the meaning for readers. Also, this researcher then has described whatever contextual information was learned from the field. For example, in question one, the researcher discusses the concern of gender awareness in cross-cultural discourse in exploration of the participants’ most significant cross-cultural and social interactional experiences (See Chart 3.3). One female participant described her gender characteristics and related gendered social expectations which affected her motivation and tendencies regarding English acquisition and expression.

In this ESL project, the field notes often clarified the significance of the quote and added meaning to it.
Example (also mostly shown in Ch 4)

**Assertion**
It appears that in this participant’s native country, the socially appropriate role of the female was a positive one and supportive in nature. This encouraged the participant to act freely and speak candidly. It also fortified her in her resolve to negotiate her own cultural and social norms while encountering the life in the U.S.

**Warrant**
--(data) I want to be free [here]...like my life in Turkey. Even though he [her husband] is patient. In Turkey, I am very independent. I don’t need to rely on him. It’s very bad. Therefore, I learn [English] very hard [in the U.S.] I don’t want to be stupid. (4/8/03, interview)

**First paragraph**
The data revealed that the participant felt that her English acquisition experiences disengaged her somewhat from the gender related hierarchy which had forged her life--dependency upon her husband’s English proficiency in order to survive in the U.S. She could regard such awareness as a catalyst for change; it probably signified a potential transformation in the status of this participant’s position vis-à-vis her husband’s status.

**Second paragraph**
The participant seemed to be still very close to their previous Turkey life where she gained English through the medium of L1s. (With a serious facial expression along with a higher pitch voice), she expressed the idea that she was willing to reform her role as a female and become involved with the reality of her own daily American life (seeing what she was faced with and relocating herself). Her life was shaped by the characteristic of consciousness (Freire, 1970)

---

Chart 3.3 An Example of the Warrant of an Assertion

**Theoretical Framing as a Facilitator of Analysis.** The researcher is likely to add some theoretical framing to the vignette to show different analytical viewpoints. Based on the suggestion of Honan et al., (2000), putting theory into the data discussion contributes to the analysis of qualitative materials. In this ESL project, such analytical analysis helped blend interpretation with the literature. The process can also help in reexamination of disconfirming information and maximize the likelihood of discovering whatever the researcher had taken for granted. The researcher has intertwined both grounded theory
and *a priori* theory. The mingling of descriptive codes and analytical codes was expected to contribute to robust reporting.

**Synopsis and Frequency Distribution.** The researcher searched for frequency data and constructed both synopsis and frequency distribution tables during the ESL discourse project.

The purpose of frequency distributions tables is “to persuade the reader that the event described was typical, that is, that one can generalize from this instance to other analogous instances in the author’s data corpus” (Erickson, 1986, p. 150). (The fact that this chart is generalizable does not mean that this study is intended to be.) Synopsis and frequency distribution are deemed to be auxiliary tools facilitating some significant categories/analysis by transferring the qualitative data to somewhat quantifiable graphs. This employment helped the researcher to determine patterns in the data. The researcher could make assertions based on the patterns she identified.

In the next section, this researcher will discuss the issue of trustworthiness as it relates to the methodological decisions of this study. Trustworthiness is an umbrella term for credibility, transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and successor validity (Lather, 1986).

**Trustworthiness**

In qualitative research, validity is incarnated as trustworthiness (Denzin, 1997). In this ESL discourse project, trustworthiness (validity) is the most important criterion to support the claim of adequacy of data. It embraces credibility, transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and successor validity (Lather, 1986). Further detail is provided in the following: (1) for credibility, the researcher applied the techniques of prolonged
engagement, persistent observation, member checks and triangulation; (2) for transferability, thick description was applied, (3) for successor validity, construct validity and catalytic validity were the key techniques (See Table 3.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Area</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility (Internal validity)</td>
<td>prolonged engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persistent observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>member checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability (External validity)</td>
<td>thick description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor validity</td>
<td>construct validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>catalytic validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Summary of Techniques for Establishing Trustworthiness in this ESL Discourse Study. Adapted from Lincoln & Guba (1985) and Lather (1986b)

Addressing the concerns of Lincon and Guba (1985) about credibility and transferability, Scheurich (1996) re-categorized these criteria as ‘originary validity.’ Credibility and transferability were offered by Lincon and Guba as policing practices to ensure that the researcher conformed to the conventions of social science research. In this ESL qualitative discourse project, the researcher, as acknowledged post-positivist, wished to respect the challenge of trustworthiness by positivists and quantitative or traditional qualitative researchers. The employment of Lincon and Guba (1985) has helped her to “survive in the conventional science-dominated setting” (Scheurich 1996, p. 2).
following section, the researcher discusses more fully the means to achieve credibility, transferability and successor validity as they relate to the methodological decisions.

Credibility (Internal Validity)

Prolonged Engagement and Persistent Observation. For almost half a year, the researcher stayed on-site, conducting three interviews, ten classroom and three outside classroom of social activities observations of similar phenomena in order to learn the non-native adult English participants’ beliefs regarding their participatory legitimacy for social interaction with English native speakers. The purpose of ESL class observation was to acquire insight into the formation of the non-native English adult speakers’ social identity during their ESL classroom activities, where mediation between non-native adult English speakers (participants) and the larger social world of ESL discourse in the U.S. occurs. The attempt to observe authentic ESL social interaction was intended to explore how participants’ English communication could be characterized in terms of social meaning and how their social identity was socially constructed in the U.S.

Triangulation. The use of multiple measures--multiple data sources, methods and theoretical schemes --is important to set up data trustworthiness. The multiple sources use includes semi-structured interviews, observation and document analysis to collect and validate data. As for the employment of theoretical framings, this study has combined critical theory and post-structuralism as lenses through which to view the collected data.

Member Checks. This study has included member check by obtaining participants’ assistance in reviewing the transcripts of interview data in order to validate their correctness, and offering participants the opportunity to suggest changes to what they perceive might be incorrect information. Throughout the analysis process, the
participants’ contributions worked as a check. Creswell (1994) stated that considering this activity of member checks as “an ongoing dialogue regarding my interpretation of the informant’s reality and meaning will ensure the truth value of data” (p. 167). In this study, the use of member checks was integral to the process of establishing data credibility and recycling data analysis (Lather, 1986b).

Transferability (External Validity)

Regarding transferability, Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that the inquirers need to offer a thick description of transactions and the inquiry context observed in settings that are related to the research questions. This ESL discourse project has achieved the criterion of transferability not only by elucidating non-native English speakers’ cross-cultural communicative interaction with native English speakers but also by exploring the participants’ inner voices regarding their struggles and conflicts during ESL discourse participatory experiences.

Successor Validity

The development of data credibility is essential to create a self-reflexive human science (Lather, 1986b). The researcher has sought to encourage and empower non-native adult English speakers to recognize and challenge their unequal power position with native English speakers. This study is in the pattern of self-reflexive human science. The following discussion of successor validity, including construct validity and catalytic validity, is based on Lather’s (1986b) principles of re-conceptualizing validity. This study has followed these two criteria in collecting trustworthy data.

Construct Validity. To prevent the tendency to theoretical imposition, a “systematized reflexivity” (Later, 1986b, p. 67) is essential to contribute to the growth of change-
enhancing social theory. This means *a priori* that the study has been changed after conducting parts of the research has been conducted. As an example, this study achieved this criterion by demonstrating the uncertainty of the theory that states that lower English achievers possess less motivation to learn English (Krashen, 1981; 1982). For example, in this study, the participants from the Intermediate Level 3 showed similar relatively high self-confidence and strong motivation to interact with their native English teachers or even to take part in outside ESL classroom social interaction compared to the participants from the Advanced Level 5. In addition, this researcher’s findings are based for the most part on what was really happening in the field in research contexts, not on existing theory (*a priori* theory). In this ESL project, the function of *a priori* theory lies merely in its ability to inspire this researcher to undertake and pursue the issue of ESL discourse, but not in imposing an existing theoretical framework on the project.

**Catalytic Validity.** The research process can be re-oriented to increase the participants’ self-understanding and determination to empower the reality of a powerless position. This study meets this criterion because the researcher intended to reveal how the construction of participatory legitimacy was impacted by power hierarchies and cultural arbitrariness (unequal power that influences the imposition of beliefs and decisions) during non-native adult English speakers’ involvement in the U.S. society. The researcher has hoped to redirect these participants’ orientation to such social-cultural factors, as power, social identity and equality, which shape their social position as non-native English speakers.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Chapter four, which presents data findings, is comprised of three sections: (1) general profiles of the collected cases; (2) the findings of case analyses, and (3) native English speakers’ opinions. This information was collected through semi-structured interviews, participatory observation, and document analysis. The four techniques for conducting data analysis applied variously throughout the chapter were: the warranting of an assertion, description through narrative vignette, theoretical framing as a facilitator of analysis, and synoptic charts and frequency tables (Erickson, 1986; Honan et al., 2000). Data transcribed within brackets ‘[ ]’ represent contextual information or grammatical corrections.

First, in the general profiles of the collected cases, the researcher intended to elucidate the demographic background information of individual cases, and to trace the social interaction patterns and tendencies which relate such information to the U.S. social structure. This section foreshadows the discussion of case analyses.

Second, in the findings of the case analyses, the combination of discourse analysis of individual cases and the findings resulting from cross case comparisons are synthesized and interwoven. These simultaneous interconnections go beyond the technique of separate case-by-case and cross case analysis, in order to clearly illustrate the dynamics...
of the data findings. The researcher has attempted to gain insight into the six cases through combined cross-sectional and longitudinal perspectives in order to elucidate the findings, which are framed and organized through responses to the four research questions. The researcher has identified the often-occurring and emergent themes and patterns through data categories and sub-categories to address the four main research questions. This study was designed to explore the impact of power hierarchies on participants’ participatory legitimacy within American ESL discourse settings. Therefore, based on the framework of the dynamics of the multiple discourses embedded within American ESL discourse, the researcher attempts to explore the individual participant’s positioning in the hierarchal power relationship with English native speakers which may shape their participatory legitimacy during communicative interaction. These varied discourses include the sites of cultural-reflective discourse, gender discourse, standard English-only discourse, ESL academic discourse and counter-discourse. These foundations are discussed in detail in chapter one in the research question section.

The research questions are related to the participants’ understanding of the interactions between their original culture and target culture, issues concerning World Englishes, a comparison of EFL/ESL academic contexts in terms of conversational performance and their strategies regarding native speakers’ power imposition. Their perspectives on the significance of English communication and its impact on their willingness to talk and their resistance to unequal power relationships between themselves and native English speakers were also examined. The research questions are listed below:

1. What cross-cultural experiences do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to encounter most frequently in their social interactions in an ESL setting?
2. What beliefs about communicating in English do non-native English-speaking adult learners report about the topic of World Englishes?

3. What do non-native English-speaking adult learners report when they are interviewed about their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics that they recall from their previous EFL classrooms? What do non-native English speaking adult learners demonstrate in their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics when they are observed in their current ESL classroom? What connections are revealed when the two learning contexts are compared?

4. What behaviors or strategies do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to use most frequently when interacting with native speakers of English to avoid power imposition of native speakers?

Third, although the two native ESL teachers in Level 3 and Level 5 in the research site, Christina and Jane, were not focused on as participants (ESL adult learners), they were observed simultaneously with study participants. Their opinions regarding the interference from non-native adult English speakers’ L1 and cultural background, as well as their ideas on the intelligibility of different varieties of English, were explored. Their opinions were included in order to holistically view how the production and reproduction of classroom knowledge delivered by them (part of which was the transmission of English natives’ cultural arbitrariness) affected non-native English adult speakers’ ideas, influencing the creation of a sense of successful communication in English and shaping their participatory legitimacy. This part of the findings was used to address the question of the assumed knowledge of native English speakers who desire to understand non-native English adult speakers’ social involvement.
Collected Case General Profile

Luc

Luc is thirty-seven years old and has been in the U.S. for two years, coming from the Ivory Coast for the purpose of political immigration. He earned a college associate degree in business management, working as a book publisher in his country. Although expressing dissatisfaction with his decision regarding the migration from his home country, his goal was at least partially fulfilled in terms of earning a living for his family. Before Luc arrived in the U.S., he had no English education with little command of English. At the time of the study, he was enrolled the Level 3 class in the research setting.

Either inside the ESL classroom or during authentic social interactions, Luc’s listening and speaking ability seemed to be far outpaced by his reading and writing proficiency. Moreover, his English communication exhibited L1 (French) transfer, which facilitated the comparison of similar or equivalent vocabulary by words or phrases between French and English. Luc’s English acquisition and communication seemed to be driven by his instrumental motivation (Ellis, 1997) to obtain a better job. His religious allegiance to Islam also seemed to be a source of renewal and strength in his life in the U.S.

Asli

Asli is from Turkey, a thirty-one year old married woman. She had been in the U.S for one year and seven months, attending the Level 3 ESL class in the research site. Her temporary migration was a result of her husband’s two-year position as a visiting scholar in the U.S. She reported that her status has been diminished from an elite Turkish literature teacher in middle school to an American minority lacking literacy in English. In the beginning of her adaptation, Asli discovered that her communication in English was
somewhat awkward. Gradually, she converted such an embarrassment-ridden disposition into positive attitudes toward English acquisition. Asli drew on her former position of privilege and self-respect to find the strength to actively take part in interactions with native English speakers.

**Ying**

Ying, a thirty-year old woman, comes from Mainland China. She earned her undergraduate degree in Economics in China and currently is a wife and homemaker in the U.S. At the time of this study, she had been in the U.S. for one year because her husband was seeking a Ph. D. degree at a local university. Ying appeared to be under-prepared for social participation and oral communication in part because of her limited understanding reflecting her original culture, and her less than skilled English proficiency. Her economics degree background seemed not to be compatible with her limited English proficiency and indifferent attitudes about social participation with native speakers of English. Ying found it disheartening that the burden for mastering oral English rested on her.

Her identity as a poor English speaker seemed to be as a result of the Adult Education Center’s language tests, which were oriented toward oral skills. She was very upset and felt powerless regarding her lack of oral and listening skills in English, which resulted in her being placed in the Level 3 class. She was struggling with conversational English as well as her weak bonds in social relationships in her second language settings. However, Ying appeared to be able to master the academic tasks necessary for English exams and classroom-based activities regarding English knowledge. She did well on the GRE and TOEFL tests, which are not based manly on listening or oral tests. Furthermore, Ying
believed that even in the listening comprehension part of the TOEFL test, she knew how to do well because it was technically orientated. Often, during interviews, Ying identified herself as a former bank clerk in China, an ESL adult learner, a wife, and a child’s mother to reflect the multiplicity of her position during her transition to a new literacy setting and discourse in the U.S.

Maria

Maria is from the Dominican Republic, an island country in the Caribbean. She is thirty-five years old, with master’s degrees in Spanish and science, and had served as a university lecturer in these two subjects in her native country. Jane, the ESL teacher of the Level 5 class, mentioned that Maria’s English proficiency, particularly in oral communication, was superior to that of the other ESL adult learners in her class. Maria’s passage to the U.S. was due to her interethnic marriage with a native Caucasian English-speaker one and a half years ago. This factor contributed fundamentally to some advantages regarding her English acquisition and social interactions. However, this involvement also caused her feelings of shock when her original culture and her American husband’s culture confronted each other. Maria’s awareness of her ascribed social role as an American man’s wife and the urgent necessity for her individual growth motivated her to become an accepted social and English communication participant in different social settings.

In some ways, Maria was eloquent and capable of deflecting others’ attempts to criticize her thoughts and behaviors. During interviews, she often inquired about the content of the research question and demonstrated thoughtful and cautious opinions; no doubt, this was also related to her educational achievements in her home country.
Marco

Marco was of Hispanic ethnicity from Mexico City. He was a single male, twenty-three years old, with an associate degree in Civil Engineering from his country, and attending the Level 5 ESL class at the research site. His young entry into the social struggle for a life in the U.S. shaped his early maturity and typically calm facial expressions. He had been in the U.S. for three years, serving in an entry position as dishwasher and then promoted to the position of coordinator of cooks and customers in a local restaurant. Marco’s perseverance and willingness to confront the struggle for survival and adaptation into the U.S. milieu were impressive. He was consistent in his engagement with the process of transformation in order to perform his social roles in an active and involved manner. This reinforced his participatory legitimacy and improved his communication with native English speakers within ESL discourse.

Ming

Ming was a twenty-nine year old female from Korea. She worked as a middle school teacher of Korean. Her migration was due to her husband’s pursuit of his Ph.D. degree in the U.S. She had been in the U.S. for one and half years, attending the Level 5 ESL class in the research site at the time of the study. She seemed to have been uncomfortable with her participation in the English environment when she first arrived, but she was active in searching for the best way to adjust herself to communication with native English speakers in her new life. Her abundant traveling experiences equipped her with liberal world-views, enabling her to confront cross-cultural experiences. This also caused her to not always conform to the general learning rules or steps for English acquisition, but she still maintained a high level of English performance, in particular, with respect to oral
communication. Hence, she might well continue to learn English with minimal formal study through methods that extend beyond the classroom. At the end of the study, Ming succeeded in being transferred from the ESL class to a mainstream master’s program of the University.

Findings of the Case Analyses

The researcher has identified repeated and emergent themes and patterns through the development data categories and sub-categories to address the four research questions (See Chart 4.1).
The impact of power hierarchies
- The unequal power relationship between native and non-native English speakers
- Native English speakers’ imposition of cultural arbitrariness and the non-native English adult speaker’s sense of participatory legitimacy

Social, cultural, historical and political concerns

Question 1
- The transitions and dynamics of cross-cultural interactions and communication
- Cultural comparisons
- Awareness of cultural assumptions and differences: accommodation and

Question 2
- Sub-culture: Gender awareness in cross-cultural discourse
- Ownership and varieties of English
- The symbolic violence of Standard English
- Symbolic domination
- Inevitability and intelligibility

Question 3
- Concerns regarding World Englishes: multiple realities
- English communicational performance and social interactions
- Factors constructing the group dynamics of English oral performance
- Inevitability and intelligibility

Question 4
- Empowerment: Resistance to the imposition of power
- Construction of counter-discourse/the use of L1
- Coping strategies

The construction of subjectivity

The determination of participatory legitimacy

Chart 4.1 Repeated and Emergent Themes Derived from the Data
Research Question 1
What cross-cultural experiences do non-native speakers of English seem to encounter most frequently in their social interactions in an ESL setting?

Two main emergent themes were revealed for question one: including gender in discourse and cross-cultural interactions.

The first theme covers the main category, sub-culture: gender awareness in cross-cultural discourse. The researcher argues that gender is a social/cultural product. Participants’ awareness of the meanings of gender-roles is regarded as a lens through which to address their social interaction behaviors, English communication production and the construction of their social identity, which leads to a picture of their daily lives and the happenings they consider significant in their cross-cultural experiences.

The second theme contains the main categories of transitions and dynamics of cross-cultural interactions and culture and communication. In this section, the issues of concern, such as development of social characteristics, the identification of self and other groupings, cultural shock, accommodation and reconciliation of ethnicity and thinking style to English communication are explored to examine the participants’ encounters during their social participation.

Gender and Discourse
Sub-Culture: Gender Awareness in Cross-Cultural Discourse

Two sub-categories, male-related ESL discourse and female-related ESL discourse, were revealed. The discourse analysis of individual cases and the findings resulting from cross case comparisons of both genders are combined throughout the chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Summary of characteristics</th>
<th>Attributes of Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1. Ideas regarding difference between male and female</td>
<td>Tension among sexist beliefs, androcentric practices and a sense of feminine fragile feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Male: patriarchal, dominant and brave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Female: submissive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The use of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Active, initiating and masculine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-confidence and motivation within social participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Possessed limited English proficiency, but the notion of categorical ‘male gender’ appeared to bolster his confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Barrier to American social involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong nostalgia and home-sickness; insecurity concerning outcome of appeal for political asylum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Supporting factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Religion-Islam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1. Ideas regarding differences between male and female</td>
<td>Reconciliation between machismo culture and sensitivity to life’s pressure with the aid of religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Male: Optimistic approach to difficulties; stoic approach to emotional expression; ability to deal with economic necessities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Female: ---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The use of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Openness; humorous interaction style; the use of a high vocal tone; self-confidence and motivation in social participation; belief that exposure to English will facilitate his efficient participation in the American labor market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Barrier to American social involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guilt and anger about being incapable of attending his grandfather’s funeral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Supporting factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Religion- Catholicism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Summary of Male-Related Gender Discourse

Male-Related Gender Discourse. Luc and Marco were the two male participants (See Table 4.1).

Luc mentioned that the man’s gendered role in his country is a product of the patriarchal, dominant social forces that forge male lives as brave and powerful persons. He reported that men hold more power and expect women to accept submissive roles. In his home country, women seem to be assigned identities that dictate their serving as
supervisors of family chores and child-raising in his society. Luc reported that the role of men entailed their looking forward to a bright future for the whole family. Maybe because Luc was raised within male dominant discourse, his speech style and linguistic practices were very active, initiating and masculine. As a result, apparently, his speech was articulate, so that native English speakers were forced to listen to him. Luc said, “I think that they [native English speakers] listen to me. I also can lead the conversational topic.” Therefore, even though Luc possessed limited English proficiency, his notion of categorical and fixed ‘male gender’ identity appeared to prepare him to deal confidently with the experience of American social interactions. In a sense, his previous male-dominant forms of knowledge seemingly began to be legitimated. However, for Luc, this emergence of dualistic and dichotomous conceptions of gender was vulnerable and probably characterized by over-generalization. He reflected, “I miss and worry about my children. Life is so difficult in the U.S. I don’t know who can I [I can] talk to. I don’t know how long will I [I will] wait for my green card.” Through the commitment to his religion, Luc attempted to alleviate his feelings of distress. In contrast to Luc’s sexist and andro-centric attitudes, his fragile feelings associated with staying alone in the U.S. and his insecurity regarding the possible outcome of his application for political asylum gave voice to his concealed gentle attributes.

The range of emotion Luc’s display appeared to make visible the meanings of gender, which were dynamic and negotiated, containing multiple notions. This inconsistency in his language (for example, at one point he referred to his feeling of active participation within American ESL discourse and then, later, he said, “Life is so difficult in the U. S. I don’t know who can I [I can] talk to?”) might be understood explicitly as the effect of a
struggle between a masculine discourse and another one that involved a man’s right to
give voice to his genuine thoughts and emotions closely associated with his own identity
in this new society. This discourse could challenge Luc’s existing awareness of gender
relationships and might impact his English proficiency.

As for Marco, his social adaptation and identity formation seemed to have occurred
during the stage when the bond to his indigenous culture was still strong. He said, “My
mind is still in Mexico.” Because of economic and immigrant concerns, in spite of his
role as the oldest male grandchild, Marco was unable to express his grief in person when
his grandfather died in Mexico. He said, “My parents from Mexico told me, Marco, your
grandfather died, and I feel so angry. But I cannot [cannot go home]. I should stay here to
earn money. It’s OK. I am going to pray for him.” His assumption of the obligations of a
male grandchild probably encouraged this sort of display---he felt guilt and anger about
being incapable of attending his grandfather’s funeral in Mexico, but he seemed to have
preserved his optimism about going through his difficulties in the U.S. This optimism
appeared to be derived from his commitment to his Catholic religion, which led him to
joyfulness and to observance of prayer for the loss of relatives and relief from his harsh
life. Marco’s role as oldest grandson/son may not always be trouble-free. In addition,
Marco seemed to adhere to an ESL discourse culture of solidarity that was embraced by
male cooks. He mentioned:

I started working here as a dishwasher. That was like three years ago. And I am a
kitchen manager. [ha-ha-ha]. I work shorter hours now. In my kitchen, most of them
are male cooks because here is very tired [working in the kitchen makes you very
tired]. They speak native English. I am the only Spanish speaker. But, it’s OK. They
listened [listen] to what I say. (2/27/03, interview)
Also, Marco’s happy disposition and openness contributed to his engagement in humorous interaction style and his use of a high vocal tone as a mechanism for engaging in oral exchanges. For instance, Marco tried to ask for higher wages from his boss.

I told my boss by exaggerating [my] voice: “Money, money, money, and money.” But, my boss responds with higher elevating voice, “I [myself] need more money, too. And I responded to him with serious, high pitch voice, “Yeah, we both need money, mo…ney, mo…ney. Good, you know I need money.” (2/27/03, interview)

Perhaps, this kind of witty display and direct implication made it easier for Marco’s boss to decode the low-context discourse and achieve a prompt understanding of Marco’s purpose. Marco’s discourse patterns featured the confidence and courage to address responses of his native English boss that were challenging. When Marco was questioned, in an exchange when a question would not be expected, he did not falter. Marco answered with bravado and continued on to get back to his point. His strength was beguiling because of his humor. He used humor to allow his masculine assertiveness to be received without threat.

In addition, in the following segment, noticeably, Marco’s exposure to restaurant culture, consisting mostly of interactions with the native English boss or other cooks, likely gave rise to his intent to master the ‘Standard English accent’ and be more accepted. Marco probably regarded the correctness of native English speakers as a very important interpersonal skill associated very closely with expanding social participation and job markets. Seemingly, Marco’s use of non-Standard English was denigrated in this working environment.

I like native English cooks and a [the] boss to correct my accent. I like people to say “No, Marco, you have to say like this. This is better for you.” When [Before] they correct [corrected] my English, [I felt] kind of mad or sad, because we don’t speak the same English. I want them to understand me. But, now, I know better. Before,
when I was working, I made some mistakes. I like some people [native English speakers] to talk to me “No, it is not like that. It is like this.” (2/27/03, interview)

This excerpt also indicates that Marco is reflective about his interaction with English native speakers and the impact of those interactions on his English oral proficiency. Thus, this aspect of the study revealed that Marco was using interlocutors in his job setting for input to improve his English language usage in non-classroom contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Summary of characteristics</th>
<th>Attributes of Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asli</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1. Ideas regarding differences between male and female&lt;br&gt;• Male: Dominant; threatening&lt;br&gt;• Female: A family care-taker but desires social independence&lt;br&gt;2. The use of English&lt;br&gt;• Provides consistent access to native speakers&lt;br&gt;3. Barrier to American social involvement&lt;br&gt;• At risk and threatened in the U.S.&lt;br&gt;4. Supporting factor&lt;br&gt;• Strong desire to be independent and free to live her own life</td>
<td>Struggle among roles of family care-taker, insecure woman, independent English learner and negotiator of power balance with her husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1. Ideas regarding differences between male and female&lt;br&gt;• Male: An informant (her husband) offering her knowledge regarding American life and the correct English to use&lt;br&gt;• Female: A family care-taker; dependent, self-segregation and self-isolation&lt;br&gt;2. The use of English&lt;br&gt;• Little comfort level in using English; low motivation for intercultural and interracial communication; desire for social approval&lt;br&gt;3. Barrier to American social involvement&lt;br&gt;• Anxious about the American environment&lt;br&gt;4. Supporting factor&lt;br&gt;• Affiliation with family</td>
<td>Negotiating among positions of family care-taker, dependent wife, and pursuer of American social acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Summary of the Female-Related Gender Discourse

Continued
### Table 4.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>1. Ideas regarding difference between male and female</th>
<th>2. The usage of English</th>
<th>3. Barrier to American social involvement</th>
<th>4. Supporting factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>• Male: A supporter (her husband)</td>
<td>• Previous successful, female socio-economic position, her affiliation with a native woman-centered group and pervasive empowerment from her husband (a native English speaker), all of which reinforce her social communication and English competence.</td>
<td>• Sometimes being scared to speak English</td>
<td>• Church female study/support group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming</td>
<td>• Male: Dominant</td>
<td>• Apathetic interaction style; ignore uncomfortable interactions</td>
<td>• Restricted participation in American society</td>
<td>• Strong motivation to survive in the new environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female-Related Gender.** Asli, Ying, Maria and Ming are the four female participants (See Table 4.2).

The first female participant, Asli, reported a feeling of being at risk and threatened in her new environment; she expressed negative feelings regarding unexpected interaction with some male strangers in America. However, she did not seek security from her native countrymen, which would cause her to make acquaintances that resembled her former interactions in Turkey. Asli accepted her integration into mainstream American society by emphasizing her consistent access to native speakers. She mentioned, “I cannot just talk to my Turkish friends. I need to talk to American people to practice English.”
In addition, the obligatory responsibility of females in Asli’s culture requires the caretaking of children. In spite of the fact that Asli’s ESL class schedule conflicted with the duty of picking up her son from the elementary school, which probably hindered and minimized Asli’s chance to make the most of her own literacy education, Asli remained determined to participate socially in the U.S. She also mentioned that she tried to explore ways that would permit her to attend ESL class without upsetting the power balance between her husband and herself. She stated, “I still want him to feel I take care of the family. I don’t want him to get mad.”

Furthermore, Asli revealed that her English acquisition experiences disengaged her somewhat from the gender related hierarchy which had forged her life—dependency upon her husband’s English proficiency in order to survive in the U.S. Asli said, “I don’t want to ask him [my husband] anything. I know that he is so important. But I don’t want to rely on him [his English] in the U. S.” In this sense, Asli could regard such awareness as a catalyst for change; it probably signified a potential transformation in the status of Asli’s position vis-à-vis her husband’s. At the same time, Asli seemed to be conscious of relocating herself within the social power hierarchy, becoming independent enough to empower herself by asserting her legitimate participation in ESL discourse. It was inferred that Asli’s social experiences in Turkey motivated her to create for herself a sense of social independence in the U.S. As Asli mentioned:

I want to be free [here]…like my life in Turkey. Even though he is patient. … In Turkey, I am very independent. I don’t need to rely on him. It’s very bad. But I learn very hard. I don’t want to be stupid. (4/8/03, interview)

From the above segment, it appears that in Asli’s native country, the socially appropriate role of the female seemed to be a positive one and supportive in nature. This
encouraged her to act freely and speak candidly. It also fortified her in her resolve to negotiate her own cultural and social norms while encountering life in the U.S.

As for the second female participant, Ying, she appeared not to feel connected and rarely reported socializing across ethnic and cultural lines. It seemed that her self-segregation and self-isolation were noticeable to Ying; she tended to surround herself with people of her own Chinese ethnicity. She stated “Because I only take part in the limited social activities with native speakers, I don’t [have] access to a lot of activities in the U.S. I get together with Chinese people.” However, such self-separation appeared to be beneficial to her close relationship with family members. Ying said, “I should take this responsibility to take care of my husband and children, right? I feel comfortable with them.” It was inferred from this comment that her comfort level greatly impacted her decisions and affiliations regarding social adaptation; intercultural and interracial relationships were not given much chance to develop.

I am not good at English. Also, maybe because I only take part in limited social activities with native speakers, I don’t [have] access to a lot of activities in the U.S. I get together with Chinese people. In this moment, I am a housekeeper and serve as [in] a role of mother. But I should take this responsibility to take care of my husband and children, right? I feel comfortable with them. (2/6/03, interview)

As a result, Ying’s husband appeared to be the main informant who educated her regarding American life and what variety of English was appropriate to speak. Ying mentioned: “The good [English] accent should be like central America people’s. Or maybe like reporters or program hosts in the broadcast or TV program. I think that their accents are very standard. But, actually, I got this information from my husband.”

In addition, it seemed that Ying’s gender-defined role, characterized by sacrifice for the child’s educational achievement as the first priority, out-weighed other reasons for
residing in the U.S. “I think that the U.S. can offer better education for my daughter. This makes me stay here. But, I still want to go back to my country to have my own business,” Ying stated. Clearly, Ying appeared to be responsive and attempted to take responsibility for her family’s needs.

The situations of Asli’s and Ying’s adaptation were noticeably similar. They both regarded the new environment as threatening and were anxious that it might seriously affect their social connections. Expressing her fears, Ying said,

I cannot go out. Even during summer, I close all my windows and doors. I am afraid of the new environment…The only thing is that I just wait for my husband [to come] back every day. (6/18/03, interview)

In this sense, Ying was somewhat withdrawn in her social interactions owing to her perceived environmental insecurity, which seemed to represent a threat. It seems likely that this was a result of her own gender-related sense of physical or mental limitations.

In sum, Ying’s social identity seemed to be comprised of dependent, responsible and sacrificing gender relations in which she lacked power as compared with her husband. Also, Ying’s speech appeared to be constrained within certain discrete realms (Chinese community and family.) This probably restricted her access to English communication and lowered the possibility of comprehensible English input in her developing English proficiency.

In terms of the third female participant, Maria, immigration seemed to be a catalyst, making Maria think critically about how she could conceivably effect change in her life. Maria established her own identity as a participant in American social interactions through association with a female study/support group in her church, one that was
involved in sharing common needs and goals. This helped Maria construct her individual ways of thinking and behaving.

As the following example shows, Maria was included in the discourse of solidarity embraced by the female church members. She mentioned that female native English speakers were very helpful, saying, “They support and agree what I say.” This seemed to provide an incentive for her integration with native speakers. Maria said:

I am in church this morning. We have [a] discussion in English. They try to understand me, when I don’t understand [explain well]. Some ideas, they try to understand and explain to me. This makes me feel I love to join their discussion and feel comfortable. (7/3/03, interview)

The effect of her affiliation with this support group was decidedly positive. It enabled her to feel connected in an essential way to the American ESL environment. In addition, Maria’s sense of professional identity, developed when she served as a science and Spanish instructor in her country, and her inter-ethnic marriage with a native English speaker reinforced her social communication and competence. For example, Maria said: “Actually, most of time, I am scared [to talk]. But, my husband pushes me to try, try and try. My husband corrects my English.” It was probably positive gender-related experiences (e.g., previous successful female socio-economic position, the affiliation with a native speaking woman-centered group, pervasive empowerment from her husband) that energized Maria’s active and hands-on communicative behaviors.

In sum, Maria tended to fall more within the pattern of speaker-focused (Henry et al., 1995, Reed et al., 1999) discourse. Her gender-related performance and communication were examined through her historical, socially-specific experiences, and were also explicitly related to changing pre-determined gender relations. Also, within the context of
American ESL discourse, power differences helped determine Maria’s linguistic and social choices, shaping the contingent social structures of native and non-native adult English speakers.

The fourth female participant, Ming, quit her teaching job in a Korean middle school to become an international student’s wife in the U.S. Her decision regarding whether or not she should pursue a stable future in Korea or emigrate to the U.S. seemed to confuse her. Being an Asian woman, her empowerment might be minimized in the predominantly male dominant social practices of Korea. However, Ming circumvented the barriers to social involvement by marrying a man who was not the oldest son. She said: “Before I got married, I knew that I must look for a man carefully. He wouldn’t be the oldest son. My husband was [is] the second son.” Ming explained that in most Asian countries, the oldest son of the family assumes most of the family duties and must meet the highest social expectations. This means that the man’s wife should endure submissively and risk the distress of marginalization imposed by her husband’s family. She mentioned: “I don’t want to have endless arguments with my husband’s family. If it happens, I will ignore that.” She was unwilling to be pitted against them over such issues as the parents-in-law’s involvement in her children’s education and whether they should live together with the parents-in-law. In a sense, for Ming, the choice of husband was a means of balancing an unequal social power relationship and of resisting and counteracting the effects of her subordinate position. This was an attempt to challenge the existing gender relations/identities and Korean social practices. However, within such gender discourse in Korea, it was evident that Ming probably would not express herself freely in English even while she was living in the U.S.
After emigrating to the U.S., Ming brought the discursive experience of a woman’s gender-defined role from her former culture to her oral conversations with native English speakers. She engaged in contacts with an apathetic interaction style, sometime ignoring uncomfortable interactions. As she mentioned:

Sometimes, the people [native speakers] have very mean attitudes. I feel uncomfortable to talk [talking]. Also, I will get hurt. Now, I am OK, I try to ignore them. I want to survive. I ignore them. If I don’t ignore them, I will get hurt. In the beginning, I’m concerned a lot. This is the way to survive here, and not to get hurt. (2/6/03, interview)

This suggested that her interactional experiences in ESL discourse were not constituted solely by her experiences in the Korean gendered role of female discourse but also by her restricted participation in discourse. Her traditional role in Korea (e.g., her passiveness and difficulty in gaining exposure to communication and obtaining participatory legitimacy in family issues) impacted her decision to participate within American ESL discourse. Also, her habit of submission seemed to have negative effects on speech participation as her limited participation was highly constrained within a narrow range of communication possibilities.

**Cross-Cultural Interactions**

The six case studies revealed the participants’ opinions regarding differences they had perceived, the comparison of different cultural values and encounters that resulted in culture shock. Going through this stage, the participants appeared to continually adjust the roles they were playing to comprehend the acculturation they were encountering. They described the process of accommodation and resolution and how their cross-social/cultural characters were developing (See Chart 4.2). The chart shows the flow of
interactions in an interconnected manner as well as the need to make accommodation when interacting in an ESL setting for the six case study participants.

Chart 4.2  An Illustration of Possible Transitions and Dynamics of Cross-Cultural Interactions

The Transitions and Dynamics of Cross-Cultural Interactions

Cultural Comparisons

Identification of Self and Other Groups. Based on the interview data, it was evident that the study participants’ efforts to manage the process of cultural change in the U.S. were negotiated through continual cultural comparisons.

In the following dialogue, the inconsistency and contradictions in Asli’s opinions regarding her description of the significance of her original culture and the comparison of Turkish and American people seemed to be affected by assimilation and led to her identify with her new culture and interaction with native English speakers. It seemed that the relationship between culture and Asli’s thinking was dynamic. In the first stage, Asli referred to Turkish people as friendly, talkative and intimate, whereas she reported that Americans appeared to require a certain distance during personal interactions. After
several months, Asli seemed to believe that Turks were more isolated than American people, who now appeared to her to be easy-going.

Asli: For my Turkish culture, people are very free and talkative. In Turkey, we are very close to people. We are friendly. We touch friends. But Americans are not so close, they want the distance.

Researcher: Are American people friendly?
Asli: No, they are not too friendly. I say… it depends on chances. Maybe. I am scared. (2/11/03, interview)

Researcher: Why do you love America more than your country?
Asli: In the U.S., most of people are very friendly. They always smile. Sometimes, even [though] we don’t know each other… they just smile. But in Turkey, if we don’t know each other, we don’t say hi. People here are very helpful. People here obey rules very well. American people obey rules. Maybe we will ask one-year extension for staying here. I think that America is better than my country. (4/8/03, interview)

As indicated in the above interview, the new culture appeared to be bringing about changes in Asli’s consciousness, apparently causing movement to a new level of mutual interaction. It was tempting to interpret Asli’s contradictory sequences as indications that she was advancing from the role of novice to become a more English proficient participant. As she was engulfed by the new culture, Asli’s sense of identity and impressions of her original cultural heritage seemed to be changing. But, this phenomenon really may not really mean Asli was attempting to give up her cultural values in favor of newly acquired ones. Instead, this could also possibly be explained as an integration pattern that changed the way Asli changed herself and thus related to her new cultural and linguistic environment.

As for Ying, she used Chinese perspectives to examine her American life, which affected how she saw herself and the new world. Evidently, Ying’s first language and professional skills, and her economic skills as a bank clerk, were not transferable to the U.S. It became clear that frustration and confusion were characteristics of her cross-cultural experiences. Also, her willingness to give up the social environment of the U.S. to return to mainland China could be described as an act of resistance to the U.S. The new American life and culture appeared to make Ying question what she was supposed to pursue and which culture she should choose. She still wanted to go back to mainland China eventually, and because of that, she seemed to be unwilling to abdicate her original traditions. This choice probably was a decidedly conscious act of Chinese identity, a way of stating “I am Chinese,” to counter Ying’s current social identity as “a failure” in the U.S.

Researcher: In the U. S., does your Chinese culture influence you to behave in a certain way?
Ying: I bring [use] my culture to see American life. I am impressed that [by] their high moral standard. They are not selfish and always think about other people. They don’t occupy the public areas [They respect common public areas]. We need to learn from them. But… for me, the U.S. is only [a] transitional place. There are some barriers and difference [differences] in my new life. I am Chinese. I still want to go back to my country [Mainland China] to fulfill self-achievement…for my own business and future. In China, I am a bank clerk. I have high education. I can earn money to support my family. But, I think that I am a failure here. I am upset. (2/6/03, interview)

Ying’s social identity was related to her affinity and exercise of solidarity with the concept of ‘going back to China and being a Chinese person.’ As a matter of fact, she was not totally located in a marginalized position during this new transitional situation. Furthermore, she appeared to disclaim her weak ability to form simple social relationships and friendships in social participations in U.S. society, preferring to label herself as a peacemaker in the tradition of her original Chinese culture. The following extract reveals her communicative role to be one of a message receiver, tamed and obedient to native speakers’ directives, in accord with her opinion that “My Chinese culture loves peace.” Also, this interpretation seemed to strengthen her sense of solidarity with other Chinese speakers and to enable her to distance herself from the category of being disadvantaged as an English oral communicator by maintaining her own cultural values.

I can feel that most native speakers are very nice. Most of time, I got used to listen [listening] to and accept [accepting] what they say. I don’t want to have an argument with people. My Chinese culture loves peace. I don’t speak a lot. (6/18/03, interview)

Similarly, Ming stated, “I am a foreigner. I am not an American. I am a Korean who needs to speak English and live here… I am insular and live in an island.” Ming had confidence in the truth of her assumptions, an awareness of her ‘otherness’ and her implicit understanding of self and other categories that led her to comprehend the order of
her new social environment. However, this categorization may also have resulted in Ming’s social isolation.

Furthermore, as reflected in the following example, Marco also seemed to be involved and active in topics or issues related to the cultural distinctions between Mexico and the U.S. He tried to maintain and defend his social, ethnic, and religious positions. For instance, even though Marco’s definition for being a Catholic might be unorthodox or controversial, as he said, “I think that Catholics don’t need to go to church every Sunday,” it seemed unquestionable that the difference between Hispanic and American Catholics could be a problem for him. Marco’s distinctive Hispanic ethnicity and Catholic identity were underlying factors affecting his present experience in his new American cultural context, shaping some of his cultural interactions.

Marco: We [Hispanic people] are kind of a polite people. We are interested in everybody else. We try to say everything in the right way politely. But American people are more direct and cold…I brought my culture here, like I am a Catholic. I know a lot of people [native English speakers] here are Catholic. But it’s different. [He shows his Catholic necklace.] So, even a lot of people here, they [native English speakers] don’t have this. [They don’t really trust Catholicism.]
Researcher: Do you go to church?
Marco: If I have a day off, I try to go to church. Because I think that Catholics don’t need to go to church every Sunday. (6/13/03, interview)

Cultural Shock. In particular, the three viewpoints of participants Asli, Maria and Luc revealed the presence of culture shock when confronting specific culture-valued differences and faced with choices regarding the dominant/popular language (See Table 4.3). The other participants, however, displayed a more tranquil attitude in their daily life when they encountered certain cultural differences.
The Presence of an Example of Cultural Shock in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural Shock Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asli</td>
<td>lower academic criteria for education in American schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>rigid institutional dominance of American society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc</td>
<td>his L1, French, failing to be recognized as one of the privileged and international languages in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Some Participants’ Experiences with Cultural Shock in the U.S.

For example, Asli was involved with her son’s education, serving as a volunteer who actively supported school activities every Friday in her son’s American elementary school. She suffered culture shock when she realized that her son’s teacher failed to provide certain academic criteria to support her expectations for her son’s future. Her responsibility to educate her son for success caused her to be dissatisfied with the teacher’s low academic expectations, which she feared could result in long-term negative consequences for her son’s academic success. As she said: “I was shocked. Shocked.” It appeared that Asli still worried about the attrition of her own cultural values, and she desired to maintain her well-articulated sense of group identity.

Asli: Teachers in my country are very rigid. They want students to obey rules. They don’t talk [say] to students “good job,” “well done,” or “very well.” They don’t want to spoil the child. I go to my son’s school, when students got the scores 60 out of 100, still “good job.” [American teachers] always talk [say] to students “good job” “good job.” No, it is not a “good job.” I was shocked. Shocked.

Researcher: What do you think?
Asli: When my son first arrived [in the U. S.], his grade was not so good. Maybe like the scores 80 out of 100. But his teacher talked to him and wrote down a “good job.” It is not a “good job.”

(4/8/03, interview)

Furthermore, as for Maria, the context of her daily living was characterized by disputes and conflicts related to her incessant cultural comparisons and shocks. The numerous examples in which Maria explored the American social order through its culture were striking. In the following interview, for example, on the one hand, Maria mentioned the suffix ‘- esque,’ referring to ‘in the manner or style’ to describe the perception of the rigid institutional dominance of American society. She stated, “It is
surprising to me. I am shocked.” However, on the other hand, Maria exhibited ambivalent feelings regarding America’s social order, sometimes showing support and agreement. She said, “I think this social order [in the U.S.]… it’s easier for me…But social order is important for me.” Her paradoxical relationship and comparisons probably accelerated the transition of her status from novice to that of better cultural adaptation to America. The following conversation occurred in the first interview:

Maria: In my age…you know [I asked her if I could sit close to her.] Especially, oh, I’m in the process of big change in my life. I think this social order [in the U.S.]… it’s easier for me; you know…They [native English speakers] are very esquetec for a lot of thing. For example, American society is very rigid. But American society has social order. But sometimes I don’t understand that. But social order is important for me.

Researcher: How do you spell this word ‘esquetec’?
Maria: e-s-q-u-e-t-e-c. It means a system. Everything is a system.
Researcher: What is this system? Is it organized?
Maria: Organized? Organization is something.
Researcher: Why?
Maria: American society is very rigid.
Researcher: I see.
Maria: For example, if you are sick, you want to see a doctor. You’re going to die before seeing him…because the appointment is after three months. You need to wait three months. It is surprising to me. I am shocked. But, I like this country and people. People are friendly, but very busy and fast here. They don’t have time to talk with me.

(2/4/03, interview)

In addition, Luc was the only participant who was surprised and disappointed regarding the linguistic domination of English, while French, his first language, was not regarded as a popular or international language in the U.S. His disappointment was the result of his limited foreign experience which may have led him to exaggerate the role of French. ESL discourse practices in the program concerning the choice of legitimate language seemed to be shocking to him because they seemed to prohibit the use of his native French language. In the U.S., the contradiction between the socioeconomic value attached to the linguistic practices of English and Luc’s expectations for the privileged status of French frustrated him. This seemed to be a hindrance which caused him to struggle desperately for social mobility during the process of socialization. He said:
When I come here, I don’t see any people speak [speaking] French. Before I come, I think that French is an international language. Why don’t American people understand [French]? What’s going on? What’s going on? (2/13/03, interview)

To summarize, three perspectives with reference to cultural shock were worthy of note. Asli, Maria and Luc all appeared to be examining their own cultural or linguistic assumptions most frequently in relation to social practices, English communication, and the position of the first language value in the U.S. Compared to the other participants, they attempted to use cultural differences more as a basis for the exploration and navigation of the social hierarchy and inequality in their daily life. It appeared that they tried to maintain an image representative of the beliefs and norms to which they subscribed.

**Accommodation and Reconciliation: the Development of Social Character**

All participants commented on the manner in which they attempted to manage their transition to the new society. They seemed to develop a new social character, which was generated through interaction with their new cultural environment. For example, Maria appeared to protect herself from the distresses of a new culture. Her determination to face the challenge of the new environment was rooted in her marital status. However, she seemed unwilling to intentionally incorporate her prior life experiences into her new life in America. She stated, “I want to focus on my life in the future, not the one [that] happened in the past. I am very focused.” Her determination to confront her new life probably rendered her indigenous, past history diminished or invisible. She stated:

Now, this is my choice. I got married with my American husband. I don’t want to spend the rest of life in complaining, such as I don’t understand language [English]… I cannot work. This is different life for me. I want to focus on my life in the future, not the one [that] happened in the past. I am very focused. (2/4/03, interview)
Particularly, in essence, Marco appeared to have received his socialization in his native country, and he proceeded to carry his cultural norms and beliefs into the U.S. while he was acclimating to the challenge of his new social context. One example of Marco’s perceptions and attitudes resulting from early influences of his family legacy concerned his struggle to adapt to America: “I am by myself here [in the U.S.]. My parents taught me I needed to fight for everything, like my life. If I want that [better life] so hard, I need to pay [the] price. But, [finally] I am going to have that.” Marco’s new social character, partly derived from his original cultural legacy, was active and fervent; it was a reaction to new cultural practices probably resulting from the relocation of his native cultural traditions, particularly those concerning coping strategies and attitudes related to new socialization procedures.

Furthermore, Luc mentioned that cultural change accelerated his transition to the new life in the U.S. However, the satisfaction of social acceptability and his adaptation seemed to be mitigated by the understanding that “The change makes me look like them [American people].” Luc seemed to accept the need to change unconditionally even though he was aware of the power of American cultural arbitrariness that necessitated his change. It appeared that his change consolidated and legitimated his new social character. In a sense, this change probably had an effect on his affiliation with his cultural traditions and his old sense of ‘who he is’. Luc said:

I feel this country can change [changed] me. But I cannot change this country. If you want to stay in this country, I need to learn their way. I have my traditional cloth [clothes] in my country. But America changes my cloth [clothes]. I wear jeans. Maybe my wife does not recognize me. I change from my traditional cloth to jeans. For these changes, I am OK. The change makes me look like them [American people].

(2/11/03, interview)
In addition, Ming was convinced that the length of time in a new environment was the principal factor in determining the effects of accommodation and reconciliation. She said, “It is time. I need some time. I can adapt myself well.” Whether or not length of time alone can facilitate adaptation to a new environment requires further study. Ming’s assumption was likely a product of her somewhat privileged position characterized by her husband’s material and emotional support.

In the above cases, it was clear that participants tended to be both courageous and accommodating as they faced the dynamics of cultural interaction and found that it significantly affected the strength of their ties to their original ethnicity and cultural associations. They appeared to have a clear sense of social character, shaped by the contextualized dynamics of their cross-cultural interactions and empowered continuously by their new life challenges in the U.S.

Culture and Communication

Ethnicity and English Communication. The participants mentioned that they appeared to be categorized by their idiosyncratic distinctiveness, which certainly appeared to cause the most immediate reaction from native speakers, directly affecting the possibility of their being invited by native speakers to join in conversations or participate in social activities. Two types of categorization by ethnicity are based on the differences in the participants’ physical appearances.

First, some participants, Ying, Asli, Ming and Marco, have obviously different physical appearances from those of American Caucasians or African Americans. Therefore, most of the time before communication occurred, it is likely that they either consciously or unconsciously separated themselves from the native speakers, or they
were recognized by the native speakers to have a clear identity of foreigners. Therefore, fewer chances developed for them to participate in discourse. For example, Ming mentioned, “When they see my face, they know I am a foreigner. I don’t need to talk [even tell] to them where I am from. Most of time, they are not interested in talking to me.”

Secondly, in contrast, several study participants had physical appearances similar to those of American Caucasians or African Americans. Therefore, they appeared to have more numerous chances to be invited to participate in conversations with native English speakers, as both sides were stimulated by a sense of intuitive closeness connected with some non-native participants’ appearance. Maria and Luc were classified in this category. For example, as the segment below suggests, because Maria’s physical characteristics were quite like those of American Caucasian women, it appeared that native speakers did not initially lump her in the non-native English group directly. Apparently, ‘a potential native English speaker’ seemed to be an ascribed aspect of Maria’s identity before communication with native English speakers really occurred. However, once native English speakers heard her non-native accent, the imposition of unequal power seemed to take place; a distinct social categorization appeared to distinguish insiders from outsiders. Simultaneously, the range of conversational subjects and interests also gradually diminished. It seemed to Maria that “they were just curious [about] where I [Maria] am from.” On the one hand, for native English speakers, Maria’s racial similarity to native Caucasian Americans forged her a place in the U.S. oral discourse. On the other hand, her accent of Dominican English displayed in conversation with native English speakers appeared to prevent this familiarity.
My facial [face], is not really American like, but close to Americans’… but it’s not [as] significant as Asian people. But they have to hear me first to notice that English is not my first language. I don’t know. Well, it is not my opinions [opinions], but, it is my experiences [experience]… But you know, they are [native English speakers] just curious [about] where I am from.

(7/3/03, interview)

According to Maria, various communication opportunities depended on how great the differences were regarding physical presentation. In this analysis, among natives and non-natives, it is evident that either ethnicity or physical distinctiveness can be a potent factor influencing motivation for strong affiliation and the desire for interaction. Furthermore, some non-native speakers, in particular, Maria and Luc, seemed to experience complex interactions. Based on the data, their social identity appeared to be developed through two different phenomena (1) the acceptance and recognition of their close physical similarity to American Caucasians or African Americans, (2) but negative reaction to their non-native English accent by native English speakers. In resolving this situation, they seemed to experience a greatly changing sense of self.

**Thinking style and English communication.** Among the six participants, Ming was the participant who most explicitly grappled with the issues of thinking style and communication patterns.

The difference in discourse patterns and the failure to present thoughts logically may lead to miscommunication and varied expectations between English natives and non-natives. In the following excerpt, Ming believed that native speakers’ discourse/linguistic strategies or logical communication (Reed et al., 1999) tended to be more straightforward, focusing on a pattern of main themes and stressing the order of statements. Ming stated, “I think that this is American culture…their thinking styles.” Moreover, Ming interpreted natives’ praise, for example, “your English is very good,” as
ambiguous. Based on Ming’s comments, on the one hand, when native English speakers were initiating a direct compliment, they seemed to be nice and always positive. On the other hand, English natives speakers could actually be trying to reinforce their authority with Ming regarding the knowledge of English. Their compliment was probably interpreted as an expression of power reminding Ming that she was merely a non-native speaker. It can be observed that native English speakers’ direct compliments may increase or decrease mutual social distance. However, in the following conversation, Ming seemed to understand natives’ use of directness, in spite of her culturally indirect logical thought process and her interpretation of cross-cultural perspectives.

English native speakers [American people] emphasize the importance of the result and comments first; and then they speak out the background and reasons by degrees. Their styles are of upside-down tree shape.’ For example, there are a lot of native English speakers talking to me---“your English is very good.” I think that this is American culture …their thinking styles. They are very direct. They try to praise and always talk to people positively in front of people. But my Korean [people] tends [tend] to be indirect and meandering. Therefore, it seems like that we [Korean people] invite the listeners to participate [in] our thinking presentation/process and then the listeners get the final main points. (5/29/03, interview)

Not surprisingly, Ming appeared to believe that native English speakers’ directness could imply something malicious (a product of her indirect thought process), something akin to such a malicious implication as follows:

In fact, maybe native English speakers think that I am stupid even [though] I am well-educated, because I don’t speak English well. They are just nice in front of me. (5/29/03, interview)

The different principles underlying the construction of different cultural discourses are likely to lead to some misunderstandings or stereotypes. Ming seemed to think of herself as shocked by the cultural differences. But perceiving these differences probably helped
Ming to define changes she was attempting to make in the U.S. and increased her awareness of the significance of her indigenous cultural values and cross-cultural experiences.

**Research Question 2**

**What beliefs about communicating in English do non-native speaking adult learners report about the topic of World Englishes?**

The research question intended to elucidate the issues of World Englishes, which cover the related concerns of the legitimate claim to employ or own English, the complex nature of English varieties, the domination of Standard English usages, and the inevitable use of Standard English for the purpose of social mobility. Three main themes corresponding to contemporary social-cultural and ESL/EFL ethos were emergent.

Data contributing to the first themes suggested participants’ assumptions regarding the ownership of English globally. The researcher labeled this major category ‘who claims English worldwide.’ In the second theme, the data pertains to participants’ awareness regarding the diverse characteristics of World Englishes, the domination of Standard British or American English, the prestigious position of Standard English regarding its intelligibility and inevitability as cultural capital. The main category is titled the ‘influence of symbolic violence.’ With respect to the third theme, the findings reported how participants were challenged by their linguistic participatory attitudes, motivations, and tendencies socially, and negotiated or struggled with their social status within the Standard-English-only discourse. In this analysis, the researcher relied on discussions and resulting insights to examine the relative capital of English that each individual participant embraced and whether or not this was likely to be congruent with the value
for American social acceptance. This discussion reflects the participants’ self-perceptions relative to the first and second themes and the participants’ thoughts related to their relative positions in society.

Who Claims English Worldwide

In the study, all participants mentioned that their assumptions of ownership of English globally were related to their conception of participatory legitimacy and reflected linguistic practices within an ESL context. Two participants, Asli and Luc, expressed the idea that English belongs to all the people who are using it. One other perspective regarding the ownership of English, that of Ying, Ming and Maria, suggested British people control English. Finally, Marco’s viewpoint was that English is supposed to be an American possession. For example, Asli mentioned that “English belongs to everyone who uses that [it].” It can be assumed that she was attempting to claim legitimacy as a non-native speaker through her affiliation with English. However, she continued to confer privilege on the value of British English and described the ability of British people
to “speak clear English” compared to her Turkish English. Similarly, Luc also expressed the opinion that “English belongs to everyone who speaks it,” but he argued especially that “[those] who are born in the U.S., [are] who have good English.” Luc tried to equate ethnic identity with ownership and legitimacy of English usage. This suggested implicitly that the U.S. not only owns English, but it also controls the kind of English accepted as standard or privileged English.

Taking a more historical viewpoint, Ying, Ming and Maria stated that English belongs to the British, resulting mainly from the fact that English originated there. Ying observed, “I think that English is from British,” and Ming stated, “English comes from England.” Maria appeared to have similar sentiments regarding the origins of English development. This view implies that the origin of English is aligned with British power, and thus it is the obligation of Britain to be in charge of English.

Furthermore, Marco, in the first interview, was ambiguous regarding the question of the ownership of English, but still confined his opinions to either “the British people or American people,” who first spoke and possessed English. In the second interview, Marco mentioned that his strong intention to learn American English was because “English belongs to America.” Moving from uncertainty to confirmation, Marco’s final response probably can be understood as a result of his geographical location in the U.S. and his affiliation with the American accent and style of communication.

The participants’ perspectives regarding who owns English worldwide covered three possible claims: (1) English belongs to all the people who use it, but the value of British and American English it is privileged, (2) British people and (3) American people. These perceptions resulted from the factors of equating ethnic identity with English ownership,
the historical origins of English and the participants’ present geographical location, which influenced opinions about who owns English. Participants tended to situate themselves in a disadvantaged status category as English users, rather than English managers (See Chart 4.2).

**Influence of Symbolic Violence**

**Symbolic Domination of Standard English.** The viewpoints from all participants revealed that English seems to have a poly-dimensional character, leading to the existence of multiple English varieties internationally. All participants maintained that they speak a variety of English which is different from that of the U.S. or Britain; the difference is characterized by accent, speaking pace, pronunciation and syntax. For example, Luc said, “My English is very different from American English. Different accent. We have different pace. They speak very fast. But I cannot.” Ying mentioned, “Our Englishes are different. Different sentence structures. But I love to speak to American native speakers. Because they speak pure English.” As for Ming, she said, “It is different [my English is different from American English.] I cannot pronounce exactly the same as American native speakers’ pronunciation.” Additionally, one participant, Marco, observed that even native English speakers use different varieties of English. Marco said, “They speak differently [American natives]. For the same word, they say in different pronunciation [pronunciations].” This seemed to cast doubt on the construction of Standard English and the privileged position of its speakers. Except for this exceptional expression, most of the participants’ understanding seemed to be in opposition to the intended goal of World Englishes to achieve English democratization by
extinguishing the unjust domination of a Western-centric linguistic hegemony (Tsuda, 1997).

As for which English version qualified as the Standard one, all participants strongly agreed that it was either American or British English. In particular, Asli’s report was impressive. She described herself as a legitimate speaker according to the choices she made regarding Standard Englishes, specifically addressing the question of whose Standard English. In the following segment, her two standards, British English and American English, were considered with regard to her expectations for the right variety of Standard English. Before arriving in the U.S., Asli seemed to show a stronger connection with respect to British English, and she claimed little interest and affiliation with American English. However, Asli’s allegiance to her supposed preference to speak British English appeared to be swayed by geographical conditions—because she was located in the U.S. now. In Asli’s case, speaking the right type of Standard English appeared to be a manifestation of power enabling Asli to increase her right to speak.

I speak more British English before. British English is more clear [clearer] and more standard than American English; I know this information from my middle school. But, now I live in the U.S.; I feel American accent is better. American English is Standard English. (2/11/03, interview)

Asli’s choice to speak British English or American English appeared to be affected by and dependent on geographical convenience and contingency. The selection of what was right was probably related to more opportunities to become a legitimated speaker when she communicated with native English speakers in the U.S.

In addition, two participants, Luc and Ying, both claimed that American English is deemed the standard version solely because it is Americans’ first language.
Simultaneously, they also both attempted to articulate their opinions regarding the importance of their own original languages, French (Luc) and Chinese (Ying). Luc said, “American people speak good English because it is their first language…. We [the countries of France and Ivory Coast] speak the same French. We speak good and the same French.” Likewise, Ying said, “They [American people] use English more because this is their first language. They speak good English. English is my foreign language. I speak very well [good] Chinese, but I don’t speak very well [good] English like Americans [do].” In these statements, the two participants revealed how linguistic legitimacy was defined; to some extent, they struggled with the issues of who uses English, when and how to use it, and when to use their own original first language. They also seemed to over-generalize regarding an L1 English speaker’s affiliation with his/her first language for the purpose of claiming its legitimacy regardless of the social, cultural and political concerns.

With respect to the socio-economic values causing the imposition of American Standard English, based on the interview data, all participants tended to believe in the value and criteria of Standard British and Standard American English. They strived to learn American English and develop an accent similar to that of Americans in order to combat the hierarchy within the ESL discourse. America’s powerful political position, its ability to create global communication, and its high standard of living were the main factors that motivated participants to learn American English.

For example, in explaining why American English is good, Luc said, “Everybody comes to the U.S. because life here is very good. I want to speak the way they speak.” In addition, Ying said, “America is the strongest country. American English is spreading all
over the world. Maybe because of the powerful media communication.” Similarly, Maria commented, “You don’t have to say United States. Everybody knows America owns the world.” Ming said, “Of course, I want to speak American English. I want to speak like [American] natives. America is the most powerful country.” The participants’ comments suggested that the choice and use of Standard English were not neutral but are connected to the concern of political control, enhancing the exercise of a certain symbolic domination and also the asymmetry of power between American or British English speakers and non-native English speakers.

Inevitability and Intelligibility of Standard English

On the one hand, some participants reported that Standard English has the advantage of providing intelligibility worldwide. As for the complexity of various forms of English, the participants seemed to feel that it was likely to result in obstacles to global communication. For this reason, they reported that the Standard structures of English that facilitate communicative understanding should be sustained. For example, Ying mentioned, “Speaking Standard English is very important. I think that Standard English is understandable everywhere.” In the same vein, Asli said, “In order to learn English, we should have one standard (criteria) what we can follow up. Maybe Standard English is better for people who learn English.” Their comments implied that English speakers would have no other choice but to use Standard English, possibly leading to the establishment of communicative world villages. However, this perspective appeared to isolate and marginalize other forms of English.

On the other hand, another perspective was related to concerns about the contingency of speaking English in other countries. Luc said, “[If] I am in Japan, I will learn Japanese
English.” This suggested that in some cases the geographical location might outweigh a non-native speaker’s respect for the legitimacy of Standard English. Nevertheless, adjusting one’s speech to that of the residents of a particular locale seemed to support the notion that English usage should be considered within the cultural and political contexts where English is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolic Domination of Standard English</th>
<th>Inevitability and Intelligibility of Standard English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Most participants agreed concerning the predominant role of Standard English: American or British English ---geographical convenience and contingence ---speaker’s affiliation with his/her first language for the purpose of claiming its legitimacy</td>
<td>• Some participants saw the complexity of various forms of English as an obstacle to global communication. ---support for Standard structures of English to facilitate communicative understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All participants expressed intense eagerness to learn American English ---America’s powerful world position ---the control of communication internationally ---the opportunities for social mobility</td>
<td>• One participant’s opinions reflected the relative weight of the geographical location in deciding whether or not to speak Standard English ---the adjustment of one’s speech to that of the residents of a particular locale (e.g., speaking Japanese accented local English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One participant pointed out the existence of a multiplicity of local American Englishes: vagueness surrounding the issues of the nature of Standard English (The comment expressed resistance to the domination of Standard English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary of findings: participants were at odds with the intentional objective of World Englishes to attain English democratization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4.4 Summary of the Influence of Symbolic Violence Regarding Standard English

The summary in Chart 4.3 displays the findings regarding the symbolic violence of Standard English. The data revealed that all participants were conscious of the complexity of diverse Englishes. Their ideal version of English differentiated between Standard American and British English. However, one participant also raised the issue of
the multiplicity of local American Englishes, showing some awareness of the vagueness surrounding the issues of the nature of Standard English, how it is constructed, and whether or not perfect and idealized Standard English exists. Not surprisingly, the practice of English entails an accommodation to political power that influences the choice of English varieties and the construction of their legitimacy. The results also showed that American Standard English seemed to be uncritically accepted and approved as the language of choice. Its prestige appeared to arise from the perceived ability of its linguistic repertoire to enhance the participants’ future. It can be argued that English natives prescribe the general social norms with which non-native adult English speakers are obligated to comply. Such power exists within the legitimate domain of Standard English-only discourse. However, one participant tended to affiliate with the local English accent/style of communication (i.e., speaking Japanese English in Japan), probably a reference to the effect of geographical location.

Linguistic Patterns and Social Identity in Standard-English Discourse: the Individual Reports

In the following, the research reports the findings concerning the individual participant’s English communication within Standard English only discourse (See Table 4.4). This discussion is linked to the ideology of literacy construction and control, consisting of history, power and social identity.
**Table 4.4 Individual Reports within Standard English Only Discourse**

**Luc**

Luc was aware of why it might be necessary to learn Standard English in the U.S. He believed that the most vital factor was to communicate with native English speakers and be accepted in the job market. Luc appeared to be an English learner whose aural/oral skills seemed to far outstrip his reading and writing skills. His motivation to master aural/oral skills resulted from two immediate situational influences: (1) his desire to achieve independence during his transition to a new life, and (2) the urgent necessity that he communicate in work places and find a higher paying job. At the outset, Luc seemed to be subject to a strict power hierarchy within Standard-English only discourse. Owing to his limited competency, he was assigned to be a message receiver and relegated to the...
identity of a powerless Standard English speaker. Consciously, Luc attempted to conceal his ineptness and the imperfections in his mastery of Standard English. He said:

When I go to [the] grocery in front of cashier, I am like a student. I could use plastic, credit card or check. I don’t know them very well. I don’t know what they say. I worry that they [will] discover my weakness. 

(2/6/03, interview)

However, after some time, Luc’s progress in English acquisition and oral communication was significant. His attempt to acquire the identity of a proficient or native-like speaker was apparent. Luc appeared to make strong efforts to speak in a way that would lead to the fulfillment of whatever communicative goals he might have within the Standard English only discourse. It was also observed that Luc had progressed from his original assessment: “I don’t know American currency very well. I don’t know what they say.” After almost five months, Luc’s acquisition of oral competence for social survival, including the use of different types of payment, was impressive:

Cashier: Cash, charge or debit?
Luc: Debit.
Cashier: You want cash back?
Luc: Yes, twenty dollars. 

(7/1/03, observation)

This suggested that Luc’s linguistic performance and inter-actional competence had progressed so that he was able to function as a social participant. He had decidedly greater confidence in formulating responses.

Luc’s relationship with Standard English was constructed historically and socially. Even though Luc had a low command of oral English skills, his prior experiences as a businessman with excellent social skills gave him confidence and his adaptation to local social practices was sustained. In a sense, this probably alleviated Luc’s anxiety regarding his insufficient level of communicative competence. In the following interview
segment, Luc’s comments indicate his perception that native English speakers’
willingness to communicate with him was a product of the conflicting frameworks of
solidarity and power (Tannen, 1994). That is, the native speaking clerk made an effort
and was patient in speaking to Luc (a move motivated by solidarity); however, the native
speaking clerk’s efforts and patience reminded Luc that the effort was also an attempt to
earn his money (a move motivated by power). Luc mentioned:

    In my opinion, native speakers who work in the grocery and shops are very smart.
    They want to earn your money. No matter how bad English I speak, they try to
    understand what I say. They want to earn my money. Therefore, at this moment, they
    are not mean. They are very patient. My job in my country is business. I know that.
    (2/6/03, interview)

    It can be inferred from this example that Luc did not need to be proactive in seeking
out communication opportunities and volunteering questions. His readiness to enter into
discourse was in all likelihood facilitated due to the native speaker’s linguistic outreach
(solidarity). But Luc’s competency in social skills enabled him to recognize what seemed
to be the native speaker’s attempts at exploitation. This appeared to impede his own
willingness to communicate in English.

Ying

    Ying’s disinclination to volunteer questions and to become involved socially were
consistent over time. In the first interview, Ying stated, “I avoid most of the chances to
speak English with Americans.” One half year later, during the second interview, she still
insisted, “When I go shopping, I cannot help to speak [speaking] English. I need to speak
English. Otherwise, I don’t want to speak English with American people.” This appeared
to be indicative of her decreased involvement with the English speaking community. Two
possibilities could explain her low level of involvement. The first is her lack of
certainty in her English: possibly she cannot be responsive in conversation. Ying
mentioned, “A native speaker gave me a ride home. When I arrived home, I just say: I am
here. I am here.” Her English oral proficiency seemed to disappear. Second, Ying tended
to exhibit and maintain strong self-control and self-esteem even when native English
speakers had a “very high tolerance level” for her poor oral English skills. This
phenomenon was probably derived from Ying’s view of native English speakers’
attributes and her limited involvement with them in social activities. Even though Ying
seemed to have positive stereotypes of the English-speaking community, she still made
few attempts to increase her contact with native English speakers. Ying said:

  When they don’t understand what I say, they [native English speakers] have very high
tolerance level. I don’t feel particular hurt because they are rude or impolite. Also,
maybe because I only take part in limited social activities with native English
speakers. I don’t [have] access to a lot of activities in the U.S.  (2/6/03, interview)

Furthermore, Ying suggested that language was fundamentally involved with the
ideology of class and power. Obviously, the extract below illustrates her judgment that
the varieties of English are not equal. The privilege of Standard English was asserted and
strongly maintained by Ying: Native English speakers who speak Standard English are
cultivated, whereas people who use non-standard English seem often to be denied access
to cultural knowledge. This may imply that the kind of English that Ying brought with
her seemed not to be valued and to be marginalized. As ‘a non-native speaker,’ she was
viewed to be ‘a person with little culture,’ as are non-native English speakers who speak
other varieties of English. According to her statement, Ying was situated in the
disadvantaged groups--as a non-native speaker without culture. However, Ying did not
provide a specific meaning regarding her use of “culture.” It could be that her use of the
term has a broad and overarching meaning that includes all people who are well
educated. Ying stated:

Standard English is a high quality English, but non-standard English is like pop-
fiction which is not valuable. People can speak non-standard English…it sounds like
they have low social status. Native English speaker who speak Standard English
means they are really highly cultured and noble with more knowledge.

(2/6/03, interview)

Ying brought her own socialization, attitudes and schemes into the Standard English
only discourse. Sometimes, these were incompatible with what this discourse required of
her, resulting in her ascribed aspect as a marginalized speaker. Based on Ying’s
comments, she also sensed that most non-native English speakers seemed to be
submissive to the linguistic norms of native speakers in order to become qualified
Standard English speakers.

Asli

Asli tried to exhibit willingness to comply with the legitimate norms of American
English and win credit in the eyes of her native-speaking discourse partners. However,
she seemed unable to master its certain determining competence or accent. In the
following excerpt, Asli reported that she is unable to gain the attention of native English
speakers or to win their respect during social interactions. Perhaps, she found herself in a
dilemma caused by her lack of intelligibility owing to her lack of access to legitimate
expressions; she tended to be spoken to by native English speakers, but not to initiate
conversation.

After I come to the U.S., I watch DVD and TV, and listen to what people say. I need
to speak like this. But it is difficult. I want them to understand me…I don’t speak the
same accent… use the same vocabulary. Maybe they think that I am stupid. I learn
very hard. I don’t want to be stupid. I know [what] I say, but they don’t understand me. I think…but, I don’t speak very well [good] English like Americans [do].

(2/1/03, interview)

As the above discussion indicates Asli had become increasingly concerned about her lack of American Standard English proficiency, noting a direct link between proper language usage and the comprehensibility needed for social acceptance and involvement in her U.S. context.

Asli’s social identity was inextricably linked to the differences between native and non-native English varieties, and native English speakers’ power. It also probably reflected her failure to meet the Standard linguistic requirements of the mainstream. It may be inferred, therefore, that her decision to learn American English could mitigate the pressures of immigration and strengthen her position in the U.S.

Maria

Maria was a proud person, and her inability to speak Standard English faultlessly seemed to be embarrassing her. Furthermore, she accepted the need to speak Standard English without question. Maria remarked, “Probably… [I am] a little [of] proud…because I want to do things perfectly… but I cannot speak Standard English.” Maybe because of this characteristic, she tried to strengthen and legitimate her own identity as an immigrant with a high sense of dignity. Maria expressed her frustration with Standard English and her struggle for social legitimacy by writing creative poetry (See Chart 4.4).
Title: In My Back Yard There Are Geese

In the pond are the family geese, [phonetic, gis]
Where they are beautifully swimming free,[fri]
I enjoy watching them in peace, [pis]
As they create gentle waves in their sea. [si]
(5/15/03, observation)

Chart 4.5 Maria’s Poetry

This poetry sample indicates that Maria had a good background in English writing skills. When asked if there was any particular meaning attached to the poem about the swimming geese, Maria explained:

I want to analogize the movement of the geese’s paddling to my own situation. When a goose swims, its upper part is floating and swimming gracefully. But we don’t see under the water, how this goose’s two feet try a lot to swim and move. You know, no choice, and no way out. I need to communicate… (5/15/03, observation)

It seemed that, because Maria operated in a Standard-English-Speaking environment in which she could not perform as she wished, her self-esteem suffered. As a result, she was eager to display an improved image of herself. Interestingly, her low tolerance for making errors did not discourage her from taking risks in communication exchanges with native English speakers.

Marco

Serving as a kitchen coordinator, Marco used rich English speaking skills in his daily life to communicate with other cooks regarding customers’ orders and service. Marco regularly encountered his manager, a native English speaker, and many native English speaking customers. His performance seemed an indicator of impressive spoken English functionality in his job. Theoretically, the more language capital the adult ESL learners
possess, the more social power and job choices they are afforded. However, as seen in the following excerpt, Marco appeared to be dissatisfied with his oral English replete with its Spanish accent, which he believed caused him to lag behind in his transition into the mainstream society. Marco appeared powerless in his use of English even though he had a good command of it (but with a Spanish accent). Marco’s feelings can be seen in his report of a grievance and argument with his boss regarding his futile effort to have his hourly pay increased.

Researcher: What do you think about your Mexican English?
Marco: Pretty bad.
Researcher: Why?
Marco: Because we don’t have the right way to pronounce… because not too many American teachers told us how to pronounce correctly. I want to learn American English. Once I open my mouth to speak English, they [native English speakers] don’t care I can speak good. I think that they just feel I have accent. My boss [native English speakers] does. He doesn’t care [that] I can coordinate well between kitchens and customers. I request him to raise my salary; he doesn’t care.

(2/7/03, observation)

Apparently, Marco presented a particularly dramatic example of the fact that what appeared to be sufficient regarding enough English knowledge sometimes did not result in related advantages in job hunting or promotion. This denial of a pay-raise may have been the result of multifaceted factors. However, for Marco, speaking with a non-standard English accent was one potential concern. It seemed to cause Marco’s isolation in some milieus and discrimination in certain aspects of social practices. This seems to support the contention that the so-called ‘English monolingualism’ (Wiley and Lukes, 1996), focusing on one variety of unaccented native English in the U.S., shapes the consequences of language practices and the chance for social mobility and non-native adult speakers’ opportunity for participatory legitimacy.
Ming’s communicative motivation and learning strategies were contingent upon the operation of the native English speakers’ power. The following segment shows that when Ming first arrived in the U.S., she needed a native English speaker’s guidance to solve a problem, but the two apparently did not work well together. Ming’s problems were not solved. Also, their conversational flow operated within the limits of the native English speakers’ instruction. The native speaker, a cashier, seemed to stress Ming’s lack of English competence and her inability to speak the variety of English he expected by saying, “Excuse me…Are you still here?” Ming felt that this subjected her to a process of labeling and humiliation. Ming was essentially cut out of the conversation because she had failed to arm herself with the coping strategies and linguistic knowledge of how to deal with ESL discourse and social participation.

In a coffee shop, or some shops, I cannot understand what he [a native speaker] is saying to the question I ask. I asked again. He says, “Excuse me?” And then he says, “Are you still here?” It makes me scary and embarrassed. I go away. I think that he doesn’t understand my accent. (5/29/03, interview)

Based on the above conversation, as a result of her passivity in asking for help from native English speakers, Ming tried to construct and develop a certain kind of help-seeking behavior within the framework of Standard English discourse. In the following conversation, Ming explains, “I can control the caption [on the TV screen], but I don’t want to talk to people [native speakers].” Although the use of captions (technology) or a dictionary may mainly serve to facilitate communication, her seeking the assistance of technology or other tools probably resulted from Ming’s low expectations involving verbal interactions with native English speakers.
Ming: When I watch TV or movie, I really want to know the slang or conversations; I turn on the caption or consult a dictionary.
Researcher: Will you go to ask native English speakers directly?
Ming: Not really. I can control the caption [on the TV screen], but I don’t want to talk to people [native speakers]. I don’t want to interact with people a lot.
(5/29/03, interview)

To summarize, within Standard English discourse, Ming’s identity varied but was constructed primarily around her dependence on the power of native English speakers. Her early identity was that of a marginalized speaker of Standard English and, later, that of an independent problem-solver seeking English acquisition. In the beginning, native speakers’ failure to provide supportive answers to Ming was clearly apparent. The particular characteristics of this practice significantly decreased Ming’s interest not only in interaction with the social world but also in cooperation with native English speakers. Ming, however, eventually achieved a certain level of independent attainment in English usage through her own learning and coping strategies.

Conclusion

The data suggested that the symbolism of Standard English represented a unifying and powerful cultural capital that was considered a distinct advantage in achieving the American dream. Native speakers attempt to create a discourse to naturalize symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984) so that standard English-only is regarded as legitimate and impose a cultural arbitrariness defined language-transfer between most participants’ L1 and English as disadvantaged within ESL discourse.

It was concluded that discourse delivers knowledge and contains power. Once non-native English adult speakers accept the fact that the knowledge of a specific discourse (Standard-English only discourse) offers a superior advantage, the combination of the
knowledge and power of that discourse forces non-native adult English speakers to accept it legitimacy. Based on the data, Standard-English-only discourse implies a desire to keep participants’ non-native English variety and multi-languages under the control of native speakers. Within native-English-only discourse, the participants have limited chances to negotiate their subjectivity, and English natives tend to reinforce the relationship based on hierarchical power.

**Research Question 3**

What do non-native English speaking adult learners report when they are interviewed about their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics that they recall from their previous EFL classrooms? What do non-native English speaking adult learners demonstrate in their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics when they are observed in their current ESL classroom? What connections are revealed when the two learning contexts are compared?

Group dynamics-based analysis was applied to elucidate participants’ conversational performance and social interaction within ESL and EFL academic discourse. Within the hegemonic configuration of the EFL or ESL classroom, a variety of unexpected aspects were revealed in the examination of participants’ conversational contributions and social relations. Some factors, such as the curriculum design, teaching methods, the role of teachers, classroom size and seating arrangement, through which participants’ classroom oral performance were explored. These factors constructed the classroom practice, politics and social interactions, which enabled the researcher to view participants’ conversational patterns, tendencies, and motivation.

Two types of data, interview and observational data, served to address this question concerning the participants’ English oral performance and classroom social interaction within EFL and ESL contexts individually. The interview data mainly addressed
participants’ previous EFL classroom experiences at the college and university level. Because this level would provide the closest English experiences in the EFL context, the researcher hoped to collect trustworthy data based on their fresh impressions. As for the observational data and field notes, the researcher elucidated participants’ verbal/non-verbal expressions and took field notes as well to address phenomena of the participants’ current ESL classroom. The researcher also attempted to investigate the nature of the relationship between the two kinds of data.

The data analysis covers three parts: part I: Luc, Asli and Ying--their previous EFL classes and current Level 3 ESL class; part II: Maria, Ming and Marco--their previous EFL classes and current Level 5 ESL class, and part III: what connections are revealed when the two learning contexts are compared? In constructing the analysis of part I and part II, the researcher developed the findings through two main categories: (A) English communication performance and social interactions; (B) factors related to group dynamics of English oral performance: (a) curriculum design and teaching materials; (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher; and (c) classroom size and seating arrangement. In addition, as mentioned in the introduction to Chapter 4, although the two native ESL teachers, Christina and Jane, were not emphasized as participants who were ESL adult speakers, they were observed concurrently with participants. Their attitudes and ideas concerning the participants’ use of L1 and the value of the participants’ cultural legacy, as well as their thoughts about the intelligibility of diverse English varieties will not be presented in this question but will be discussed in the final section of Chapter 4 instead.
Luc, Asli and Ying--Their Previous EFL Classes and Current Level 3 ESL Class

Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Previous EFL Classrooms

Asli and Ying made negative comments about the dynamics of their previous English classes at the college level; Luc was an exception among the case study participants. The interview data elucidated information indicating that the group dynamics among students of Asli and Ying’s former English classes in Turkey and China were largely restricted and geared to competition instead of cooperation. As for Luc, he was an exception because the data indicated that his previous experiences were very limited. In the following conversation, it was found that Luc was lacking any English education in the Ivory Coast.

Luc: I have been in Africa for 26 years, I never learned English.
Researcher: You never learned English?
Luc: Yes, I came here in 2001. I started to learn to speak English. We don’t have a lot [of] English education. I start [started] to learn English in the U.S. from A, B, C….. I don’t know why my country didn’t offer English classes. (2/11/03, interview)

Therefore, in the following section, the data report is mostly focused on Asli and Ying. Based on the interview data, Table 4.5 displays the results and an overall summary for the participants (Luc, Asli and Ying) of the Level 3 class regarding their previous EFL experiences at the college level on: (I) communication performance and social interactions; (II) factors related to group dynamics of English oral performance: (a) curriculum design and teaching materials; (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher; (c) classroom size and seating arrangements.
I. English Communication Performance and Social Interactions
* Luc had no previous English experience.
* Asli and Ying had passive feelings about their English oral communication.
  --- Asli: a lack of English sentential utterances; unwilling to respond to English teachers; isolation from the peers’ social interaction.
  --- Ying: only vocabulary-usage; a competitive learning environment led to ineffective English communication; the influence of Chinese values: a conviction that being an intellectual is the best policy for being successful (to surpass other peers)
* Ali and Ying used their own L1s in the English classroom.
  --- the interference of L1s as a barrier to English oral conversation.
  --- concern with the syntactical differences between L1s and English

II. Factors Related to Group Dynamics of the Oral Performance:
* Luc had no previous English background.
  (a) curriculum design and teaching materials
    --- Asli and Ying gave a negative impression of the curricula of their former English programs.
    • severely channeled and restricted to grammar-based contents
    • a lack of content related to their local culture and knowledge
  (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher
    --- Asli and Ying had low satisfaction with teachers’ teaching style
    • teachers’ role was that of message deliverer.
    • one-way lecture and grammar-translation teaching
    • led by examinations to narrow teachers’ range of teaching to grammar skills, reading and writing
  (c) classroom size and seating arrangement
    --- Ying and Asli: 35 students or more; no restraint in students’ seating arrangements.
    --- Ying: young adults’ discipline allowed free seating

Table 4.5 Level 3 Participants’ Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Previous EFL Classrooms at College Level (Interview Data)

English Communicational Performance and Social Interactions

The following is a summary of the discourse practice of the ESL classrooms. Ying and Asli both reported that they (1) had passive feelings about their English oral communication within the EFL context, which was minimally interactive among the students and teachers; and (2) appeared to have resisted transferring experiences for using their L1 in their previous English classes, in spite of the convenience and assistance of employing L1 during English learning process.
At first, describing negative communicative experiences and rigid social relationships, for example, Asli mentioned,

I don’t think that we can share something in class. Our class is always quiet. I don’t talk until I wait for teachers’ permission. I have very simple vocabulary or phrases to teachers’ questions; sometimes I still keep silent. (2/11/03, interview)

These remarks reveal that when Asli’s teachers asked performance-oriented questions, she tended to respond with one word or simple phrase answers. Her conversational patterns appeared to lack sentential utterances, and she was even unwilling to respond to English teachers. Students’ social interaction in English class seemed to be isolated and slow.

As for Ying, interview data elucidated that she had very few chances for oral practice in English class. In a situation similar to Asli’s situation, Ying’s limited oral communicative activities resulted in her having few chances to fulfill the goal of using English, but were focused on vocabulary-usage instead. Based on Ying’s comments, her competitive learning environment seemed to decrease her connection with English teachers and other peers in the college level English classroom. Regarding this point, Ying said:

English teachers didn’t offer a lot of communicative chances to us. In China, I recited a lot of vocabulary…[I don’t know how to use them]. Well, even though in the university,…not the middle school, the severe competition for scores, a [feeling of] tension exists among my classmates. (2/6/03, interview)

In addition, the interview data revealed that Ying’s social interaction experiences verified a problem that she pointed out derived from a deeply held Chinese value: being an intellectual is the best policy for being successful. Most students in China are destined to accept the value that surpassing others is individual achievement.
Secondly, it was found that Asli and Ying were using their own L1s in the English classrooms of the EFL contexts. They reported the use of L1s was unavoidably embedded within the practices of the EFL classroom communication. However, the interview data indicated that the intervention of their L1s was regarded as an obstacle that impeded English oral communication. Asli said, “Turkish sentence structure is Subject + Object + Verb, but English is Subject + Verb + Object. I cannot change to English quickly when I [try to] speak English.” Similarly, Ying mentioned, “I think that my Chinese doesn’t help my English speaking. Their structures are different.” Equivalent syntactical structures between L1 and English shape the use of L1 in order to assist the English oral contributions of Asli and Ying. Even though the employment of L1s was permitted and not avoided in class, the interview data reported that Asli and Ying appeared to resist transferring and code-switching. Another interesting finding is that they did not focus on the difference/similarity of pronunciation of their L1s and English, but on the nature of the syntactical differences instead. Such a process could perhaps verify that their former English education was more grammar-oriented.

Factors Related to Group Dynamics of English Oral Performance

Curriculum Design and Teaching Materials. Asli and Ying tended to give a negative impression of the curricula of their former English programs. Most of the content of the teaching materials was comprised of grammar rules and vocabulary.

Asli remarked, “In my country [Turkey], English books are very simple--just read and write [just for the purpose of reading and writing], not talk [not for speaking]. [This is] not enough in the U.S.” Asli’s foundation from her former English teaching materials in Turkey was channeled and restricted.
Ying mentioned that English textbooks simply emphasize grammar and reading comprehension. For her, the contents of the English textbooks seemed to be out of date or always to provide some information alien to those with a Chinese background. Based on Ying’s description, even though Ying criticized China’s English curriculum, she praised the grammar skills provided. Hence, it is very understandable that Ying had such confidence in her grammar. Ying said:

In China, we focus more on reading and writing. For listening and speaking, we seldom have chances to practice. The English I have learned in China cannot be used here. The only purpose for English learning in China is passing exams. I think that I can read and write well. In particular, I am very skillful in grammatical rules. But I cannot speak well. I know that spoken English is the most quick and easy [way] to see English learners’ language proficiency. (2/6/03, interview)

The above statement seems to partially explain why the oral skills of Ying and Asli did not grow steadily. They did not have the opportunity to contribute to any supplemental teaching materials that might have been of special interest to them. Also, based on Ying’s and Asli’s comments, the content of their local culture was not included in the teaching material, and this is another issue of concern.

Instructional Method and the Role of the Teacher. Asli and Ying reported that they had no expectations for or satisfaction with the sometimes boring routines and teachers’ teaching style. The role of teachers appeared to be only that of message deliverer.

In Turkey, based on Asli’s comments, one-way lecture and grammar-translation teaching were common, possibly reducing interpersonal interaction and class cohesion. Also, the classroom functioned ineffectively because the teachers had positions of power, which meant that inflexible leadership tended to be the dominant characteristic. The
limited group dynamics in the former English classrooms occurred because of the teacher’s authority, Asli pointed out:

In my country, English teachers don’t tolerate students; they are tough. [The] classroom [environment] is tough. English teachers talk, but we don’t talk. In my country, they taught a lot of grammar, but not conversation. (4/8/03, interview)

Ying indicated that the form of the examinations dictated teachers’ range of English teaching and narrowed it to reading and writing. Grammar skills were constantly checked and trained by teachers. Also, some of her English teachers taught her to memorize the grammatical rules by rote. Ying’s remarks reveal that, as a consequence, she was hindered in the development of her oral skills, as she maintained her habits and preference for grammatical-translation learning.

She also recalled an English teacher who taught her to memorize some English vocabulary words technically by means of a similar Chinese pronunciation. This appeared to be a shortcut approach to memorization.

Classroom Size and Seating Arrangement. Based on the descriptions of Ying and Asli, their English classrooms probably contained 35 students or more at the college level. They seemed to have become accustomed to this classroom size in their English class. As for the seating arrangement, Ying and Asli both mentioned that there was no restraint in their seating arrangements. However, Ying suggested that the reason schools at the college level could follow such a practice lay in the general agreement that the young adults should discipline themselves in class, and that they would sit immobile and attentive during the teachers’ lecture.
Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in the Current Level 3 ESL Classroom

From the observational data collected in the present study, the Level 3 ESL class appeared to have supportive interaction patterns. It tended to be a cohesive group with positive social dynamics. However, it was found that to some extent, the group dynamics still did not completely fulfill a certain expectation. Based on conversation during the classroom break with students who tended to keep silent, some were still afraid to speak out in public; some were worried that Christina (the ESL teacher) or proficient peers might make fun of their English accent and intonation. However, the nature of the Level 3 class was basically non-threatening, and thus the fears might have been unfounded. According to observational data and field notes, Table 4.6 displays summary results and an overall summary of participants (Luc, Asli and Ying) of the Level 3 class regarding their current ESL experiences at the time of this study: (I) communication performance and social interactions; (II) factors related to the group dynamics of English oral performance: (a) curriculum design and teaching materials; (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher; (c) classroom size and seating arrangement.
I. English Communication Performance and Social Interactions

(a) Luc and Asli seemed interested in classroom social involvement and were actively engaged in utilizing the verbal constructions

--- Luc: applied his main L1 because of his lack of English education background and his dedication to his multiple original languages; help-seeking behavior appeared sometimes to be attention-getting instead of self-regulated

--- Asli: conversational English appeared to have become her goal in the class; her role as an ESL speaker was significant in contributing to the adaptation of her son to American public school life

(b) Ying tended to be uninterested in class activities and peer affiliations

- English oral performance was very troubled and uncertain
- her silence was part of a trade off: peaceful satisfaction for isolation and lack of English development.
- One ESL peer announced in the class, “I never hear Ying speak English.”

II. Factors Related to Group Dynamics of Oral Performance

(a) curriculum design and teaching materials

--- relatively flexible, lively, updated and creative.
--- use of the book *Basic English Grammar* to foster students’ abilities in syntax, structure, and rhetoric, one-third of the class time
--- teaching materials on diverse topics abundantly selected from periodicals, journals and newspapers to support topic-based conversation for ESL adult or young adult learners at the pre-intermediate to intermediate level

(b) instructional method and the role of the teacher

--- a communicative approach; teachers as co-communicators
--- learners are included in the decision-making process
--- Christina’s assertion regarding her own impeccable accent of Standard English affected the ESL learners’ construction of their identity as Non-Standard English speakers.

(c) classroom size and seating arrangement

--- relatively small, with fifteen learners or so; the selection and enactment of students’ seating was free and random; slightly negated any attempt to arrange students in hierarchical social positions and reduced the intensity of Christina’s supervision of individual students

--- Luc and Ying usually chose different seats every time.

--- Asli’s seat was very fixed.

- right in front of Christina’s table and platform; a heavier responsibility for being a good student; better opportunities to be complimentary; positioning herself favorably in relation to Christina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6  Level 3 Participants’ Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Current ESL Classrooms (Observation Data and Field Notes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**English Communication Performance and Social Interactions**

For the three participants’ communication performance and social interactions, the observation data revealed that Luc and Asli seemed interested in classroom social involvement and were actively engaged in utilizing verbal constructions. The American ESL classroom appeared to be active, and this was central to motivating the participants’
commitment to improve their English proficiency and to improve their cooperative learning outcomes. Conversely, Ying seemed to be uninterested in class activities and peer affiliations. She apparently had neither confidence nor motivation to seek access to social interactions as a source of English language input. Ying seldom initiated conversation with her peers and seemed to avoid direct communicative efforts from Christina (the native English-speaking ESL teacher.)

It was observed that Luc appeared most able to demonstrate academic oral involvement during ESL interactions. He may have attained better English oral proficiency, but his performance of academic tasks like mastery of grammar rules was still seemingly at a minimal level. In the Level 3 class, Christina seemed to lift the ban on ESL adult learners’ use of their L1. Compared to Asli and Ying, it was observed that Luc alone significantly used his L1, French, in order to effectively assist his oral performance. In the Ivory Coast, the linguistic situation appeared to be complicated. Besides French, for example, the local dialects include Foulany, Wolof, Jioulla, Maly, and Maraca. Luc reported that he is proficient in communicating in and comprehending all five of these languages. Luc’s significant use of contrastive analysis (Ellis, 1997) between his L1 and English probably resulted from Luc’s lack of English education background in his home country and his dedication to use of the multiple aboriginal languages. He was careful to listen to the English that Christina articulated; he customarily compared what he heard with a French translation. On certain occasions, during Christina’s English lecture, observational data revealed that Luc focused on comparing the meaning/spelling of vocabulary words, simple phrases, and their pronunciation with similar French words and phrases as one of his personal learning strategies. He was apparently comfortable and
satisfied with those activities in which he was able to confidently use French, and he even announced once or twice that he was not a linguistically incapable person. Most of the time, his curiosity and contingent negotiation with his ESL peers and Christina were expressed in this way: “English is important. But why don’t American people learn French. French is so easy to understand.” His learning strategies seemed to accentuate how he differed from his ESL peers. In the following excerpt, Luc’s strategy of listening to English pronunciation to compare it with French is clearly illustrated. Also, even though at one level, based on the observational field notes, this strategy predictably caused Christina communicative difficulty, she was still responsive. This seemed to illustrate Christina’s willingness to depart from mono-lingualism, English-only domination in the ESL class.

Luc: Is it dirty [‘d3tə] or [‘d3ti]?  
Christina: I used to say [‘d3ti]? But now I say [‘d3tə].  
Luc: [He intends to compare it to French pronunciation.] Why do you pronounce [‘d3ti]? Why?  
Luc: [He walks to the blackboard to write ‘dory’.]  
Christina: We don’t have this word in English.  
Luc: Why not ‘dory’? (2/26/03, observation)

In addition, the data also indicated that Luc maintained a constant dialogue of help-seeking behaviors with Christina. But, occasionally, based on Luc’s demonstration, his help-seeking behaviors appeared to be attention-getting instead of self-regulated learning strategies. It was observed that other peers, sitting silently, appeared to define themselves as Luc’s followers through their very attentive way of listening to the verbal contributions that Luc sometimes initiated. Luc’s demonstration of power contributed to the vicarious experiences of his classmates.
As for Asli, based on the field notes, Christina acknowledged her excellent performance in class. It was observed Asli was not only concerned about grammatical correctness, but also had strong motivation and willingness to express herself orally. By the end of the quarter, the researcher was impressed with Asli’s progress. This focus appeared to reinforce her grammatical foundation. The data indicated that conversational English appeared to have become her goal in the ESL class.

I finish [have finished] reading the whole grammatical book in American ESL class. However, I want to change this impression. I don’t want to be a very skillful grammatical person. I would rather I can speak. Speaking well is very important. This is the most quick way to make people feel if [that] you know English. (2/11/03, observation)

Based on Asli’s description, one factor might explain the change regarding her persistent engagement and pleasure in class involvement and conversational exchange. Asli’s involvement in the discourse of motherhood contributed to her empowerment, allowing her to “open my mouth to speak English.” She had noticed that very often her first-grade son rejected the input of English knowledge and teachers’ directives by keeping silent or speaking Turkish. Asli was concerned about her son’s deteriorating motivation for school. She mentioned, “My son told me that he doesn’t want to learn English and wants to go back to see his friends in Turkey. I need to speak English with him and know his school life.” Asli reported that she took part in the parents-volunteer program in her son’s school. Her role as an ESL speaker was significant in contributing to the adaptation of her son to American public school life. The observational data showed that this point probably extended her affiliation with her peers who had children. Also, these statements seem to partially explain why Asli’s oral skills might have steadily grown in the ESL academic discourse.
However, the data indicated that Ying’s social participation contrasted with that of Luc and Asli in the Level 3 class. Ying seemed slightly nervous in the classroom. She was also quiet on most occasions, which led to her isolation from classroom social relations. She apparently complied with Christina’s directives. In contrast to Luc and Asli, it appeared that Ying’s English oral performance was troubled and uncertain during the course of communication. This was consistent throughout the whole academic quarter. Ying demonstrated that even though she was expert at and interested in grammatical knowledge, this was somewhat invisible knowledge because of her lack of English verbal production. Christina’s report also identified Ying as requiring more support in learning and oral expression. However, this condition was given a negative connotation when an ESL peer announced in the class, “I never hear Ying speak English.” This comment seemed to remind people of Ying’s existence and her strikingly scant involvement the classroom conversations of Christina and her ESL peers. While Ying’s classmate’s criticism of the degree of conscious effort involved in Ying’s social participation was sarcastic, it is central to examine how Ying negotiated such derision and how her negotiation confirmed such criticism. The observational data revealed that, seemingly, she failed to recognize the explicit linkage between power and English knowledge, and was incapable of deflecting this peer’s attempt at sarcasm. Ying remained silent. Based on the interview data, it became evident that Ying’s silence was part of a trade off—peaceful satisfaction for isolation, and possibly revealed lack of English development.

In addition, the observational data elucidated that Ying’s position did not provide any overwhelming urgency that she master English usage and become involved in her little
Factors Related to Group Dynamics of English Oral Performance

Curriculum Design and Teaching Materials. From the observational data, Christina was found to play an active role in planning the curriculum and teaching materials, which in the Level 3 class were relatively flexible, lively, updated and creative. Christina made the course relevant to the ESL students. Generally, she attempted to increase the likelihood that they would be motivated in the direction of the curriculum content. The list of documents of teaching materials included the required texts--*Basic English Grammar*, and teaching materials comprised of the diverse topics abundantly selected from periodicals, journals and newspapers. First, the fundamental purpose of using this grammar book was to foster students’ abilities in syntax, structure, and rhetoric. However, the use of this text occupied merely one-third of the class time. Second, it was found that the main teaching materials used in this classroom were handouts to support topic-based conversation for ESL adult or young adult learners at the pre-intermediate to intermediate level. Based on the analysis of teaching materials, they were very user-friendly and organized around high-interest topics that encouraged the ESL learners to talk about what they were most interested in. For example, when Martin Luther King Day was approaching, Christina prepared teaching materials about the significance of civil rights, the issue of racial prejudice, Dr. King’s autobiography, and his famous speech ‘I Have a Dream.’ The teaching materials showed that the characteristics of the content
tended to be applicable to the design of either small group or pair activities in order to provide ESL learners with opportunities to engage in their communicative skills. It was observed that Christina tried to structure the nature of interaction into the classroom lesson.

**Instructional Method and the Role of the Teacher.** Christina’s teaching performance tended to be focused on a communicative approach to instruction. Generally, she attempted to serve as a co-communicator to involve learners in communicative activities. The observational data showed that although Christina exerted competent leadership and took responsibility for decision-making such as the choice of curriculum content and teaching pace, she sometimes incorporated learners in the decision-making process to meet their needs more effectively. It was found that most of the time her kindness and patience provided a solution for the ESL adult learners’ pressure and stimulated learning interest as well. Sometimes, ESL learners were encouraged to take risks; Christina’s tolerance for errors (Larsen-Freeman, 1986) seemed to be quite natural, which allowed the students to take advantage of opportunities to practice English.

However, to some extent, it was observed that Christina’s assertion regarding her own impeccable accent in Standard English affected the ESL learners’ construction of their identity as Non-Standard English speakers. Also, Christina demonstrated that she sometimes directly judged learners’ answers as being generally wrong or right. These concerns are given further attention in the final section of Chapter 4.

**Classroom Size and the Seating Arrangement.** The observational data revealed that the Level 3 class size was relatively small, with fifteen learners or so. Supposedly, the small size of the class can partially account for the optimal functions of group dynamics,
maximizing students’ learning chances and enhancing the communication with the practice of social skills.

As for the seating arrangement, the selection of student seating was free and random. The data also indicated that this informal selection seemed to slightly negate any attempt to arrange students in hierarchical social positions and reduce the intensity of Christina’s supervision of individual students. More data on this researcher perception might have supported this observation.

Among the three participants, Luc and Ying usually chose different seats every time whereas Asli’s seat was very fixed. From the point of seat selection, the observational data revealed that Asli’s familiarity with standards regarding a desirable student was significant. Asli’s own choice of her seat can be regarded as a reflection of her social behaviors in the Level 3 class. Asli always selected the seat directly in front of Christina’s table and platform. Theoretically, this seat might be the location most completely managed and supervised by Christina. From the observational field notes, it can be inferred that Asli’s educational background as a Turkish teacher intensified her sense of the significance of this seat and that she understood the student who sat there should assume a heavier responsibility for being a good student. Even though Asli was late or absent from class once in a while, her ESL peers never occupied this seat. Her selection was congruent with her efforts to be attentive to Christina’s lectures and diligent in completing her assignments. Based on the observational data, by this seat choice, Asli gained better opportunities to be complimentary, positioning herself favorably in relation to Christina. Through reciprocal interactions, Christina demonstrated a willingness to engage in more two-way interaction with Asli than with other learners.
Maria, Ming and Marco--Their Previous EFL Classes and Current Level 5 ESL Class

Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Previous EFL Classrooms

Based on the interview data, Ming and Marco, who in EFL contexts of their previous colleges had been shaped to be passive in their roles by the teacher-centered practice, appeared to be force-fit into the established classroom order. However, Maria appeared to realize a smooth and consistent transition from the English classroom environment in her previous colleges. Based on interview data, Table 4.7 displays the results and an overall summary of the participants (Maria, Marco and Ming) of the Level 5 class regarding their previous EFL experiences at the college level on: (I) communication performance and social interactions; (II) factors related to group dynamics of English oral performance: (a) curriculum design and teaching materials; (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher; (c) classroom size and seating arrangement.
I. English Communication Performance and Social Interactions
--- Ming expressed an inactive attitude toward English contributions and social interactions
* Teachers’ power shaped Ming’s insufficient right to speak.
* Most English teachers often utilized question-and-answer drill.
* She tended to answer in terms of vocabulary-based and fragmental sentences.
--- Maria and Marco revealed a dynamic involvement in English communication.
  (a) Maria
  * Her strong motivation to work on her communicative competence was emphasized over grammar.
  * Grammar was learned following from the situational contexts.
  (b) Marco
  * Marco had a great deal of communicative English involvement even though his involvement in
    English classroom dynamics was limited
  * His communicative attitudes tended to be self-assured and he was inclined to volunteer answers.
  * He conveyed his message tactfully and humorously.
--- the use of L1
Ming and Maria emphasized either phonetic comparison or the differences in comprehending verbal
communication between English and their L1s.

II. Factors Constructing the Group Dynamics of the Oral Performance
  (a) curriculum design and teaching materials
--- Ming and Marco revealed that their English curricula tended to be grammar-driven and rigid, which
was in part due to the lack of authentic teaching texts (a priori design of the curriculum content.)
  * Ming: Studying English meant studying English grammar in Korea.
  * Marco: There was a shortage of authentic contents for situational models
--- Maria was the only participant who was optimistic about her previous curriculum content.
  * Most of the curriculum had high-interest topics and was applied to contextualized uses.
  (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher
--- Marco and Ming appeared to have negative impressions regarding their EFL teachers’ instruction
  * English instruction was inextricably tied to the dictation of standardized authority within the
    EFL classroom, with the teacher playing a dominant role.
  * The lack of well-trained non-native English speaking teachers constrained their acquisition of
    oral skills and communicative performance.
--- Maria tended to appreciate their speaking proficiency and teaching.
  * She could make use of opportunities for cooperative interaction with her fellow students.
  (c) classroom size and seating arrangement
--- classroom size
  * Ming: her classroom size was often above 40 students in her university.
  * Maria and Marco: it was very difficult to recall the concise number of students in their classes.
--- the classroom seating
  * Ming, Maria and Marco: had the freedom to devise their classroom spatial arrangement.
  * Marco seemed not have preferred any fixed seat.
  * Maria loved to sit in the front where she was accessible to the teacher.
  * Ming seemed to sit far from her teachers to avoid their supervision.

Table 4.7 Level 5 Participants’ Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Previous EFL Classrooms at the College Level (Interview Data)
English Communication Performance and Social Interactions

The interview indicated that Ming expressed an inactive attitude toward English contributions and social interactions whereas Marco and Maria revealed a dynamic involvement in English communication in their previous experiences. However, they reported a different focus regarding their communicative performance and socialization. Based on Ming’s comments, her EFL teachers apparently were not disturbed by the student’s quietness and compliance. She tended to be inactive in classroom involvement and interaction. Ming mentioned, “We didn’t talk until the teacher called our names. But, most of the time, we just read and write.” Ming seemed to have adopted communication characteristics to conform to some of her English teachers’ communicative expectations because based on her report, such classroom policy had started in her middle school. Ming mentioned that most of her English teachers often utilized question-and-answer-drill in order to evoke students’ responses, but such formats imposed a rigid communicative context. She sometimes tended to answer in terms of vocabulary-based and fragmental sentences.

As for the employment of L1s in the participants’ previous classes, Ming and Maria reported the intervention of their L1s as a perceived obstacle to their English oral interactions. Ming revealed a negative impression regarding the employment of L1’s to facilitate classroom oral production. She said,

They [English and Korean] have totally different structures, such as word orders pronunciation, and alphabet. [In particular], there are some pronunciations are not in Korean language, such as [b], [d] and [θ].

(2/6/03, interview)
In this regard, Maria also viewed Spanish as creating an impediment to English communication. She said, “[In English], ‘I don’t mind.’ means that ‘I don’t care.’ But, in Spanish, ‘I don’t mind.’ means that ‘I don’t have interest.’”

To summarize, the interview data elucidated that Ming and Maria focused on either a phonetic comparison or the differences in comprehending verbal communication between English and their L1s. This concern is converse to the focus of Asli and Ying regarding the nature of the syntactical differences between English and their L1s.

In addition, speaking communicatively was emphasized by Maria. She appeared have been deeply involved in English projects and social activities in her former EFL experiences. Her only comment regarding the focus was, “In class, I practice my English grammatical rules through my conversational exercise.” Her strong motivation to work on her communicative competence is emphasized over grammar. It appears that the grammar was learned from situational contexts.

Even though most of Marco’s English classroom dynamics had limited cohesiveness and support, he mentioned that he had a great deal of communicative English involvement. The only reason given was: “I was very interested in language learning.” His strong motivation was expressed as a readiness to enter the discourse, which possibly tended to be based on a lack of anxiety. Marco reported that his communicative attitudes tended to be self-assured and that he was inclined to volunteer answers in class; he loves to convey his message tactfully (Reed et al., 1999) and humorously. He also mentioned that he had positive peer relationships and a constructive interaction with most of his English teachers.
Factors Related to the Group Dynamics of English Oral Performance

Curriculum Design and Teaching Materials. From the description of Ming and Marco, their former college English curricula tended to be grammar-driven and rigid, which was in part due to the lack of authentic teaching texts. Ming mentioned, “Some of my English teachers used a lot of drill tapes; I also learned a lot of grammar.” Even though regarding the four skills some of Ming’s previous English teachers loaded the curriculum with quite unequal weights, they appeared to be insistent on using such forms of teaching materials. Based on Ming’s report, one of her English teachers even admonished students: “When you talk in English, you still make a lot of grammatical errors.” Therefore, Ming indicated that studying English meant studying English grammar in Korea. Furthermore, Marco said, “[In Mexico City], everything [English] we knew [learned] was from English books which were not true.” Obviously, these remarks reveal that there was a shortage of authentic content for situational models in Marco’s previous college level curriculum.

The interview data showed that Maria was the only participant who was optimistic about her previous curriculum content. She reported that most of the curriculum was likely to encourage her to talk about what she was most interested in and to apply her English to her local contextualized use opportunities.

Instructional Method and the Role of the Teacher. Marco and Ming appeared to have negative impressions regarding their EFL teachers’ instruction and roles, whereas Maria tended to appreciate their speaking proficiency and teaching.

Based on the description of Marco and Ming, they tended to believe that English instruction was inextricably tied to the dictation of standardized authority within the EFL
classroom, with the teacher playing a dominant role. Learning activities tended to be mechanical practice and use of analytical skills to understand English patterns. They also suggested that the lack of well-trained non-native English-speaking teachers constrained their acquisition of oral skills and communicative performance. Marco and Ming revealed that most of their teachers’ ‘non-Standard English’ characteristics might have been relevant to the students’ perception of their marginalized identity and status. Ming said, “Most of my teachers cannot speak native [native-like] English. We studied English for six years. But we cannot speak any English. This is a big problem. Nowadays, Korean young people have a lot of chances to talk and be taught by English speakers.” Also, Marco mentioned, “We don’t have the right way to pronounce, because not too many American teachers [English native speaking teachers] told us how to pronounce correctly.”

Conversely, Maria recalled that, in her classroom activities, she could make use of opportunities for cooperative interaction with her fellow students. She believed that most of her English teachers were very helpful to her in refining the oral skills she was trying to develop. Maria said, “They [Non-native English speaking teachers] can teach English by means of English. They can speak English all the time.” Maria had the appearance of being a powerful student in her current Level 5 class. Her active involvement in conversation performance seemed not to surprise people at all. Based on Maria’s comments, the teaching style of her former English teachers strongly supported her current conversational performance. She reported that most of her English teachers were good listeners and attempted to learn what the students’ individual needs were.
Classroom Size and Seating Arrangement. The three participants made differing reports regarding classroom size. Ming remembered that the classroom size was often above 40 students in her university. Maria and Marco said that it was very difficult to recall the precise number of students in their classes.

As for the classroom seating, based on the description of Ming, Maria and Marco, they had the freedom to devise their own classroom spatial arrangement. Marco seemed not to have preferred any fixed seat because the physical environment of the classroom did not affect his concentration. Maria loved to sit in the front where she was accessible to the teacher. In particular, Ming said, “I choose to sit at the back of the classroom all the time. At that time, I am not interested in learning English” Ming’s report of her experiences revealed her attempts to have relatively more unobstructed occasions to pursue her own activities and make decisions about involvement in the conversation. Ming seemed to avoid an appropriately close interaction but preferred distant supervision from some of her English teachers. Ming’s report indicated this kind of physical setting seemed to maximize distractions that might affect her learning.

Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in the Current Level 5 ESL Classroom

The observational data revealed the Level 5 class appeared to manifest cooperative and productive interactional patterns. The group dynamics can be characterized by the relatively efficient classroom management and creative as well as well-balanced environment. The effect of the class cohesiveness appeared to be quite strong. Most of learners demonstrated the ability to take more responsibility for their English learning within the less threatening class. However, it was also found that some learners from
Asian countries (e.g., China and Korea) tended to display a lower communicative intent than that of other countries’ learners. Their passive socio-linguistic competence might have slightly hindered the development of the communicative class and lessened the effect of group dynamics. The study data indicated that this phenomenon could stem from their (i.e., Korean students’) background of grammar-based teaching (Li, 1998) and the administrators’ expectations for classroom order and quiet. According to the observation data and field notes, Table 4.8 displays the results and an overall summary of participants (Maria, Marco, Ming) of the Level 5 class regarding their current ESL experiences at the time of the study: (I) communication performance and social interactions; (II) factors related to group dynamics of English oral performance: (a) curriculum design and teaching materials; (b) instructional method and the role of the teacher; (c) classroom size and seating arrangement.
I. English Communication Performance and Social Interactions

* Maria and Marco had advanced English oral performance and active social involvement and were more apt to be extroverted and audacious as well.

---Maria
- Her conversations covered wide-ranging topics, and were highly dependent on body language and gestures.
- She attempted to reinforce her authoritative positioning in her social role as a classroom leader but was pleasant in interacting with Spanish-speaking peers.
- She appeared to demonstrate self-specific knowledge of discourse in assuming her privileged participatory legitimacy and assigned status as a good student.

---Marco
- He focused on the prestige of aspects of his original heritage, such as food.
- He appeared powerful and privileged among the three peers with Spanish background.
- He tended to show defiance of some classroom practices and occasionally involvement in his own activities.
- Sometimes, he prevented other peers’ distracting gossip.

* Ming was adept at English communicative performance and active patterns of social interaction and tended to be introverted, disciplined and courteous.

---Ming
- She legitimated values of her original heritage, such as education.
- She was visibly compliant with Jane’s (the ESL native teacher’s) directions.
- She tended to deny her affiliation with other ESL peers of Korean background.
- She passed the TOFEL English test and was admitted to the university’s master’s program in special education and this seemed to validate the role of the marginalized, remedial and survival ESL program.
- Her social identity was dynamic, first as novice and then as message contributor in the class.

II. Factors Constructing the Group Dynamics of the Oral Performance

(a) curriculum design and teaching materials
- They were designed to develop the habit and ability of living and thinking in English.
- Three teaching documents were available
  - (1) syllabus: the content included name of instructor, class time, required texts, assignments with due dates and notes, attendance requirements;
  - (2) mock TOEFL test questions: they covered almost genuine reading, listening comprehension, and grammar questions;
  - (3) handouts and journal articles: the main teaching materials. The content of handout and journal articles tended to be stimulating, self-oriented and accessible to life.

(b) instructional method and the role of the teacher
- Jane’s teaching demonstration appeared to be un-defensive and secure. She worked as a facilitator.
- Jane often conducted task-based activities, interactive language games and auditory instruction appropriate to real social contexts to shed light on communicative competence.
- She often advocated that ESL learners’ inescapable duty was being comprehended by native English speakers.

(c) classroom size and seating arrangement
- Level 5 class usually comprised about twenty learners and the individual physical placement was free.
- Most of the time, the individual learners seemed to maintain fixed individual seating.
- Maria chose to place herself in the first row, which was in very close proximity to Jane and the teaching platform.

| Table 4.8  Level 5 Participants’ Conversation Performance in Terms of Group Dynamics in Current ESL Classrooms (Observational Data and Field Notes) |
| English Communication Performance and Social Interactions |

In the Level 5 class, Maria, Marco and Ming demonstrated they had adept English communicative performance and active patterns of social interaction, but their performances were somewhat various. Generally speaking, Maria and Marco were more apt to be extroverted and audacious, whereas Ming tended to be introverted, disciplined.
and courteous. In addition, some sharing that Marco and Ming engaged in strongly legitimated some aspects and values of their original heritage, such as food or education. This was also a kind of coping strategy to enforce their conversational involvement. The observational data indicated that the three participants’ legitimate participation was achieved through an involved and proficient dialogic interaction.

First, as for Maria, she tended to believe that fluently spoken English was a hallmark of a successful English learner. It was observed that Maria’s thoughtful verbal responses seemed to reflect her wealth of English linguistic resources. Based on the observational data, her conversations with Jane (the ESL teacher in the Level 5 class) and other ESL peers covered wide-ranging topics, and were highly dependent on body language and gesture. For example, once Jane discussed a news commentary regarding the existing value of poetry in contemporary society. Maria’s oral contribution appeared to be associated with higher order thinking skills, such as evaluating and inferring.

Jane: How can poetry compete with MTV?  
Maria: I agree with you. This author didn’t think that poetry is dead. Poetry is dead. The author still maintained the nostalgia. He recalled the most romantic part—people inclined to possess the allusion and symbol of the poetry. In my opinion, the author should have very abundant living experiences (5/13/03, observation)

As for some of her social interactions in the class, in the following segment, Maria attempted to reinforce her authoritative positioning in her social role. That Jane and other ESL peers perceived her as classroom leader was evident and set up her participatory legitimacy. Most of the time, once class started or even in the course of the class, she commanded her peers to be quiet.
Maria: Do you think that you are noisy?
Another ESL student: Do you think that I am terrible noisy?
Maria: You distract me. I cannot concentrate. (5/1/03 observational field notes)

In another example, when the whole class was out of order during a presentation,

Maria did not hesitate to address her comments to the entire group.

One ESL student: [In my country], we have different cultures...ten different customs. If girls just turn eighteen years old, parents will take them to hang around the streets. It is kind of announce that they can start to look for marriage partners.
[It is interesting to most of the students. They start to make noise.]
Maria: [Turning her head from the right most seat at the first row to the whole class.] Hey, please calm down. I cannot hear anything. [Actually, the student who is addressing the issue of different cultures is sitting next to her.]
Maria: [Hastily posing a question to this ESL student.] Do they [these eighteen-year old girls] ever see men before? (5/1/03, observation)

Based on the above conversation, Maria appeared most attentive to other peers’ behaviors and attempted to wield a certain influence over her ESL peers. However, it was observed that Maria did not employ her assertive attitude toward students with a Spanish background. When she got the chance to talk with the Spanish-speaking peers, she tended to be more pleasant and seemed to forget her preoccupation with classroom management.

Very often, she reported to Jane how much of the syllabus content she had finished and addressed the issue of curriculum pace. Because Maria was so keenly interested in completing the assignments, Jane was very impressed with her interest. This probably derived from Maria’s former identity as a university Spanish teacher, which acquainted her with methods for maintaining herself as an acceptable good language student and provided her with access to a powerful social position as indicated in this ESL class. The data also revealed that Maria was accorded status and shaped it on the basis of her ability to implement the relationship of knowledge and discourse (Foucault, 1972).
As for Marco’s oral performance and social involvement, he often appeared quite keen and competent in his comprehension of classroom practices. Once, during a role-playing activity in an English oral exercise, Jane asked questions regarding famous Spanish restaurants around the community. Marco responded based on his knowledge of Mexican restaurants, and this evidently permitted him to appear powerful and privileged among three peers with Spanish speaking backgrounds. Based on the observational data, Marco’s Spanish allies supported his recommendation of the restaurants. They also appeared to explicitly declare their affiliation with Marco.

Nevertheless, now and then, Marco demonstrated a tendency to ignore the classroom activity tasks, turning his head to check another Mexican female student’s answer or talking with her. Most of time, Marco sat together with one Mexican female student. Apparently, as elucidated from the observation data, Marco’s recognition of his own oral proficiency is ranking almost at the top of the class led to his defiance of some classroom practices and occasioned his involvement in his own activities, such as talking to his ethnic peers in Spanish, disregarding his teacher.

However, in a sense, completing the prescribed tasks and specific mode of orientation indicates acquiescence to the teacher’s authority. Marco occasionally demonstrated his willingness to comply with this ESL classroom discourse, thereby displaying the essential characteristics of a good student. Further evidence of his constructive interaction was demonstrated by his helping Jane to prevent other peers’ from engaging in distracting gossip. For instance, Marco tried to break up one student’s conversation with Jane regarding service at an American hospital because it was not related to the classroom content. Marco said, “OK, can we continue to study? Don’t talk about different topics.
Can we come back to study?” It was observed that this action was compatible with what another participant, Maria, did in this ESL class.

In summary, based on the observational data, Marco’s patterns of classroom participation were affected by different activities or types of tasks. He attempted to resist the dominance of English-only discourse by seeking to maximize the exercise of preference for certain assigned tasks or ignore the imposition of the teacher’s power. Moreover, Marco appeared to exercise some forms of resistance in order to challenge the remedial status of the ESL class.

In contrast to the audacity of Maria and Marco, Ming was observed to be a typical ESL adult learner in that she was visibly compliant with Jane’s (the ESL native teacher’s) directions. The data revealed that Ming was always disciplined, awaiting Jane’s command to talk. When Jane learned that Ming was one of the participants in this project, she said to the researcher, “Oh, you got the right person.” Evidently, Ming’s selection strongly affirmed Ming’s legitimate position as a good English learner in Jane’s mind. Ming’s proficient communication in classroom English activities was apparent. She was not manipulating, but polite and receptive. During the class or breaks, Ming tended to deny her affiliation with other ESL peers of Korean background, but rather socialized with peers with different cultural backgrounds. Based on Ming’s actions, she tried to prevent disputation and personal gossip arising from the Korean classroom clique. This strategy that she applied alienated her from the Korean community, too.

In the beginning, the field notes showed that Ming’s identity, her ‘ESLness’, was acceptable to her. Later, at the end of the winter quarter, she got a high enough TOEFL English test score to be admitted to the university’s master’s program in special
education. Within this transitional stage, Ming appeared to receive necessary assistance from this Level 5 class. Ming’s new social identity, as a future university master’s student with skillful English proficiency, certainly located her in the upper stratification, reflecting the observation that “the very way that knowledge is defined in relation to learners reflects a position about power and the social order” (Auerbach, 1995, p. 11). Moreover, Ming’s performance also revealed that this promotion strengthened her awareness of her increasing participatory legitimacy within American society, assigning her a role as a source of knowledge regarding non-native adult speakers’ success in academic fields.

It was observed that Jane very often appreciated Ming’s legitimate position as a well-performing student; she intentionally guided Ming’s participation to draw out what Ming already knew and validated what she brought to her oral contributions. In the following dialogue, Jane tries to introduce the American education policy as a catalyst to comprehension of the meaning of legacy. Later, Ming was guided to solve the problem through a comparison with Korean educational policies. In the early stage of listening comprehension, Ming seemed not to clearly understand the meaning of legacy. She tried to construct understandings of this word from her assumptions and Korean experiences. She repeatedly asked, “I don’t understand how can they base on legacy? What is legacy? Are they really rich?” Ming proposed solutions—the word “rich” might be synonymous with the concept of legacy, which seemed to be congruent with the evidence available in Jane’s conversation about the “donation.” Even though this performance (the solution of a synonym for “rich” as “legacy”) was not perfect, Ming was assisted and gradually appeared more capable of making use of comprehensive and cognitive strategies. Finally,
Ming appeared to be achieving more student-centered learning when she asked, “How are other students with good grade but no legacy? Their parents don’t leave anything behind them,” and she provided information regarding the negative consequences of legacy resulting in an unequal chance to be admitted to Korean universities.

Jane: He has very high grades and SAT test [scores]. He is a good student all the way round. He could not get into the privileged universities because his father is [was] not a student there. We just call [it] ‘legacy.’ If your parents were students from these privileged universities, it is easier for you to get in. Because they get [got] in, it is like a legacy. This is one way to get in. And the second way is by donation. This is a problem here. Sometimes, smart children cannot get in. I want to ask about your country. Is it based on the test scores or grades to determine whether students can enter universities? Or what?
Ming: In Korea, it is impossible like this [with legacy or donation] to enter universities. In my country, entering the university is the most important thing in people’s life.
Jane: [That] is good.
Ming: I don’t understand how can they base on ‘legacy’? What is legacy? Are they really rich?
Jane: Not really, yeah, maybe they believe if your father can enter the privileged university…
Ming: How are other students with good grade but no legacy? Their parents don’t leave anything behind them. We won’t make this thing happen. We take the international examination and equal way to enter university…
Jane: Oh, yeah, they have a lower possibility to enter [of entering] good universities. It is [a] kind of discrimination.
Ming: Oh, I see. (5/14/03, observation)

These comments revealed that Ming’s coping strategy was shaped by sharing experiences and by making comparisons of the higher education situations in the U.S. and Korea. Jane guided Ming as she increasingly participated in question posing in the development of an apprenticeship (Rogoff, 1990), and this later shaped Ming’s identity as an information provider. Her social identity was dynamic, first as novice and then as a message contributor. Internalization occurred through Jane’s assistance. The data indicated that through assisted performance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), Ming achieved
understanding of how to use the word ‘legacy’. This dialogue took the form of a progressive and scaffolding process.

Factors Related to Group Dynamics of English Oral Performance

Curriculum Design and Teaching Materials. Three teaching documents were available: (1) the syllabus: a handout delineating class policies: the content included name of instructor, class-time, required texts, assignments with due dates and notes, attendance requirements; (2) mock TEFOL test questions: these were almost genuine reading, listening comprehension, and grammar TEFOL questions. They were intended to help facilitate learners enter into the mainstream school. This helped to legitimate the marginalized role of the remedial ESL class; (3) handouts and journal articles: these materials were obviously concerned with learners’ aspirations and interests and were main teaching documents. Some photographs and artwork evoked learners’ real world experiences. The materials tended to be stimulating, self-oriented and related to real life.

In summary, based on the analysis of teaching materials, the content of the handouts and journal articles were designed to pique Level 5 learners’ curiosity. The materials were designed to develop the habit and ability of living and thinking in English.

Instructional Method and the Role of the Teacher. Generally, Jane’s teaching appeared to be non-defensive and secure. Jane employed team consultation, pair building, and support efforts to create a feeling of community. Jane’s approach emphasized not only cooperative relationships among speakers but the use of language forms appropriate to real social contexts to shed light on communicative competence. The teacher worked as a facilitator and manager of the class, taking charge of establishing situations to promote learners’ communication activities. Most of the time, task-based activities, interactive
language games and auditory instruction comprised the learning activity of the Level 5 class. Also, the observational data indicated that Jane appreciated the ESL learners’ multi-cultural legitimacy and values.

However, Jane sometimes advocated an inescapable duty of being comprehended by native English speakers, a matter to be regarded as an issue of concern when they encountered native speakers. A continued discussion of this concern is offered at the end of Chapter 4.

**Classroom Size and Seating Arrangement.** The observational data showed that the Level 5 class usually contained about 20 learners. It was observed that the small classroom size might partly account for the effective functioning of group dynamics in facilitating the classroom maintenance.

The seating arrangement was similar to that of the Level 3 class. The individual physical placement was free choice and unstructured. Based the observational data, while Jane attempted to lessen the social hierarchies of the relevant supervision, it was interesting to note that the individual learners seemed to maintain a fixed seating pattern most of the time. The spatial arrangement revealed that the learners tended to be well behaved and to obey their self-established norms. Among the three participants, Maria demonstrated a desire to place herself in the first row, which was in very close proximity to the teacher’s platform. The data revealed that her own selection, to some extent, reflected her self-assigned role as a good ESL student, and she easily exerted some power over her fellow ESL peers, as mentioned above.
The Connections

What Connections Are Revealed When the Two Learning Contexts Are Compared?

This section covers the similarities and differences regarding the EFL and ESL contexts. They are as follows:

Similarities

Based on the interview and observational data, the physical setup of the seating arrangement in the EFL context was the same as that of the ESL context. The selection and enactment of learners’ seating patterns were random, with a free physical environment. Their arrangement would fit their own needs. Some participants preferred no fixed seat in either the EFL or the ESL context. In the ESL context, some participants’ preponderantly tended to arrange themselves close to the teacher and the teachers’ platform so as to assume a heavier responsibility for being good learners and to obtain more frequent occasions to be praised and to associate and become affiliated with the classroom teacher.

Differences

Most of the participants reported that in their previous EFL contexts at the college level, the classes were largely restricted and geared to competition instead of cooperation. In contrast, in the ESL contexts, most of the participants tended to report that classroom dynamics were likely to be active, centered on evoking a relatively high commitment to accomplishment and to improving their cooperative learning outcome.

The preponderance of evidence suggests that most of the participants were less apt to contribute to the English oral communication and social interaction in the EFL context
than in the ESL context. In the EFL contexts, most of the participants were likely to encounter constraints and feel intimidated as they attempted to engage in English oral construction. Most of them were only capable of employing vocabulary-usage and fragmental sentence-based utterances as the teacher conducted question-and-answer drills. They tended to have neither strong confidence nor motivation in class activities that would give access to social participation and peer affiliations owing to the competitive learning environment or lethargic design of curriculum and instruction.

Conversely, in the ESL context, most of the participants showed a preference for English verbal constructions and classroom social involvement. Most of the participants tended toward active engagement based on one or more of the following patterns: the applicability of the wide-ranging topics, the emphasis on the prestige of their original heritage, validation of the marginalized and remedial ESL program. This focus was derived from the fact that the survival necessities of their current life situation were urgently and inevitably woven into their outside the ESL classroom contexts economically, socially, culturally and politically so as to motivate them to become involved in and actively improve their English speaking participation in the ESL class. These necessities included the adaptation of self and family members to American life or meeting the needs of the job market, even though these responses may indicate their short-term targets. In addition, only one participant reported very limited previous English experiences because of his lack of any English background in his country. Another participant’s consistent classroom behavior of exhibiting negative patterns and tendencies in English oral contribution and classroom socialization seemed to be very congruent with her former passive patterns.
As for the factors constructing the group dynamics of English oral performance, the curricula in the ESL contexts were generally found to be more active than those of EFL contexts. Most of the participants suggested that the structure of the curriculum in the EFL context seemed to be a kind of de-contextualized and *a priori* design, focusing more on the orientation of reading and writing skills and the standard form of literal analysis. In addition, one participant revealed that there was a shortage of content related to local cultural background. As a negative consequence, another participant revealed that English-learning in the EFL context could be equated with the acquisition of English grammar, whereas the ESL class teacher was found to take a more active role in planning his/her own curriculum. It was observed that the orientation of the ESL classes was relatively stimulating, dynamic, and flexible, and offered authentic access to genuine life situations.

The main teaching materials covered in the ESL classroom were handouts on various topics selected from magazines, periodicals and newspapers. In terms of instructional method and the role of the teacher, most of the participants reported that the possibilities for EFL instruction were limited so as to hinder the students’ involvement in meaningful dialogues. The teacher-centered, grammar-translation and one-way lecture (mandated by all kinds of examinations that narrowed teachers’ range of teaching to basic literacy skills) tended to construct a mode of instruction that led some participants to develop submissive and fatalistic attitudes. Some participants indicated their concern over the issue of the shortage of non-native English speaking teachers with well-trained oral skills. In contrast, it was observed that within the EFL context, teachers served as co-communicators to involve students in dialogic activities, such as pairs/small groups, to
maximize each learner’s chance of being involved in the communicative exchange and
the use of language forms appropriate to real social context to shed light on
conversational construction. The class size of the EFL program was more likely to be
relatively larger than that of the ESL program. Most of the participants mentioned that
their EFL program contained 35 to 40 learners in each class; however, the current ESL
program had 15 to 20 learners in each class.

Research Question 4
What behaviors or strategies do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to
use most frequently when interacting with native speakers of English to avoid power
imposition of native speakers?

In this question, the resistance implicit in the participants’ behaviors and strategies is
examined. The researcher discusses how non-native adult English speakers within the
ESL setting seemed to resist the negative consequences from the focus on their mastering
Standard English. These acts allow the non-native adult English speakers to withstand the
impermeable structures of U.S. society where the practice of Standard vernacular English
comes into play, which distorts what some argue to be fundamental rights of participatory
legitimacy. Most of the participants tried to make their resistance seem a virtue by the use
of (1) counter-discourse, (2) social groupings through the use of the L1s, and (3) some
kinds of coping strategies to mitigate the English natives’ dominant power.
The Construction of Counter-Discourse

Most participants in the study including Maria, Marco, Ying and Ming revealed a counter-discourse to deflect English natives’ power imposition of behaviors and utterance (See Chart 4.5).

![Chart 4.6 The Construction of Counter-Discourse](image)

In the following segment, for example, Maria’s assertive use of the phrase “please be patient” appeared to be an attempt to provide speech opportunities and a strategy to repair or recover from break-downs in communication with native English speakers. Furthermore, even though the native English speaker food service worker’s social construction had more immediate power in terms of English proficiency, Maria was positioned as a customer who paid money for service. It is likely that, as a result, their power differences were minimized, and this contributed to Maria’s ability to implement (through interrogative or declarative expressions) social strategies (as a friendly or dominant customer) by boldly declaring, “Please be patient,” and thereby closing the gap.
in social relationships between herself and native English speakers. Simultaneously, she
tried not only to invoke the native English speakers’ empathy but also to skillfully
manage the discourse while maintaining her dignity and self-esteem by saying, “I am
from [the] Dominican Republic. But I’ll not tell her/him that I am from a foreign
country.” The statement “I am from Dominican Republic” appeared to be a positive
communicative adaptation, in response to a presupposed bias against Maria’s identity,
and it facilitated the ESL discourse message.

I’ll say to the native English speaker who takes [the] food order, “Please be patient.” I
try a lot. Of course, my English has accent. I will tell them, “Please be patient.” Most
of time they [native English speakers] lose patience for my English. English is not my
language. Maybe another strategy works—to talk to them “I am from Dominican
Republic.” But I’ll not tell her/him that I am from a foreign country. I don’t have any
specific reason that I don’t say this way. I just try. (5/3/03, interview)

Another example shows that Maria was able to prevent the native waiter’s potentially
subjecting her to an inappropriate seating arrangement in an American restaurant. Her
countering the waiter’s directives negated his/her assumption that Maria might accept
his/her commands unconditionally because of her limited ability to contradict his/her
utterance. Maria said,

Well, they [native English speakers] think they are superior, and privilege, because
they are native. But, that doesn’t mean they are going to be hasty with me. For
example, in the restaurant, they don’t give me right attention; I’ll not take that. I tell
the waiter, “I can wait more. I want to get the right table.” (5/13/03, interview)

Marco’s intrinsic indoctrination in his inherent cultural values extended to his
philosophy of work in the new environment, which constructed Marco’s counter-
discourse to defend his legitimate immigrant position in the job market. For instance,
Marco’s friend, a native English speaker, said to him “You [Marco] come here [in the
U.S.] and take our jobs.” Seemingly, his friend was attempting to assert and solidify his
domination directly. Marco answered, “No, because you [American people] don’t want to work hard like me. You want money, but you don’t want to work for money. I don’t borrow money. I save money.” Marco interpreted his American friend’s words as an expression of power imposition; he tried to counteract this overwhelming attempt in a direct verbal exchange and interaction. It seemed that Marco seized the advantage and was in a one-up position in this counter-discourse. Marco’s response to his friend appeared to frame his strategies as a gambit in this power exchange.

As for Ying, she was more eager to defend her social status through counter-discourse, especially since her oral English proficiency was not officially recognized as was that of international students with F1 visas. Some examples of Ying’s positioning as a less proficient non-native English speaker to negotiate native speakers’ expectations of her were: “They [native English speakers] know I am a foreigner”; “Maybe they know that I am just F2 [the visa that an international student’s spouse (her husband) holds] people, not a real international student,” and “They are patient. But if my status is F1 [the visa that an international student holds], they could have higher expectations of me.”

I think that American people quite understand what my problem is [in English communication]. They know I am a foreigner. They are patient. Maybe they know that I am just F2 [the visa that an international student’s spouse holds], not [a] real international student. I am only [an] F1’s [the visa that an international student holds] family member. I think that they don’t request too much. I think that they know my situation. Even though I don’t understand what they say. (2/6/03, interview)

Based on the above text, Ying’s assertion of her claims regarding her powerless social participation and communication was based on her role as an international student’s (female) spouse. Even though this counter-discourse served to defend Ying in spite of her low oral English proficiency, she appeared to view such positioning regarding her
management of ESL discourse as natural and legitimate in the context of her identity in the structured power relationship between ‘the dependent wife and the independent husband.’

In addition, based on the data of the observational field notes, Ying felt that her life had been disordered when she could not even comprehend well enough to order a simple English meal in a U.S. restaurant. The only way to finish the order was to ask for the waiter’s recommendations and explanation. Ying appeared not to want everyone to notice this, so she tried to adopt an attitude of competence and fake her way through it. She tried to analogize and compare certain items to Chinese food, asking, “The flavor of this chicken is like that of Chinese Kung-Pao chicken?” Based on Ying’s performance, by engaging in such counter-discourse, she could transmit the message: I am not as unskillful in comprehending the English menu as it might appear because I know a Chinese menu very well. As a result, she could shift her marginalized social identity to a better identity as a legitimate speaker with food knowledge.

Similarly to Ying, in the following excerpt, Ming attempts to reverse her position as a non-native English speaker through the counter-discourse of criticizing native English speakers’ controversial grammar expression.

Researcher: How’s your oral English?
Ming: It’s OK, but still not correct. But, sometimes, they [the native English speakers] confused themselves. They confused “if I were you” with “if I was you”. But in any grammatical book, I learn “if I were you.” (5/29/03, interview)

In addition, in counter-discourse, Ming’s understanding of an English contribution depends on whether “native English speakers have experiences to deal with international people or foreigners.” Partially, based on this counter-discourse, Ming attempts to
counterbalance the unequal power and the assumed responsibility of communication intelligibility: native English speakers might take the responsibility to understand her reasonably well. Their lack of experience with non-natives ensured the probability that there would be no communication.

The Use of L1 within American Society Discourse

First, based on interview data, two participants appeared to use their L1s with native English speakers during their social interaction. Even though their social interaction appeared to be reduced and restricted, they resisted speaking English only. This resistance apparently also expressed explicitly their ambivalent feelings regarding their paradoxical identity as ‘outsiders or insiders’ in the English-only or Standard-English-only context. For example, in Marco’s experience, when his boss asked him “What are you doing?” he answered, “No, comprendo. [I don’t understand.] I don’t speak English.” Similarly, Luc asked one female native speaker who was working for social security affairs at the front desk, “Parlez-vous Français? [Do you speak French?]” She went to ask for her colleague’s help, but neither understood French. He asked again, “Parlez-vous Français? [Do you speak French?]” They both shook their heads. He said, “Veuillez m’aider chercher quelqu’un(e) qui sait parler Français. [Please help me look for a person who knows how to speak French.]” Based on the further interview, Marco and Luc both mentioned that they could have used English to finish the whole discourse interaction; however, they preferred to use their L1s because, as they both pointed out, each believed that his L1 (Spanish or French) should be the most popular international language. Each believed that native English speakers should know that.
Secondly, all of the participants tended to speak their L1 when encountering people of the same ethnicity during the U.S. social interactions. Frequently, they used their L1s for some confidential and intimate discussion or criticism of English native speakers’ behaviors. But this action was not followed continually and consistently when English speakers joined the conversation. Therefore, the use of L1s between compatriots to resist the domination of English tended to be slightly hidden and imperceptible out of a concern for politeness. For example, Asli said, “I’ll change my language to English if my American friend cannot speak Turkish. I want to respect people who join our conversation.” In addition, Ying mentioned, “Yes, sure, we should change Chinese to English in order to make him/her [a native English speaker] understand. It’s polite.”

On the other hand, Maria was the only participant who appeared to employ her hyper-assertive attitude toward other non-native English speakers who were not of Spanish speaking background. Maria seemed to have a very low tolerance level when her international friends spoke L1s which she did not understand. Based on Maria’s report, when she got the chance to talk with her Spanish-speaking friends, she tended to enjoy the conversation more. But it was obvious that Maria was very attentive to the non-natives without Spanish-speaking language background. Maria said, “Other non-native speakers [without Spanish-speaking language background] speak too much their L1s. I hear a lot of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. When they chat, I don’t understand that. It’s not good.” She was flexible about speaking her own L1 for comfort; however, she was critical of students of other nationalities regarding their use of L1s. For Maria, to some extent, English seemed to be regarded as a means of reconciling the linguistic differences
among diverse ethnic groups to better facilitate all communicative participants’
intelligibility.

The Use of L1 within ESL Academic Discourse

Based on the observational data and field notes, sometimes the ESL academic context
appeared to be counter-hegemonic to English; some participants opted for the use of L1s,
either during the breaks or in class.

For example, in the following lesson excerpt, Luc responded with an illegitimate
contribution using French, his L1, which weakened the English-only, commonsense
practice in the Level 3 class. The evidence clearly illustrated the significance/necessity of
employing L1 assistance in order to shift toward shared authority between ESL students
and teachers.

Christina (the ESL native teacher): Please explain ‘quantity’? What is quantity’?…It
means ‘amount.’
One student: ‘A lot.’
Christina: Could be ‘a lot’ or ‘a little.’ [It] just helps you to identify how much.
Luc: What is ‘quantity’? I don’t know what is ‘quantity’? Does it mean ‘amount’?
Christina: ‘It depends on how you use that. It really narrows down…Well, I don’t
want to spend a lot of time on it.
Luc: [He doesn’t give up] Hi, teacher, do you understand French? Why don’t
American people speak French? Hi, teacher, the pronunciation of ‘quantity’ is
[kantēētay] in French which is not like [kwantētf].
Luc: [He turns his head to another ESL learner, Ben, who is a French native speaker]
Ben, it is [kantēētay] in French, right?
Luc: Right? Right? [Some peers whisper: please speak English. However, Ben keeps
silent.]
Luc: [Talking toward to the whole class.] Ben is very quiet today.
(2/27/03, observation)

As this example appears to indicate, most of the time, Luc paid a lot of attention to
what word the ESL teacher pronounced and how she pronounced it, comparing it to the
French pronunciation. Christina attempted to categorize Luc as an acoustic English
learner. In her ESL classroom practice, Christina made the decision to use a certain curriculum and instructional style and to set the pace of the class. She did not want to continue to explain the meaning of ‘quantity.’ This announcement enabled her to impose her choice on Luc and other ESL peers. To some extent this embarrassed Luc and caused him to lose his participatory legitimacy. He resisted this imposition by creating a partial French discourse to demonstrate to the ESL teacher and other classmates his social identity as a skilled French speaker, obscuring his limited competency as an English speaker. This helped him to raise his position and construct for himself a certain degree of participatory legitimacy in this Level 3 class. At the same time, he tried to recruit other French speakers to support his resistance.

In contrast, in the following segment, while engaging in the exercise entitled ‘Completing These Sentences Using the Noun’ in class, Marco was highly motivated, showing off his vocabulary competence by pointing out the similarity of Spanish and English. Marco tried to explain the meaning of ‘chaperoned,’ which is akin to the concept of ‘guardian.’ Later, he audaciously articulated the Spanish, his L1, pronunciation of ‘compañante’ to inform Jane (the native ESL teacher) and other classmates of the fact that Spanish was in certain instances comparable to English:

Jane: If your dating is chaperoned, someone else always goes along. In some countries, if you first meet another woman, someone else always goes along.
Marco: [Interrupting the conversation between Jane and another student] It’s chaperoned? You know chaperoned? Guardian!
Jane: Sort of. You can say a guardian comes along. American parents watch high school children [to see] what’s going on. Sort of [a] ‘guardian’...
Jane: You have Chaperone?
Marco: We have the same word ‘chaperoned’ (compañante) in Spanish. [He provided Spanish pronunciation.] My little brother and sister…they have chaperoned [dates].
Jane: That’s right. That’s right. (3/4/2003, observation)
Based on the observation, unlike Luc whose attitude was more confrontational, Marco attempts to demonstrate a similarity between his native language and English for his and other classmates’ advantage. The use of L1s within the ESL academic discourse seemed to help balance asymmetrical linguistic power relationships in this English-only academic discourse, achieving greater legitimacy for learners’ L1 linguistic capital.

**Coping Strategies: Ignoring (Silent)/Deflecting/Passing**

Some participants applied different coping strategies to the native English speakers’ power imposition, including the strategies of ignoring (silent), deflecting and passing, either in the U.S. social contexts or ESL classroom.

As for the ignoring (silent) strategy within the U.S. social context, Asli stated, “In the U.S., if I encounter people [the native speakers] who I don’t like a lot or they have a mean attitude, I don’t want to open my mouth to talk.” Marco, Ming and Ying also revealed that they just ignored it when native speakers treated them unequally. Based on the interview data, on the surface or inside participants’ minds, the ignoring (silent) strategy is used to redress or minimize native English speakers’ face threatening impatience. However, this strategy could be characterized as a less courteous linguistic use, even as a kind of non-verbal expression that ignores native English speakers’ acceptability and the possibility of misunderstanding in this communication. Through the unsupported and contradictory move of keeping silent, participants attempted to maintain a strong subject position to save their own face and reduce feelings of imposition.

Within the ESL classrooms of Level 3 and Level 5, it was found that deflecting and passing strategies sometimes occurred.
As for the deflecting strategy, half of the participants, Asli, Maria, and Marco, were observed to employ the strategy of deflecting. For example, for Asli, in the following conversation, it appears that the question and response practices in the Level 3 class reflected the unequal and hierarchical power relationship between teacher and ESL adult student, and she tried to escape her undesirable and powerless position. When Asli answered incorrectly, she expressed her sorrow. It seemed that Christina’s (the ESL native teacher’s) dominant power served to facilitate her control over Asli, as demonstrated by Asli’s comment “I am afraid of asking you English because my English is bad”; however, all of Asli’s comments appeared to be attempts to mitigate the impression made by her limited English proficiency. Continually, Asli used the phrase “So, I asked classmates.” Evidence indicated that Asli intended to construct enjoyable affiliations with her peers, reinforcing her position as a popular student with adept social competency. From observation data, it was apparent that Asli did not often ask academic questions of her peers. Asli appear to deflect a sense of poor performance by substituting popularity. Furthermore, in this interaction, Christina displayed her expertise and her concern for her student. She showed the qualities of a good teacher by patiently encouraging Asli, saying: “When you make mistakes, don’t say sorry” and “Don’t say your English is bad. When you want to say some words, please ask me questions and let me know.”

Christina (ESL native teacher): What’s the answer to this question? No, that’s not ___ (my/mine) hat. ___ (My/Mine) is green.
Asli: The first one is ‘mine’, and the second one is ‘my’.
Christina: No, wrong. They should be the first ‘m-y hat’ and the second ‘m-i-n-e’ is green.
Asli: I am sorry.
Christina: When you make mistakes, don’t say sorry.
Asli: I am afraid of asking you English, because my English is bad. So, I asked classmates.
Christina: Don’t say that. Don’t say your English is bad. When you want to say some words, please ask me questions and let me know. (3/11/03, observation)

As the above excerpt indicates, Asli tried to deflect potential criticism for her incompetence, sustaining her role as an accepted participant. In addition, Christina maintained her “privileges of knowledge” (Foucault, 1982) and assuaged her student’s resistance. However, dominated individuals or groups struggle against the privileges of knowledge possessed by those who dominate.

In terms of passing strategy, Luc, Asli and Ying were observed occasionally to use the passing strategy in the ESL class. For example, in the following excerpt from a spelling and pronunciation lesson, when first asked the plural of calf, Ying and other peers answered with the unanimous but incorrect response of “calfes.” However, since one female peer sensed the misspelling of “calfes” and produced the opposite opinion of “No, it is no [not]”, Ying monitored the female peer’s response and physically expressed her agreement that the answer of “calfes” was incorrect by nodding her head. At that point, she was not confident, exhibiting an uncertain expression and unsure if her response was correct as a final answer. Afterwards, Ying made a quick about-face saying, “Yeah, no ‘f’” after Christina’s hint of “Delete ‘f’…add…” This revealed the superficiality of Ying’s legitimate participation in this discourse; her interaction was guided by Christina’s expectations. As Christina attempted to lead her to the approved answer, “calves,” Ying kept silent, waiting for other peers’ answers. Again, Ying employed her tracking strategy by following another peer’s response - “oh, put ‘-ves’” to produce the correct response, “calves.”
Christina: What is the baby cow?
Several students: Calf.
Christina: Good! What is the plural, plural of ‘calf’?
Several students: Calfs.
Christina: Are you sure? [Ying shakes her head slightly, too.]
Several students and Ying: ‘-es’, ‘-es.’ Calfes.
One female student: No, it is no [not].
Ying: [Uncertain expression; nodding her head in disagreement with ‘Calfes’]
Christina: Try again. What is the plural of ‘cow’? I told you the plural of ‘calf’ is not regular. Delete ‘f’…add…
Ying: Yeah, no ‘f.’
Christina: No ‘f’ and what?
Ying: [Silent again]
One student: Oh, put ‘-ves’.
Christina: Good job.
Ying: [Nodded emphatically] ‘-Ves’. Yes, ‘-ves’.
Christina: Yes, calves.
Christina: How about ‘loaf’?
One student: L-o-a-v-e-s.
Ying: [Nodding her head, indicating her understanding] (2/27/03, observation)

As the above example suggests, Ying employed some contingencies to conceal her incapacities in English. Ying tried “passing” (Goffman, 1963), and her effort to disguise an incompetent ESL learner identity was evident. Goffman (1963) suggested that people make efforts to cover their stigmatized condition, conceal individual discrediting behaviors and attempt to ‘pass’ as normal people. This helps them to adapt to the norms of a certain institution. Rymes and Pash (2001) extended Goffman’s (1963) philosophy, indicating that “…one can use the techniques of passing (in Goffman’s sense) to pass (in the academic sense) from grade to grade” (p. 281) in the academic context. Evidence showed that Ying was a less than competent English learner, especially in English oral communication. Her attempt to fit into the Level 3 class drove her to become adept at the practice of passing strategies. In addition, she displayed exaggerated physical movement (nodding or shaking her head or shrugging her shoulders), waiting for the construction of
peers’ answers and teachers’ approval before arriving at final answers. It appeared that both Ying’s amenable behavior toward ESL teachers’ instruction and her appearance of competency during oral participation were spurious.
Native English speakers’ Opinions

The data analysis also focused on the opinions of the two native English teachers of the Level 3 and Level 5 ESL classes regarding the significance of the non-native adult English speakers’ original culture and the intelligibility of diverse English varieties. This discussion is intended to elucidate complementary/various aspects of English native and non-native English speakers’ communication.

Level 3: The Native ESL Teacher: Christina

Attitude toward the Non-native Adult English Speakers’ L1s and Cultural Backgrounds

Christina appeared to demonstrate a belief that white, middle class norms serve as the underlying foundation to the construction of American culture. It was striking that Christina believed that her cultural background made it is easier to access the customs that prevail in this American society. Christina said, “I am from the white middle class of the U.S. society. I can represent our culture.” It seemed that her over-generalized statement probably misled ESL students’ into believing that there was not much variation in American customs.

On the other hand, Christina’s role as an ESL teacher seemed not to be fixed. Rather, it was subject to change. The observational data elucidated that she also tended to involve herself as an integral part of the non-native adult English speakers’ community, sharing their L1 and English learning experiences. The statement “He speaks more American Polish” in the following excerpt, appears to suggest that the male Polish student’s accent was gradually becoming Americanized, and probably indicated that, to some extent, he had assimilated the target language (English) better than the female Polish student had.
As this example seems to demonstrate, this male Polish student made a swift about-face from an attitude of not really agreeing (shrugging his shoulders and laughing), to a response of almost agreeing and said, “Yes, maybe,” probably admitting his social identity as a more competent English learner with Polish background (He had been in the U.S. more years than this female Polish peer.) Apparently, the Americanization of accent of L1 seemed to be welcomed and supported. Christina’s acknowledgement of the two non-native adult English speakers’ different varieties of Polish illustrated in the data may be de facto verification that language confers a status that is far from neutral. In addition, Christina could possibly have legitimized inequality based on the form of language, thereby producing hierarchies of knowledge leading to differential social power and positioning.

In the following segment, illustrating problem-solving in an embryonic state, one student with a French background helped guide another toward progressively internalized achievement by verbalizing the French term ‘Boeuf for ‘cow.’ With that assistance, the first student was able to respond “Oh, ‘Boeuf.’ I know that it is much bigger than a fox.” Through this exchange, the students negotiated their construction of shared understanding. To some extent, this demonstrated how English and the non-native adult English speakers’ L1s were mutually inclusive for the purpose of L2 (English) learning.
The second student with French background: ‘Boeuf.’ [Christina moved to the blackboard and wrote down this French word.]
The first student [with French background]: Oh, ‘Boeuf.’ I know that it is much bigger that a fox. (2/27/03, observation)

Based on the above conversation, it is clear that the first student gained scaffolded help in constructing his learning from the assistance of the second student with more capable skills in L1 (French) and L2 (English). This scaffolding analogy is consistent with Vygotsky’s (1978) suggestion that when learners demonstrate interaction with their social world and cooperation with peers, internal processes can be developed. After these processes have been internalized, they result in learners’ achievement. In this case, the first student with French background seemed to assume the duty of initiating such interaction for strategic functions. In summary, according to Christina’s demonstration, her willingness to incorporate non-native adult English speakers’ responses in her instructional strategy enabled her to employ a wide range of resources while taking advantage of the assistance of non-native adult English speakers’ L1s.

Ideas on the Intelligibility of English Varieties

In the following excerpt, Christina revealed that she was aware of the fact that the domination of Standard English generated communicative inequality and raised an issue of intelligibility for the international community: “You go to some states; some [American] people are raised in one community and taught in Standard English there. They don’t understand your English, and you don’t understand their dialects.” Moreover, because of the legitimacy of Standard English, it was in a position to dominate the practice of ESL discourse between English native and non-native adult speakers. In confronting this unequal situation, non-native adult English speakers should attempt to
improve their chances for participatory legitimacy, Christina advised, by petitioning for leniency and requesting that accommodations be made: “You [non-native adult English speakers] are learning English and please ask them [native speakers] to speak slowly.”

Christina said:

You go to some states; some [American] people are raised in one community and taught in Standard English there. They don’t understand your English, and you don’t understand their dialects. Tell them you are learning English. And please ask them [native speakers] to speak slowly.           (3/11/03, observation)

In addition, in the following example, Christina also served as a problem solver and mediator for her class. She asserted that NBC Broadcast Standard English is the standard that should be followed and represented the linguistic goal that her non-native adult English students should pursue. It was presumed that Christina’s message impacted participants’ formation of their identity as ‘non-standard and with accent’ English speakers, and affected their beliefs concerning construction of participatory legitimacy in their social interaction with English natives in the U.S. and during classroom learning.

Christina suggested that:

English is spoken with different accents. British English is different from American English even though in the long run they are similar. The accent of Ohioans is different from that of New Yorkers. Well, I speak NBC Broadcast Standard English, basically without accent.       (2/11/03, observation)

The above example appears to indicate that Christina acknowledged the existence of the poly-dimensional character and multiple varieties of English. Yet, it appeared that English instruction was inextricably tied to the dictation of standardized authority within the ESL classroom.

In addition, as the excerpt continued, Christina’s picture was remarkable it that it situated herself in an authoritative position regarding English ‘knowledge’ (“ways of
using language in particular contexts”) (Auerbach, 1995, p. 13), as she suggested that

“[Regarding English Grammatical rules]…only ESL teachers know that.” Christina said:

I [Christina] think that you don’t need the continuing tense. I am remembering that…This is not perfect…but only ESL teachers know that. Continually, this sentence ‘Are you hearing a noise outside the window?’ It is not correct. We, Americans, give you the [kind of] impression that you have to use this tense. Americans don’t say it that way. No. Simple is good. Please change to ‘Do you hear a noise outside the window?’

We give you the American way to say this language [English]. You don’t know a lot of ways to say that unless you are Americans. For example, ‘Tony has a noisy electric fan in his bedroom window.’ Well, ‘in’ his bedroom window. We, American people say ‘in’ not ‘on’ his bedroom window. I don’t know how American people know that. Maybe Americans make a lot of mistakes. But, we just say that.

(2/12/03, observation)

2/26/03 and 2/27/03, observation)

Here Christina suggested that non-native adult English speakers were given false impressions regarding the grammatical tense that should be used and pointed out that

“We Americans give you the kind of impression that you have to use this tense.” Based on this comment, it can be inferred Christina made an effort to share assumptions about the mistakes committed in obtaining knowledge of English and her attempt to understand the learners’ difficulties in coping with daily life activities. The nationality or country of origin can guarantee acceptance of spoken English--“You don’t know a lot of ways to say that unless you are Americans.” However, Christina’s rapid self-correction from “You don’t know a lot of ways to say that unless you are Americans” to “We American people say ‘in’ not ‘on’ his bedroom window. I don’t know how American people know that.

But, we just say that” serves her own native ESL teacher’s assumption of authority. But, her assertion seemed not to be based on enough precise knowledge of the historical development of the English language. Christina arrived at her response, “I don’t know how American people know that,” by intentionally avoiding detailed grammatical
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analysis, most of which is probably taken for granted by her. Not surprisingly, the remark revealed her insistence on the relevance of knowing when rules concerning English grammar tenses should be applied and probably served as justification for her prevailing status as the authority on English based on her native English background.

Level 5: The Native ESL Teacher: Jane

Attitude Toward Non-native Adult English Speakers’ L1s and Cultural Backgrounds

In the Level 5 class, the evidence showed that Jane’s (the ESL teacher’s) knowledge regarding “the cultural connotation of the language” (Auerbach, 1993, p. 26) qualified her to teach ESL. In the excerpt below, Jane emphasizes the importance of ESL learners’ cultural/historical inheritance, while comparing the differences and similarities of cultural traditions between the U. S. and other diverse cultures, such as China, Germany and Russia. The data show that Jane also discusses the possibility of conflicted feelings between different generations of immigrant families over the issue of marriage. These classroom practices were conductive to the sharing of cultural backgrounds between teacher and students. The following exchange was observed:

Jane: Arranged marriage is not typical in our culture. If you are an immigrant, maybe your parents keep the image of an arranged marriage and you don’t accept that way. It is difficult here.

Marco: What is a arrange [arranged] marriage?
Jane: One kind is you have a son, and I have a daughter. We want them to see each other and get married. Sometimes it is a stranger. You never know each other. People from two families come together and introduce them and maybe after six months or one year they get married. Someone else chooses the partner. I know that in the Chinese culture there are matchmakers. In China, before, they have a lot of arranged marriages. This could be a part of cultural revolutions. Germany and Russian people wear wedding rings on the right hand. Most Chinese students don’t wear any ring. Very interesting. Now cyber-romance leads to cross-cultural marriage. Do you know what cyber is?
As the above section suggests, Jane’s teaching was presumed to have the potential to enlighten ESL learners regarding concern for local cultural identity, allegiance to cultural traditions and recognition of one’s independent identity.

In addition, as the excerpt below continues, it seems to be evident that ESL students in Level 5 were empowered by Jane to envisage their multi-cultural contributions and values, thereby being granted their cultural legitimacy. Jane said:

But, in the U.S., we don’t have a standard [for greeting], because we are from different nationalities. We bring different customs to this country.

(5/13/03, observation)

This segment implies that within the melting pot, Jane expected that ESL learners’ would be included in the societal space, not dependent solely on the contingent relationships established through interaction between temporary visitors and dominating authority. The ESL learners’ local cultures and contexts were appreciated and respected by Jane. The evidence also revealed there that did not seem to be arbitrary restraints that newcomers were expected to observe since multiculturalism was approved and accepted.

Ideas on the Intelligibility of English Varieties

In the following excerpt, apparently, Jane suggested that non-native adults English speakers’ responsibility of being understood by natives counts quite heavily in ESL discourse. She advocated the tactics of speaking more slowly and articulating carefully as the main coping strategy for non-native adult English speakers responding to the pressure
resulting from natives’ difficulties in comprehension or mis-understanding the pronunciation of their names:

Jane: When you [go to] order pizza to go, how can you identify yourself? I can tell you, I understand you, because I know your name. And I know what you are doing. You need to speak slowly and clearly. People in the U. S. [they] never teach ESL. Slower, speak slower. Speak your name slower. We don’t have such pronunciation in our country. Slow down. You need to keep slowed down. Or don’t give the [a] name they don’t know. They don’t care. Just write it down.

One ESL student: But, but, after finishing ordering, I go out [of] the pizza shop to wait. I forget which American name I used. [Everybody laughed.]

Jane: When you order pizza, you cannot go out. When they say Brian, just say you are Brian. (2/20/03, observation)

As this example illustrates, the non-native adult English speakers seemed to be trying to position themselves as the natives wished. Jane’s message made it clear that it was the responsibility and obligation of non-native adults English speakers to communicate intelligibly. In addition, the data elucidated that non-native adult English speakers appeared to have to exercise patience in order to gain acceptance as ‘normal speakers’ by English natives. With little chance to reverse the inequality of the situation, non-native adult English speakers appeared to be powerless in ESL discourse due to their non-English background and communicative patterns.

As revealed in the next section, Jane also addressed the communicative issue of the intelligibility of World Englishes, not only interactions between English natives and non-natives but also between the non-natives. Jane said:

People who work in the pizza shop; they are foreigners, too. You speak Korean English; she speaks Spanish English. They don’t try very hard to understand you. Similarly, your Korean classmates maybe don’t understand quite well your Spanish English. [You] tell them---would you please repeat the sentence?

(2/20/03, observation)

In the study, because the classroom observational activities mainly focused on the six participants’ behaviors, patterns, the interrelations with native ESL teachers and how they were positioned in the classroom, the data resources between participants and other peers
were slightly limited. However, the above excerpt raised the issue of linguistic interaction between non-native adult English speakers (peers). In order to produce a holistic picture of communicative reality, data from the interaction of participants and other ESL peers was also recorded and validated to make it possible to examine participants’ discourse practices as reflected in classroom conversations and impacted by social position. Despite the fact that this specific aspect of only non-native adult speakers’ inter-discourse communication was beyond the main themes of the study, examination of this aspect of class activity helps in the development of a broader picture of the non-natives’ communicative practices. Further study of ongoing different English scenarios of only non-native English speakers who are from different cultural backgrounds would be beneficial. This concern will be given further attention in Chapter 5.

Furthermore, in the segment below, it is evident that Jane’s position as native ESL instructor provided her with a desirable and powerful platform capable of affecting non-native adult English speakers’ awareness regarding their linguistic behaviors and discursive patterns. Jane instructed the class in the rules of pronunciation regarding the verb suffix—“ed,” which can be pronounced either [t] or [d], creating an exercise that was a drill in contrasts. She corrected every non-native adult English student in order to improve his/her pronunciation because she was concerned that errors would result in her ESL students being devalued and stigmatized to the status of “a foreign person.”

Dedicating herself to the improvement of her non-native adult English learners’ pronunciation skills, Jane mentioned that “the verb suffix – “ed” [st/zd], [ft/vd], [kt/gd], [pt/bd] and [tʃ/tʃdgd], for me, [this] is a big indicator for [of] whether you are Americans or not.” This image of being American or having an American-like essence was
intimately connected to the admonition “When you speak English, I want you to speak like Americans.” This attitude appeared to be pervasive in Jane’s Level 5 class, and very likely served to repress non-native adult English learners, causing them to question whether it was all right to speak. The following exchange was observed:

Ming: Martha is finished (not clear pronunciation [ʼ finʃ]) with literature now.
Jane (native ESL teacher): I am going to help you learn this word. Finished [ʼ finʃt]. Again.
Ming: [ʼfinʃt]. Good.
Jane: The reason I complain and yell about that is because this is the first sign of a foreign person. I don’t want you…anybody to think that you are at fault. The verb suffix – ed [st/zd], [fd/vd], [kt/gd], [pt/bl] and [lt/dgd], for me, [this] is a big indicator for [of] [it]. Well, you could be born here, right? Your mom is from Taiwan, whether you are Americans or not. Every language has a little thing. Well, foreign people…well, I want people to think that you are born here. This is the only reason I emphasized OK. But, you could be born here. And I want any people you deal with in the U.S., in the golf course, in schools, in shopping centers…[to think that you are born here.] You talk clear in [t]/[d]. Even though you don’t speak correctly, you should do what is supposed to be [done]. When you speak English, I want you to speak like Americans. [They are] not [ʼfinʃd] or [ʼfinʃd]. It is [ʼfinʃt], [ʼfinʃt].

(5/7/03 and 5/14/03, observation)

As the above example suggests, the prevalent attitude associated with privileged and accurate English pronunciation is likely to lead to the creation of prejudicial stereotypes resulting from the beliefs that ‘Americans tend to speak correct English’ and ‘non-Americans speak non-perfect English.’ Based on the comments, it seemed that the ethnic identity afforded segments of the population ownership of the language. Americans seemed to have custody over English and were legitimate English speakers. This finding complied with Tsuda’s (1997) suggestion regarding the hierarchical structure among the varieties of English, with the American variety being located at the top of this hierarchy.

In summary, American or Standard English was in a position to affect communication, consistent with native English speakers’ preferences.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY FINDINGS, PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of power hierarchies on the participatory legitimacy of non-native adult English speakers during American ESL discourses, in particular, their communicative interactions with native English speakers. In addition, the study investigated the underlying multiple discourses, such as the cultural-reflective discourse, gender discourse, standard English-only discourse, ESL academic discourse and counter-discourse. The issues of concern in this discussion can be regarded as the following:

- the connections between gender patterns and ESL discourse development;
- the mutual interactions between participants’ original culture and the target culture forces through which the participants’ cross-cultural experiences are explored;
- issues of World English related to decisions about English ownership and the domination of Standard English;
- the comparison of EFL/ESL academic contexts regarding participants’ conversational performance in terms of group dynamics;
participants’ strategies to resist the power imposition of native English speakers.

All of these phenomena shape English communicative patterns and tendencies, and they determine the participants’ participatory legitimacy within American ESL discourse.

The participants were six non-native adult English speakers who were from different cultural backgrounds. The major data sources were semi-structured interviews, participatory observations of communicative activity both inside and outside the ESL classroom, and document analysis. Supplementary data were obtained from the two native ESL teachers in the Level 3 and Level 5 classes, in order to view holistically how the transmission of English natives’ cultural arbitrariness affected the non-native English adult speakers’ decisions impacting their participatory legitimacy. The data were analyzed through general profiles of the collected cases regarding the participants’ demographic backgrounds and by interweaving the discourse analysis of individual cases and the results derived from cross case comparisons, featuring cross-sectional and longitudinal viewpoints. This chapter covers (I) a summary of the research findings, (II) pedagogical implications, (III) and recommendations for future study.

Summary of the Research Findings

The summary and discussion of the research findings are framed and presented through responses to the four research questions.

Research Question1
What cross-cultural experiences do non-native speakers of English seem to encounter most frequently in their social interactions in an ESL setting?

Two main aspects were displayed in order to answer this research question. The first aspect explains use of the non-native adult English speakers’ gender-roles as lenses through which to address their cross-social and cultural interactions, English
communicative patterns and speech tendencies and the construction of social identity. Furthermore, this will be helpful to examine the non-native adult English speakers’ expectations for their daily encounters and experiences based on their gender attributes. The second aspect, non-native adult English speakers’ reports regarding their cross-cultural experiences, including the transitions in their cross-cultural interactions, accommodation and reconciliation for cultural comparison and communication, are elucidated to examine their encounters during their social participation. In the first part, the non-native adult English speakers’ social interaction and adaptation is briefly but specifically examined.

As for the male-related gender discourse within American ESL discourse, based on the interview data of the study, the two male non-native adult English speakers displayed some characteristic gender attributes and linguistic behavior. (1) Even though one male non-native adult English speaker possessed very limited English proficiency upon his arrival in the U. S, his belief in a clear-cut ‘male gender’ identity seemingly bolstered his confidence and assertiveness in American social interaction. (2) The other male non-native adult English speaker abided by the requirements of the ESL discourse culture of solidarity within the job market which was embraced by his male colleagues. (3) Sometimes one male non-native adult English speaker engaged in humorous exchanges, direct implication and use of a high vocal tone as mechanisms to alleviate reciprocal embarrassment with native co-workers. (4) Their English expressions tended to be energetic, initiating, dominant, motivated and self-confident.

The results of the study indicated that the female-related gender discourse in American ESL contexts was characterized by certain attributes. (1) Some female non-
native adult English speakers desired a non-threatening, caring and safe environment in the U.S., rarely socializing across ethnic and cultural boundaries because of their traditional sense of confinement. In contrast, some gained strength through positive social factors (e.g., inter-ethnic marriage or church female support group) so that they could achieve broader social interaction. (2) Some female non-native adult English speakers were able to become involved in active and supportive conversations naturally with liberated acts, frank speaking expressions and hands-on speaker-focused oral behaviors. In contrast, some, through their reticence, lowered the likelihood of comprehensible English input and eclipsed the importance of their own freedom of expression.

Several salient points emerged from the study of male and female related gender discourse of participants in order to examine the participants’ life encounters in the U.S. It was found that all male and female non-native adult English speakers were imbued with the gendered culture constructed by their original social practices. Moreover, after a period of assimilation in the U.S., both male or female participants’ gender awareness and relations tended to be heightened within the American ESL community in which English was acquired.

Generally speaking, the findings supported the assertions previously submitted by Ehrlich (1993) that gender-related tendencies and patterns in second or foreign language acquisition appeared to cross communities as well as social and cultural categories; female-male attributes appeared not to be fixed and/or rigid. The findings also confirmed the perspectives of Tannen (1994, 1996) concerning gender-related patterns and related strategies, such as power and solidarity in gender and dominance. Furthermore, the findings broadened Oxford’s (1993) limited discussion of gender differences in L2
learning strategies and styles based on merely social and cognitive development by addressing the complicated framework of the social linguistic system where a combination of gender and power, social identity and equality come into play.

Based on the participants’ self-reports, it was obvious that the idea of ‘gendered culture’ was shaped within particular American social, cultural and situational contexts, i.e., was a social construct and did not reside within the participants’ characters permanently. In addition, to some extent, all participants’ previous gender dominated or dominant forms of knowledge had to be legitimated consciously/unconsciously to shape their speech style, linguistic practices, confidence and motivation within American social participation. This appeared to significantly impact the participants’ decisions to take part in U.S. ESL discourse. In a sense, their discourse patterns were affected by their male or female characteristics, sometimes in demonstrating an appearance of social competence (e.g., in dealing with economic necessities and alleviating reciprocal embarrassment.) On the other hand, most importantly, the findings of the study showed that most of the non-native adult English speakers appeared to be willing to shift their role from helplessness to effective negotiation of their daily American life (seeing what they were faced with and relocating themselves). As they became more aware of their capabilities and their own cultural values, they began to feel empowered. Usually, their lives were shaped by the characteristic of consciousness (Freire, 1970). Their struggle also reflected the individual autonomy aspect of critical theory, for they became the authors of their own worlds (Pennycook, 1997). Ying was the only exception. Her American social interaction seemed to be highly confined within discrete realms (family and Chinese community), cut off from the world of other possibilities; she rejected interaction outside of her
immediate comfort zone. This confinement limited her opportunities to acquire English and acculturate to the new life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common conceptualizations of social identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Summary of the Two Genders’ Social Identity

The comparison of male and female gender roles in the study contradicted the fixed notions of social identities in regard to gender polarity. The results of the present study indicated all non-native adult English speakers negotiated some degree of overlapping social identity for themselves (e.g., not just a specific ethnic identity but identities based on other social categories) (see Table 5.1). In the present study, it appeared that non-native adult English-speakers tended to engage in multiple social identities. The findings seemed to confirm Genishi’s philosophy (1999) that social identity is symbolically produced by discourses and also is unstable and mobile, and tend to be constructed through local interactions and power relationships (Norton, 1995, 2000; Weedon, 1997, Toohey, 2000). Moreover, the data analysis has further extended the research of Weedon (1997) and Norton (1995, 2000) which investigated the attributes of females’ or female adult ESL learners’ social identity. This research covered two male and four female non-native adult English speakers, and the results seem to suggest that attributes of social identity of both male and female are similar--struggling, negotiating, and contradictory, though more evidence from more male participants would be needed to confirm the preliminary findings on this topic in the present study.
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In addition, this section has explored participants’ opinions with regard to the transitions in their cross-cultural awareness, the process of cultural comparison and acculturation and English communication in order to scrutinize what they encounter most frequently in their social participation. In the study, all non-native adult English speakers seemed to be interested, involved, and active in topics or issues related to cultural comparisons. Being more sensitive to and knowledgeable about cultural differences than other issues, they were well prepared for these types of questions and seemed inclined to provide their own opinions. On occasion, they expressed their opinions with reference to differences they had perceived, especially differences in cultural values and culture shock. After this preliminary stage, the non-native adult English speakers appeared to continually modify the roles they were playing to make sense of the transitions they were experiencing. They described the procedure of accommodation and reconciliation and how their social characters were being shaped. Because they were confronting cultural issues in a U.S. environment that advocates diversity, all the non-native adult English speakers in the study tended toward a clearer recognition of their social identity, and they seemed more empowered and capable of defending themselves in this cross-cultural discourse.

The results of the study showed some important emergent cultural factors affecting non-native adult English speakers’ English acquisition process and their assessment of their own social and linguistic legitimacy in their new American environment.

In the beginning, all the non-native adult English speakers attempted to compare and contrast their native culture (life style, values, gender and ethnicity) with the American (target culture) society and communication in English. The findings of the study showed
that all participants were struggling to maintain their original cultural heritage through a comparison of that culture with the target culture (American culture).

Examination of these data revealed that the process of social comparison or categorization (Tajfel, 1974) involves racial, emotional, behavioral, and linguistic cues that in the beginning divided all participants into certain categories. The findings concerning this process of comparison and categorization are congruent with those of previous studies, such as Roth and Harama (2000), regarding change in the L2 learners’ sense of the relationship between self and others as they gain more self-understanding. In addition, the non-native adult English speakers in this study were enabled to perceive the value of their own cultural legacy and the experience of initial marginality, which was followed by either subsequent empowerment or social isolation in the new environment. Furthermore, in this stage, half of the non-native adult English speakers reported the presence of culture shock when their cultural expectations were different from those of native English speakers and they were confronted with prestige-related language choices regarding use of either their original language or English. The data of the study showed that three participants made a stronger attempt to employ cultural differences as a foundation within which they could navigate and elucidate the inequality of the social hierarchical system in their daily American life. The findings revealed that they made an effort to uphold an image representative of the attitudes and norms to which they subscribed in their cross-cultural experiences.

In the second stage of accommodation and reconciliation in the U.S., it was found that all participants seemed to develop a new social character, which was engendered through interaction with the new U.S. cultural environment. Their determination to wrestle with
the new norms for survival appeared to be positive even though it was part of a dilemma facing them in their new culture. Unlike the claim of Schecter and Bayley (1997), whose child participants’ defined themselves in terms of allegiance to either their Mexican or Mexican-American cultural heritage, these findings indicated that the development of the non-native adult English speakers’ new social character was characterized by a refusal to incorporate their prior life into their new U.S. life and, on the other hand, by the relocation of some native cultural traditions, especially coping strategies and attitudes related to new socialization procedures and the length of time spent in their new environment.

These findings demonstrate the non-native adult English speakers’ flexibility which seemed to allow them to be accommodating as they faced the dynamics of cultural interaction and found that it significantly affected the strength of their ties to their original ethnicity and cultural associations. In the study, the weak claim of the non-native adult English speakers’ original culture and the need for L1 maintenance, which is different from the findings of Schecter and Bayley (1997), may have resulted from the participants’ being adults whose perspectives were already established.

As for ethnicity and English communication, in this study, most of the non-native adult English speakers stated that native English speakers immediately or instantaneously categorized their ethnicity based on their physical appearances. This factor affected the opportunities to be invited by native English speakers for involvement in conversation or social participation. The finding suggested that there were two types of categorization owing to differences in non-native adult English speakers’ physical presentation.
First, some non-native adult English speakers reported that they have obviously different physical appearances from those of American Caucasians or African Americans. Consequently, they either consciously or unconsciously alienated themselves from the native English speakers, or they were acknowledged by the native English speakers to have a clear ethnic identity as foreigners. Therefore, fewer opportunities were extended or taken advantage of for them to take part in ESL discourse (e.g., in Ming’s case, she reported that most native English speakers could recognize her ethnicity and were not interested in talking with her).

Second, the study found that some non-native adult English speakers whose physical appearance seemed to be like that of American Caucasians or African Americans appeared to have more frequent opportunities to be included in communication activities with native English speakers. It could have been the case that either or both sides were motivated by the instinctive closeness associated with similar physical appearance. However, once native English speakers discovered that the participant had a non-native accent, an asymmetrical power relationship seemed to emerge and the social distance either returned or increased. Simultaneously, the range of conversation topics and enthusiasm seemed to decrease. That is to say, in the study, some participants’ racial similarity to native Caucasian Americans located them in a position to be accepted in ESL conversations by native English speakers, but their different or non-standard accent demonstrated in conversation with native English speakers appeared to preclude this closeness (e.g., in Maria’s case, her Caucasian appearance made it easier for her to be included in conversation; however, after the native English speakers heard her foreign accent, she did not feel much hospitality for extended conversation).
To summarize, based on the results of the study, when the non-native adult English speakers had interacted with American culture for a period of time, the impulse to assimilate the new cultural traits and social patterns tended to be gradually mediated by the participants’ native cultures. The findings of the study revealed that the integration pattern was likely to result in one or more of the following: (1) a shift in the way the non-native adult English speakers saw themselves and related to their new environment: a change in awareness of status in the old sense of ‘who they were and otherness’ and implicit understanding of self and other categories that led them to comprehend the order of the new social environment; (2) alteration in the strength of the non-native adult English speakers’ bonds to their own cultural affiliations caused by their awareness of themselves as English learners; (3) satisfaction with new social acceptability, which seemed to go beyond participants’ awareness of the power of American cultural arbitrariness that necessitated adaptation and change. This change also appeared to legitimize their new social character; (4) marginalization of non-native adult English speakers’ native skills in new environmental socialization due to American cultural practices.

Research Question 2
What beliefs about communicating in English do non-native speaking adult learners report about the topic of World Englishes?

The findings reported participants’ opinions regarding ownership of English as well as the symbolic domination of Standard English, which the philosophy of ‘World Englishes’ attempts to overcome in order to emancipate ESL speakers. In addition, the findings suggested the linguistic capital that each individual participant possessed and whether or not this would be consistent with the criteria for American social acceptance, how
participants negotiated their social status, and how they modified linguistic and social participation patterns, tendencies and motivations within the Standard-English-only discourse. These discussions reflect participants’ self-awareness with respect to the related concerns of ‘World Englishes’ described in Chapter One and Two.

Most of the participants tended to associate English with either the United States of America or Britain. Some non-native adult English speakers displayed a sense of ambiguity regarding the origins of English, but they felt that it was aligned with British power and British obligation, although for one participant the most influential factor was his geographical location in the U.S., all of which underlie participants’ claim that British or American people ‘own’ English internationally.

Even though some non-native adult English speakers made an attempt to claim their legitimate right to use or own English, they still somehow problematized their own legitimacy by acknowledging their ethnic difference (e.g., Luc mentioned, “who is born in the U.S., who has good English”) and their inability to become attached to and learn so-called prestigious American or British English. The results pointed out that the non-native adult English speakers in the study tended to recognize their positions as being reducible to merely that of English users instead of English managers, and tended to hesitate to claim themselves as legitimate speakers. This also suggests that their experiences seemed to be constituted in terms of the disadvantaged status that they occupied in their English discourse.

The findings offered evidence to support Norton’s (1997) suggestion that only when English speakers asserted ownership of English did they claim themselves as legitimate speakers, derived from Bourdieu’s philosophy (1977) of how authorization of speakers is
constructed. In Norton’s (1997) attempted extension, in spite of the fact that she addressed some questions of concern such as the relationship between native and non-native teachers/standard and non-standard English speakers, and Western cultural hegemony, she only focused on the literature analysis and did not provide any data findings to support her claim. This qualitative research based on case study has constructed evidentiary data and offers further possibilities for explaining how the assumption of ownership of English might affect the construction of legitimacy for speakers in the field of TESOL.

In sum, the results of the study suggested that the non-native adult English speakers’ equating the native English speaker’s ethnic identity with the ownership of English usage, their geographical location in the U.S. and their historical viewpoints regarding the origin of English development reinforced most participants’ beliefs that the United States of America or Britain own English globally. These perspectives tended to limit the non-native adult English speakers’ chances to negotiate their legitimacy and right to the ownership of English (e.g., Luc also reported that people from his country own French).

In terms of the data pertaining to non-native adult English speakers’ awareness regarding the complicated and diverse nature of English, the findings showed that the participants were aware of the existence of multiple Englishes. However, the participants tended to differentiate their English varieties from American or British English in terms of certain English characteristics such as accent, speaking pace, pronunciation and syntax. However, one finding revealed that the diversity of local American Standard English seemed to cast doubt regarding the development of a Western Standard English.
This finding appears to support the position of the present study: an ideal or legitimate Standard English, in reality, does not exist within ESL discourse or any discourse.

With regard to which English variety qualifies as the standard one, the results of the study showed that all participants appeared to accept the standard role of American or British English. However, unlike the perspectives of Leung et al. (1997) focusing on the local White monolingual English majority automatically allied with Standard English in England, the findings of the present study showed that the six non-native adult English speakers tended to discuss the inextricable link between different nationality (native English participants in the United States or Britain) and Standard English in a globalized world. This difference might be based on the present study’s non-native adult English speakers’ weak affiliation with and limited acknowledgment of difference in English usage between the local ethnic majority and minority of the U.S or England. Also, their diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences with cross-cultural migration are likely to lead to universal viewpoints. In addition, the findings of the study suggested that some non-native adult English speakers’ perspectives concerning which English version is legitimated as the Standard seemed to be affected by whether or not English was deemed a certain country’s first language. The findings suggested that if the speaker’s language is his/her language, it earns the status of predominance for that participant.

In terms of the socio-economic values causing the imposition of American Standard English, based on the interview data, all non-native adult English speakers expressed a strong motivation to learn American English. The powerful world position of the U.S., the prevalent Americanization of global culture (Tsuda, 1997), U.S. control of communication internationally, and opportunities for social mobility in the U.S.
contributed to the non-native adult English speakers’ intense eagerness to learn American English. The result implied widespread domination of American or British English practices which situated most of the native English speakers in the United States of America or Britain at the top of a linguistic hierarchy in which they have power in the form of obligations as well as rights vis-à-vis non-native speakers because of the natives’ preponderant linguistic status.

However, in the study, one non-native adult English speaker’s perspective reflects the relative weight of the effect of geographical location in making a decision to speak American or British English. She preferred to adjust her English communication so that it would be similar to that of the residents of a specific locale (e.g., speaking Japanese accented local English in Japan). This suggested that English usage should be considered within the local cultural contexts and the local English usage should prevail over the prestige of Western Standard English. In this study, this phenomenon also represented the non-native adult English participant’s ambivalent feelings regarding a desire for acceptance of the dignity of their own local English variety and a preference for Standard English.

In addition, data from this study suggested that most of the non-native adult English speakers had a tendency to recognize the existence of diverse English varieties but chose to accept and learn American or British English even though it appeared to be at odds with the intentional object of ‘World Englishes’, to attain English democratization and to decrease the predominant role of Standard English in all aspects of international communication (Tsuda, 1997).
The above results of the study provided the possibility of echoing the frame of post-structuralism and social-cultural principles in the study: (1) Non-native adult English speakers’ awareness of the non-privileged status of their own English resulted from the comparison they made with the power of British or American English. Moreover, because native English speakers’ perception regarding the privileged (standard) or non-privileged (non-standard) English was viewed through post-structuralist relativism, “relativizing everything” (Appignnesi et al., 1995 p. 76), the distinction between the privileged/or non-privileged English can only be understood as a relative phenomenon. (2) The results of the study can better support Foucault’s (1984) concept of panopticism (e.g., domination of American or British English), the ability to control through infiltration and technical inventions in order to extend authority/power to all social disciplines, institutions and their multiplicities. (3) The findings revealed that non-native adult English speakers tended to accept the reproduction of Western English speakers’ position of symbolic power, which confirms the claims made in Bourdieu’s philosophy of the establishment of legitimation thorough the explanation of recognition and mis-recognition (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Thompson, 1984). The findings suggested that American or British English speakers are deemed as legitimate by non-native adult English participants because they have recognized American or British English speakers as legitimate unconditionally; they may have mis-recognized American or British English speakers as legitimate due to the arbitrary imposition of American or British culture.

As for the non-native adult English speakers’ involvement in the Standard-English discourse in the U.S. society, in the study, most of speakers somehow tended to have certain linguistic patterns and beliefs, tendencies and motivations that affected social
participation. Based on observational and interview data, the participants’ participation is characterized and detailed implications described below.

It was found that the immediate life situations involved in coping with the transitional life or surviving in the U.S. job market facilitated most of the participants’ acquisition of aural and oral English skills. The findings of the study suggested not only that most of the non-native adult English speakers were making efforts to acquire aural and oral skills, but also that they were sensitive to the difference in their local English accent and word usage from the standard and legitimate English norms. To some extent, non-native adult English speakers internalized the blame for their ineptness in Standard English. Based on the results of the study, it might be inferred that their attempts to avoid mistakes, to be perfect in communication with native English speakers, probably forced them to be overly concerned with how they spoke instead of what they spoke about. Also, one non-native adult English speaker’s grievance with a native English-speaking boss concerning a pay raise suggested his more fragile or lower positioning compared to his boss in relations of power due to their unequal communication skills. Based on the results of the study, all of these phenomena might reflect the non-native adult English speakers’ powerless social position outside the boundary of the mainstream Standard English context and cause them to lag behind in their assimilation into that context. The finding is similar to that of McKay and Wong (1996) regarding Chinese-immigrant students’ positions in relation to the dominant power within the U.S. multiple social discourses. Furthermore, the current study extends the limited scope of the study with Chinese-speaking participants, to assist ESL teachers who are teaching ESL students from widely diverse cultural backgrounds and concerned about effective pedagogy for the students.
The results of the study were also consistent with the viewpoint that the right to speak a language is closely related to having the power to command listeners’ attention (Bourdieu, 1977; Thompson, 1984), sometimes regardless of proficiency.

Another noteworthy finding was that successful social experiences may mitigate non-native adult English speakers’ concerns regarding their insufficient level of communicative competence. In the study, notwithstanding the fact that one non-native adult English speaker’s limited English proficiency meant that his communication in English was not effective or fluent, his acquisition of social skills facilitating accommodation to social practices was sustained. His prior work experiences led to the development of confidence in social interaction and a lack of anxiety. Data from the study pointed out that well-developed social skills enabled the non-native adult English participants to be acutely perceptive about the conflicting frameworks of solidarity and power (Tannen, 1994) of English native speakers’ communicative strategies.

On the other hand, the results of the study also indicated that some non-native adult English speakers had a low desire to interact for the purpose of social survival, which might have led to their unwillingness to speak English. Two different kinds of situations were revealed: (1) In the study, the passive involvement appeared to be derived from the non-native adult English speaker’s self-perception acknowledging that native English speakers had a high tolerance level regarding the non-native adult English speakers’ low command of communicative English skills. (2) In an embryonic state of social involvement, the non-native adult English speaker seemed to internalize the negative impressions associated with asking native English speakers’ help. As a result, a certain kind of help-seeking behavior within the Standard English framework was developed,
especially, utilizing the assistance of technology (e.g., consulting an electronic dictionary and watching TV), instead of asking for help from native English speakers.

**Research Question 3**

*What do non-native English-speaking adult learners report when they are interviewed about their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics that they recall from their previous EFL classrooms? What do non-native English-speaking adult learners demonstrate in their conversation performance in terms of group dynamics when they are observed in their current ESL classroom? What connections are revealed when the two learning contexts are compared?*

Interview and observational data provided a means to illustrate the participants’ English communicative performance and classroom social interaction within EFL and ESL contexts individually. The interview data primarily addressed participants’ prior EFL classroom experiences at the college or university level; the observational data and field notes illuminate the phenomena of current ESL classrooms. In order to view the participants’ classroom oral performance holistically, some of the factors affecting their communicative motivation, tendencies and patterns were also identified. These factors include the curriculum design, teaching methods, the role of the teacher, classroom size and seating arrangement characterizing the classroom structure, the necessary classroom maintenance and the conditions of the development of interaction among participants. This question also intended to investigate the relationship between the EFL and ESL academic discourse.

**The EFL Classroom**

Based on the interview data, most of the non-native adult English speakers in this study tended to report negative patterns of social dynamics from their previous English classes at the college level. One participant reported being an exception and indicated that
the EFL students’ involvement seemed to be cohesive and characterized by within-group cooperation. For another participant, the absence of a report about his previous EFL experiences was a result of his being devoid of any English education background in his home country.

In the study, as for English communicative performance and social interactions within the EFL classroom, most of the non-native adult English speakers in the study tended to have minimal English communicative experiences, using fragments and incomplete expressions, and rigid social relationships that matched their passive classroom dynamics in their home countries, although one participant revealed that the students’ positive attitude regarding their English communication led to their involvement in varied and dynamic tasks and their satisfaction about cooperation in their cohesive EFL classes.

Regarding most of the non-native adult English speakers’ passive English communicative performance and social interactions in their previous college EFL classes, based on the interview data, they provided simple vocabulary-based and fragment sentential answers in response to the teachers’ typical practice of using question-and-answer-drill and performance-oriented questions, which imposed a particular type of communicative context in the classes. Also, their limited association with English teachers and other peers was affected by the competitive learning environment in their college level English classroom, which appeared to be an extension of the middle school prototype phenomenon of English classes. The results of the study pointed out that the persistent cultural value that shaped students as successful intellectuals to reflect the English teachers’ power as teachers resulted in students’ having insufficient opportunities to speak. Conversely, one non-native adult English speaker’s positive speaking
contributions and social activities were impressive even though the limited group
dynamics offered few chances for communicative participation.

As for the factors constructing the group dynamics of English oral performance, such
as the curriculum design and teaching materials, most of the non-native adult English
speakers reported that they found the EFL English curricula to be too formal, old-
fashioned, focusing on reading and writing skills and grammar-oriented. In particular, the
data showed that the dominant purpose was passing examinations and that this indeed
affected the English curriculum and its impact was negative. This phenomenon was
consequential in their middle and high school experiences and was typically extended to
their college-level English class.

The findings of the study implied that the a priori design of the curriculum content
was restricted and channeled; it did not help students put what they were learning into
practice outside the EFL classroom, which appeared to offer them a very restricted
communicative environment to confirm the curriculum content. In terms of English
teachers’ teaching methods and roles, most of the participants’ English teachers were
reported to be rigid with the students about the classroom regulations, sometimes
imposing set boundaries on the students and making sure that students recognized what
was expected of them. This finding revealed that the role of English teachers’ seemed to
be that of message deliverers, conducting grammar-translation teaching and one-way
lectures. In addition, the data indicated that because of most of the English teachers’
deficiency in spoken English, they were considered less qualified, not fully capable as
English teachers. That is, being orally proficient as Standard English speaking teachers
was an ascribed aspect of the qualified English teachers’ identity.
As for the classroom size and seating arrangement in the EFL context, most non-native adult English speakers in the study mentioned that their classroom was comprised of approximately thirty-five to forty students. The classroom spatial arrangement was random and not restrictive. The freedom resulted from the fact that the school authority to some extent had agreed that young adults are disciplined enough to practice classroom management themselves.

Summary conclusions based on these findings of the study regarding the EFL classroom are as follows:

(1) Most of the EFL teachers’ ‘non-Standard English’ characteristics seemed to have been pertinent to their marginalized identity as well as their less-equipped professional status, and even in part led to the consequence of their non-native learners’ limited oral acquisition and negative beliefs regarding their powerless participatory legitimacy in English communication. (2) The findings of the study suggested that most of the EFL teachers confined their range of English teaching to mechanical practices and the use of analytical skills for the development of reading and writing. In terms of the non-native speakers’ cultural norms, English instruction was dominated by and inextricably tied to the teachers’ hierarchical authority in their countries. (3) The findings implied that most of the non-native adult English speakers’ incapacity in English oral communication was partly anchored in the limitations of available authentic communicative contexts outside the EFL classroom. (4) For some non-native adult English speakers in the study, although not all examinations were clearly referred to as school entrance exams, it seemed that the entrance exams were the prototype of school exams, determining the ways in which
school exams were presented and typically influenced the orientation of the English curriculum.

In sum, the above findings support the claims of the related studies of Li (1998) and Ellis (1996) concerning the restriction of communicative practice within the Asian EFL classroom. Some factors that affect communicative practice include the purpose of English learning, curriculum design and material development, current English instruction methods, teachers’ training for oral proficiency, classroom size, group dynamics, the availability of opportunities for speaking English outside the EFL classroom and the acceptance of local cultural norms that are embedded into the EFL classroom and might constrain students’ conversational performance. The current study enlarged the scope of Li’s (1998) study, in which the participants were Asian EFL school teachers, since it engaged participants who were non-native learners from diverse EFL backgrounds to promote a broader view on communicative practice in the EFL classroom.

Concerning the role of L1s within the EFL classroom, the data showed the use of L1s was inevitably woven into the fabric of EFL classroom communication. However, two different kinds of interference regarding contrast analysis were discussed. The interview data revealed that some participants with intermediate oral proficiency focused on the discrepancy in syntactic structures or grammatical rules whereas some participants with a high command of oral skills pointed out their specific trouble with the pronunciation of some English phonemes, which was caused by the absence in their L1s of an equal or similar pronunciation. The findings showed that both the relatively intermediate and highly proficient participants in English discourse tended to reject the practice of
transferring, which led to error-making. Even though these findings are not new, they add strength to Ellis’s (1997) assertion that L2 speakers tended to identify the interference of their L1s as a source of their mistakes, as a barrier to prompt interaction in their L2 acquisition. Specifically, the current study offers the possibility of explaining how interference between two languages affects the phenomena of oral conversation in the L2. More evidence would be needed to make an assertive statement. The above finding of the study on L1 and L2 transfer indicated a combination of cognitive aspects and pedagogical implications concerning language choice for non-native adult English speakers. Notwithstanding the fact that the above discussion tends toward a focus on the cognitive aspects of the English communicative operation, these aspects also facilitated manifestation of the linguistic construction of English oral activity in EFL classrooms in terms of language or pedagogical choices. Cognitively, the findings showed that the non-native adult English speakers appeared to resist L1 and L2 transferring, although the employment of L1s was permitted and not avoided in the linguistic practice of the EFL classes, based on educational policies. This discussion helps to bridge the gap and enlarge the connection between the cognitive and social linguistic aspects to strengthen EFL classroom research. Further study in this area is suggested because of the limitations of the case study methodology in the present study.

The ESL Classroom

In the ESL Level 3 and Level 5 classes, the observational data indicated that the nature of group dynamics appeared to be active and non-threatening. It seemed to evoke most non-native adult English speakers’ commitment to accomplishment in order to improve their cooperative learning outcomes.
Basically, the positive social dynamics tended to facilitate participants’ English communicative performance and social interactions. Six of the participants, all except Ying, appeared to be actively involved in exploiting the verbal constructions and lively patterns of classroom social involvement. In contrast, Ying was the only participant who tended to be apathetic in English oral contributions, peer affiliations, and class participation. She apparently had neither the incentive nor the self-confidence to approach class involvement on any regular basis.

Five non-native adult English speakers’ oral performances were positive. The observation data revealed that some non-native adult English speakers appeared to legitimate the value and demonstrate the prestige of their original cultural heritage, for example, in the appreciation and introduction of the culture, food, education systems and languages. In some cases, the L1 was applied extensively and demonstrated so as to compare what the participants received from the English lecture with an L1 translation. In addition, some participants identified themselves with particular methods for maintaining a significant classroom role, such as serving as a gatekeeper to the ESL teacher’s teaching pace and countering the power imposition, establishing a powerful classroom participatory legitimacy regarding social interactions to achieve a kind of social identity as a classroom leader; and working as a powerful and privileged decision-maker among classmates of the same ethnicity and thus possibly compensating for the deficiency of the non-native adult English speakers’ position.

Based on the findings of the study regarding non-native adult English speakers’ oral communication and social interaction within the ESL classroom, the following conclusions are suggested. (1) The non-native adult English speakers seemed to
demonstrate critical reflection, a process of “the emergence of consciousness” (Freire, 1970, p. 68) regarding the reality of the knowledge (the subject matter of English) which they were engaged in acquiring, facilitating the creation of their own power and a chance for social mobility. (2) Sometimes, the position the ESL class provided for the non-native adult English speakers was likely to shape their understanding regarding the standards and norms of the discourse appropriate to win the native ESL teacher’s approval and liking. (3) In general, the non-native adult English speaker’s identity was recognized as being contingent upon interaction with other classroom participants and the distribution of power. Moreover, to some extent, the non-native adult English speakers’ demonstration of resistance confirmed the observation that some aspects of the loose structure of ESL education might be regarded as having a remedial status. (4) The marginalized role of the remedial and survival ESL program seems likely to be negated. English knowledge through the ESL program was a springboard, somewhat legitimated and verified as cultural capital, facilitating the non-native adult English speakers’ entrance into the mainstream university or job market. (5) Supporting Auerbach’s (1993) concern regarding the shortcomings of English only discourse in the ESL classroom, students’ demonstration of the prestige of their original cultural heritage (e.g., the use of L1) seemed to serve to balance the unequal power of the ESL classroom. This issue will receive further attention in the summary of two native English speakers’ opinions regarding non-native English speakers’ L1s and cultural backgrounds.

As for the effect of curriculum and teaching materials on the group dynamics of English oral performance in the ESL classrooms of the study, based on the document analysis, the two ESL teachers attempted to offer relatively flexible and inspired teaching 255
documents, which had some relation to the authentic character of learners’ real world
knowledge. In terms of the two ESL teachers’ roles and instructional methods, the
observation data showed that they appeared to serve as facilitators of the class, taking
charge of establishing situations to promote learners’ communication activities and use of
language forms appropriate to real social contexts to shed light on communicative
competence. Sometimes they invited ESL adult learners to take part in decision-making.
ESL adult learners were encouraged to take risks; in particular, the ESL teachers’ high
tolerance for learners’ errors was impressive. Nevertheless, the observational data
indicated that the two ESL teachers sometimes emphasized the significance of ESL adult
learners’ unavoidable responsibility to communicate intelligibly when encountering
English native speakers. In addition, the Level 3 and Level 5 classes contained about
fifteen to twenty learners or so. The small classes seemed to make it easier to practice
communicative English and easier to monitor students’ behaviors. The seating
arrangement was free.

To summarize, for the first comparison of ESL and EFL contexts, based on the results
of the study, most non-native adult English speakers’ social behaviors and
communicative performance have been highly correlated with positive classroom
dynamics. Evidence revealed that the preponderance of the ESL contexts appeared to
cater to active communicative performance and socialization, far outmatching the EFL
contexts. Also, it was suggested that most of the non-native adult English speakers’
performance in the ESL contexts does not entirely reflect the foundation of their former
English learning in EFL, which tended to be severely channeled and restricted. As for
another comparison within the ESL context, the participants in the two proficiency
Levels (Intermediate Level 3 and Advanced Level 5) were compared regarding their affective filters (e.g., self-confidence and motivation) during their dialogic and social interaction. Based on the data, in the comparison of Maria, Ming and Marco of Level 5, as well as Luc and Asli in the Level 3 classes, both groups were characterized by similar relatively high self-confidence and strong motivation to interact with their native English teachers or even to take part in outside ESL classroom social interaction (discussed in other questions). The findings of the study suggested that not only Advanced Level 5 participants but most of the less skilled participants in the ESL classroom as well were characterized by high self-confidence and strong achievement motivation.

More evidence is necessary to generalize this claim regarding these learners.

**Research Question 4**

*What behaviors or strategies do non-native English-speaking adult learners seem to use most frequently when interacting with native speakers of English to avoid power imposition of native speakers?*

In this question, the researcher observed that all study participants appeared to show a tendency to consider their own non-native accent of English to be far from the criteria of the standard one; nevertheless, they exhibited resistance to devaluation when their marginalized social identity and inferior language position placed them in conflict with the effects of native English speakers’ power imposition.

**Counter-Discourse**

The finding that most of the participants exercised counter-discourse might function as a fruitful site for elucidating the phenomenon of the inequitable power shaping in asymmetrical discourse interaction. For non-native adult English participants, the use of counter-discourse spearheaded the attempt to deflect potential domination and avoid the
submissive status of taken-for-granted listeners or receivers in the effort to achieve participatory legitimacy. Based on evidence from the data, the functions of non-native adult English speakers’ counter-discourse can be characterized as follows. (1) The application of counter-discourse serves to facilitate mitigation of mutual embarrassment and possible argumentation, and protect non-native adult English speakers from humiliation, enabling them to save face and maintain dignity and self-respect when an intended interaction with native English speakers or an initiative is rebuffed. (2) Counter-discourse resists the presumed bias of non-native adult English speakers’ powerless social identity and their status as incapable or illegitimate speakers. For example, by verbalizing his thoughts regarding cultural difference (e.g., the value of earning a living as a counter to native English speakers’ sarcasms and strategies of money management), one participant endeavored to make a pronouncement of legitimacy regarding an immigrant’s position and dignity in the job market. This kind of response to English natives appeared to frame the non-native adult English speakers’ social strategies as gambits within a social structure characterized by inequitable power distribution. (3) Non-native adult English speakers’ counter discourse and commands to the native English speakers indicated a rejection of the native English speakers’ assumption that non-native adult English speakers might accept their directives unconditionally. (4) Through the counter-discourse, power differences between native English speakers and non-native adult English speakers were minimized. Counter-discourse also assists to repair mutual breakdowns of communication. Non-natives’ questioning or declarative expressions (e.g., “Please be patient!”) were conducive to the exercise of social strategies
of power or solidarity (e.g., being a welcoming or powerful customer), thereby perhaps closing the gap in social relationships.

The above findings strengthen Pennycook’s (2001) synthesis of Foucault’s philosophy regarding the prevalence of power-resistance: “Power is always linked to resistance: Where there is power, there is resistance” (p. 91). They also support the findings of Chick (2001) regarding the competing discourse or counter-discourse for the development of a new discourse in order to construct the new South African national identity. Furthermore, in contrast to Chick’s domestic ethnographic study, the current study was conducted as cross-cultural literacy case studies, which provided a wider possibility for examining power-resistance discourse issues.

In the present study, as for the use of L1 within American society discourse or the ESL classroom, examination of the data suggested the following conclusions: (1) The use of L1 as a symbol of ethnicity is salient and, as a result, non-native adult English speakers justified this behavior as a way to ensure their linguistic rights and balance an asymmetrical linguistic situation of Standard-English-only discourse, and to support a multi-lingual identity within such English-only or Standard-English-only discourse inside or outside the classroom. (2) The L1 tended to be employed in social contexts in which there were informal interactions (e.g., a confidential and intimate discussion, criticism of native English speakers’ behaviors, the classroom break). The use of L1 appeared to be submerged and largely imperceptible. (3) At the same time, the use of non-native adult English speakers’ L1 in American ESL discourse appeared to threaten other non-native adult English speakers from different ethnic backgrounds. Their feelings of disapproval were evident, for some non-native adult English speakers, even though the use of English
was likely to veil the symbol of their ethnicity. More importantly, it seemed to blur the boundary of ethnic division to reconcile various linguistic and ethnic tensions. (4) In spite of non-native adult English speakers’ attitudes toward the use of L1s within authentic social contexts, their use of L1s within the ESL academic discourse of this study seemed to be confident and casual.

In the study, these participants spoke in their L1s--taking advantage of interstices, or gaps within the U.S. social interactions which demand English-only or Standard-English-only as a social practice policy--as a kind of resistance. These findings supported the related studies regarding the fact that within the social or school context in which the practices of the mainstream or target language might not be completely determined or are not strictly enforced (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Heller, 1995; McKay & Wong, 1996). Consequently, the possibility of counteractions occurs, such as the refusal to speak the target or mainstream language in certain social contexts in order to resist the symbolic domination of the mainstream or target language.

As for other important coping strategies, the results of the study indicated that most of the non-native adult English speakers used some coping strategies to resist the native English speakers’ power imposition either within the U.S. social contexts or the ESL classroom, including the strategies of ignoring (i.e., silence), deflecting and passing. The discussions based on observational and interview data can be summarized as follows. For some non-native adult English speakers, concern about face saving seemed to surmount the significance of seizing their right to speech and participatory legitimacy. They tended to employ the ignoring (remaining silent)/deflecting strategy. In addition, the results showed that even though some non-native adult English speakers failed to understand
English well, passing strategies still served as a way of maintaining their status as an attentive ESL learner and resisting the imposition of native English speakers. They had mastered techniques for avoiding opportunities to answer native English speakers’ questions directly and construct correct responses to the questions. Finally, in this study, sometimes the native English speakers seemed to use coping strategies to assuage the feelings which brought forth such resistance.

Two Native English Speaking Teachers’ Opinions

Even though the two native English teachers were not participants, their beliefs and attitudes toward the non-native adult English speakers’ L1s and the values of their original cultures and recognition of the intelligibility of various English varieties might enhance the social-cultural aspects regarding the construction/effect of power, subjectivity and equality in English native and non-native communication either inside or outside the ESL classroom. Based on the results of the study, some conclusions are discussed in the following section.

(1) In terms of the ESL teachers’ attitudes toward the value of the original cultures of non-native adult English speakers, the study revealed that the native English teachers involved themselves as an integral part of their ESL students’ community and appreciated the learners’ cultural heritage. Their acceptance of ESL learners’ L1s allowed them to employ the L1s to assist in problem-solving in their ESL acquisition activities. The data indicated it was assumed that this would help ESL learners to gain insight into their cultural and linguistic capital. However, the results indicated that the beneficial functions were somehow curtailed because of the teachers’ limitations in comprehending students’ various L1s. Nevertheless, the evidence showed that the non-native adult English
speakers’ perceived respect for ESL learners’ geographical and socio-cultural identities/considerations made it easier for the non-natives to accept most American customs. (2) As for their ideas on the intelligibility of English varieties, it can be inferred from the observational data and field notes that the native English teachers played prominent roles in modeling what English communication or pronunciation would be understood clearly. Most of the non-native adult English speakers seemed to be trying to situate and identify themselves according to natives’ expectations. Also, the results of the study served to justify the researcher’s conviction that the non-native adult English speakers were provided with a model of legitimate English, the use of Standard English, that was probably beyond their ability to achieve. For example, occasionally it was found that participants seemed to be expected to speak perfectly or fluently, which affected the non-native adult English speakers negatively so that they withdrew from participation. Based on the results of the study, the native English teachers’ demonstrative position probably shaped the non-native adult English speakers’ knowledge concerning their decisions about what constituted legitimate conversational patterns and participation within the ESL discourse.

As the above conclusions suggest, the native English teachers generally perceived that they needed to be positive in valuation of non-native adult English speakers’ historical/cultural inheritance so that they could facilitate the establishment of increased participatory legitimacy. On the other hand, the native English teachers appeared to play influential roles in determining what English conversation or pronunciation could be expected to be understood well during native-non-native communication. These
phenomena ultimately suggest that people should not over-generalize or simplify the issues of communication between English native and non-native English speakers.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The findings of the study illustrated how power circulates and serves to categorize ESL learners’ positions in oral communication and social participation within ESL discourse both inside and outside the classroom. Moreover, such cross-cultural English communication practices are embedded in the ideology of social/cultural/historical constructions, which directs the realization of what literacy acts should be. Further, the connections between the core contents of ESL learners’ English usage/language choice, social identity and cultural awareness appear to be dynamic. Based on these results, certain factors should be considered in the ESL learning and teaching contexts. (a) The data from this study reflected issues highlighting the increasing presence of international/cross-cultural communication, in which diverse languages fuse with each other, creating greater and greater need for light to be shed on how English (L2) is woven across the languages and how languages are related. (b) The results of the study brought to light power issues in curriculum, classroom procedures, pace of the class, use of certain texts and the students’ construction of their own meaning. (c) ESL teachers should be aware of classroom practices through which each ESL learner’s participation advantages/disadvantages might be based on his/her social and cultural background.

Based on the practical perspectives, the voices this study has presented collectively have brought forth some issues of concern regarding teaching methods, the development of curriculum, teachers’ teacher education development and the arrangement of physical
facilities in the classroom. Furthermore, even though the development of ESL classroom practices is so tenuous and complicated, appropriate attention to these concerns may contribute to the empowering of ESL learners’ cross-cultural English communication and literacy development.

**Teaching Methods.** The results of the study imply that ESL teachers should be encouraged to develop methods to teach the authentic usage of oral communication, which will not only promote their ESL classrooms’ readiness on the whole but also enhance the learners’ personal adjustment, a self-initiating and self-determining desire to communicate, and flexibility and incentive in social interactions in the meaningful and authentic contexts of social reality. As a guide, ESL teachers might create a successful English classroom similar to the target language context and reflecting real world possibilities. Within this context, ESL teachers would be likely to fulfill the facilitative pedagogy necessary to promote students’ becoming effective language users and, above all, to enable them to carry on English communication in authentic language. ESL teachers might serve as active participants, facing students sympathetically (with empathy), flexibly, and positively, rather than as passive observers in the ESL classroom.

**The Development of Curriculum.** The findings showed clearly that the sustained development of curriculum should promote classrooms with learners of differentiated ethnic background to offer motivation to ESL students to interact/communicate purposefully and contentedly. Furthermore, what matters is that ESL teachers explore issues related to the explicit rationales and principles behind the subject matter and multi-cultural program, as a catalyst and guideline for development of the whole ESL framework. The improved framework will assist ESL learners, through cross-cultural
experiences, to develop a newfound social character/identity, that is, the positive recognition of self and others in spite of incessant cultural comparison to better accommodate the cross-cultural English communication.

Some programs might be developed as follows: (a) The development of a bi-cultural/multi-cultural program would facilitate recognition of the value of the ESL learners’ different cultures. In this way, ESL teachers might empower the learners and deliver the message that their languages and cultures are respected as a way to promote their self-esteem, even though target language literacy is the primary goal. For example, more subject matter of a diverse character should be included in the selection of curriculum and instruction materials. The ESL learners could then integrate information from texts with their own cultural knowledge. In peer-work and activities, learners could exchange cultural information to motivate interest in learning and cultivate the concept of English acquisition based on the learners’ needs. ESL teachers could also introduce materials demonstrating the bi-cultural/multi-cultural development of U.S. society. As for the ESL learners, in the shuffle of the new cultural environment, they would reconsider the positive consequence of the old saying ‘When in Rome, do as the Romans do.’ The developing bi-lingual/multi-lingual capacity should not be treated as a shortcoming, but as a benefit instead. (b) Intensive content development of the subject matter may not only enable ESL learners to acquire remedial and survival ESL skills regarding their citizenship responsibilities and the requisite skills for the entry job stage, but, to some extent, it may reinforce their capability to protect their own rights, engaging in problem-solving and the search for social equality. It also may confirm the shift in the ESL learners foundation during their English learning as they begin to integrate the
development of critical consciousness/attitudes/themes concerning their essence as people with their specific ethnicity, gender and social status and also with their own English knowledge and related literacy practices. (c) As for the lower proficiency learners and newcomers and also experienced ESL learners, ESL teachers should develop an extensive support and counseling program to assist the learners in adjusting to the new environment. Sometimes, in the present study, it was clear that frustration, exhilaration, and confusion were characteristic of cross-cultural language acquisition and communication.

Teachers’ Professional Development. In this study, the TESOL training for the two native ESL teachers in the Level 3 and Level 5 classes was limited. Both of them were retired from public school teaching and had little previous ESOL experience and no teaching certification in ESL. The findings of this study suggested that the teacher education program should provide the foundation to maintain the ESL teachers’ fervent interest in teaching. For all levels of ESL teachers’ professional development, how to assess and license them over the span of their professional life remains an issue of concern. Completing professional subject-matter courses, a requirement for an initial certification assessment, and a continuing obligation of on-the-job training are necessary for teacher education through the assistance of academic institutions that officially certify trainers/instructors. In addition, gaining a deep awareness of bi-cultural/multi-cultural perspectives must be particularly targeted to facilitate meaningful teaching and learning results. In particular, this understanding is critical for fostering ESL teachers’ capacity to grasp and support learners’ oral expression and conversational performance both socially and culturally. For example, the ongoing assistance from mentoring programs, which
gives a sense of partnership through peer collaboration, offers substantially helpful activities such as the contribution of mentors’ experience in the reading and analysis of related professional articles, follow-up group/seminar discussions, and self-reflection diary writing.

**The Arrangement of Physical Facilities in the Classroom.** The current study implied that ESL teachers should develop better arrangement of the classroom environment to ease ESL learners’ tensions not only about mastering their new target language acquisition but also to make them more cognizant of the fundamental issues concerning equality. Keeping in mind Toohey’s (2000) synthesis regarding Foucault’s philosophy (1979), it is clear that the spatial arrangement of individual students; in the classroom not only assigns their location but also symbolizes the hierarchy of supervision and the ranking of the students, thus, the plan for ESL learners’ seating arrangement should minimize the ESL teachers’ dominant supervisory position and the ranking implicit in such student’s location. For example, this necessity pointed out the importance of an appropriate seating arrangement that reinforces peer cooperation and group cohesion, instead of being in conformity with the teachers’ designation of appropriate learning roles/behavior. This is an area needing further study and research.

The aforementioned implications suggested certain obligations of ESL teachers in lesson preparation and classroom practices with respect to the ESL learners’ claim to their participatory legitimacy or right to speak within ESL discourse, both inside and outside of ESL classes.
Recommendations for Further Study

The results of the study have indicated a need for additional research, including more studies of the perspectives of both native and non-native English speakers concerning issues of power, culture and language, inter-communicative interactions of English non-natives of different ethnicities, and studies utilizing broader data collection. In addition, future quantitative inquiry is also recommended to fulfill the purposes of generalizability. These future research directions are discussed in the following section.

This study mainly focused on the experiences of a selected group of case studies of non-native English speakers and included only two native English speakers. The two groups (native/non-native) appeared to carry different expectations of what features of English conversation/pronunciation can be understood reasonably well and on whom the obligation of being comprehended rested. The directions of further study should include additional native speaker’s perspectives regarding the varieties of English that can be used to achieve communicative equality as well as the recognition of multi-cultural contributions and values. Examination of both parties’ attitudes might well be conducive to enhancing and promoting deeper insights into ESOL teaching and learning associated with a variety of genres. It could also give rise to the independent construction of English knowledge systems. The findings of this study also suggested that the inter-communication located in different English scenarios between English non-natives of different ethnic groups was an issue of concern. This research direction could open the possibility of sketching a better picture of the holistic phenomena related to various genres of the World English paradigm.
In terms of the data collecting method, the study conducted three outside classroom observations regarding participants’ lived experiences and social communication interactions. In order to acquire diverse representation of the consistent patterns of discourse in the participants’ situated communicative English contexts, further study is recommended to investigate frequent and prolonged engagement through persistent observation of non-native English speakers engaged in various social activities in authentic social contexts (e.g., at church or on the job). As to generalizability, this study examined six non-native adult English speakers’ perceived beliefs regarding their behaviors and motivations in social participations related to communicating in English. These findings can not be generalized to other non-native English speakers. The sampling methods limited the possibilities of generalizability. In the future, a large-scale quantitative survey data might be employed to explore non-native English speakers’ perspectives towards some particular affective factors or attributes and the levels of involvement in English oral communication/social interactions in the U.S. The affective factors or attributes might include participants’ English communicative competence, individuals’ personal extroverted or introverted behaviors, related to previous social or economic status, the L1 backgrounds of ESL adults, the duration of residency, and the self-awareness of ethnicity of ESL adults. New directions of study such as these have the potential to develop new ways of thinking about ESL adult learners and the instructional programs that are needed to help them achieve their ESL related goals.

Conclusion

This chapter presents a summary of the findings based on the data discussed in Chapter 4. These findings have highlighted the interactions between non-native adult
English speakers and native English speakers as well as the complexity of the power relationship implicit in ESL discourse. Non-native adult English speakers are often the ‘subject of’ and also ‘subject to’ the ESL discourse in these interactions. Standard-English-only ideology often limits non-native adult speakers’ self-recognition of participatory legitimacy. The pedagogical implications regarding teaching methods, curriculum development, and teacher professional develop of ESL teaching contexts were also addressed. Further studies were recommended, including a quantitative inquiry involving non-native English participants to serve the purpose of generalizability, and advanced studies of native and non-native English speakers on their motivation and approaches to achieve communicative equality. Authentic social context observations were also suggested to examine non-native adult English speakers’ varied communicative scenarios. This study was aimed at empowering non-native adult English speakers so that they could have critical reflection, the characteristic of consciousness (Freire, 1970), and a positive attitude toward ESL oral discourse, and awareness of the role of their literacy capabilities and cultural heritage as sources to arouse their minds about life (Tharp and Gallimore, 1988).
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