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Abstract

Recent decades have seen growing importance placed on research in heritage languages in the United States as a result of the increasing number of immigrants whose mother tongue is not English. Despite the rapid increase of the number of people who speak the Chinese language in the United States, research on Chinese heritage language education has received little attention. For instance, the studies of Chinese community school have been “deplorably scant” (Zhou & Li, 2008, p. 166). This ethnographic study was thus carried out at a Chinese heritage language school in a Midwestern U.S. city. Two classes of twenty-one eighth and ninth graders participated in the study, involving two Taiwanese immigrant teachers and four focal students. Data collection took place about six months through semi-structured interviews with four focal students and two teachers, participant observation, and audio-recordings of classroom discourse.

The aim of this thesis is threefold. First, in Chapter 4, I examine what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at. Second, in Chapter 5, I explore how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, and how they express convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. Third, I investigate the relationship between language
ideology and ethnic identity as well as the link between their language behaviors and their self-identification and language ideologies.

In Chapter 4, through the examination of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, the findings show that Arthur, Paul, and Jack seem to be at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE), and Bill appears to be between Stage 2 and Stage 3 – Ethnic Emergence. In Chapter 5, the results indicate that the students expressed uncooperative language behaviors, including giving wrong answers and using taboo words. They purposely behave uncooperatively and seem to “miscommunicate” and try to be “bad” communicators (Ladegaard, 2009, p. 650). Their corrective actions can be regarded as a favor from the native speakers (Paul and Jack) to the nonnative speaker (the teacher Lily). They intend to help the teacher because they perceive their roles in correcting errors due to their language ability and the relationship with the teacher. Additionally, when arguing with their teacher, Arthur switched to Mandarin Chinese from English and Bill code-switched between English and Taiwanese. They use both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese.

The findings in Chapter 4 support the conclusion that like the role of language attitude Tse argued for, language ideology may also be connected to ethnic identity. From a theoretical perspective, Bakhtin’s dialogic theory of discourse can offer us an opportunity to better understand how the students are conscious of language and social worlds. Their language ideologies can also reflect how they are aware of their heritage language and ethnic group.
Finally, we may reasonably conclude that the students’ self-identification and language ideologies appear to affect their language behaviors. For instance, in Chapter 4, Arthur expressed his ideological resistance to studying Mandarin Chinese, which may influence his attitudes toward classroom activities and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. As native English speakers, Paul and Jack other-corrected their teacher’s nonnative English in an attempt to offer a friendly help, and simultaneously, their American identity is embedded in the corrections, echoing their ideological affiliation with English. Through code-switching, Arthur and Bill used both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. They also converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language – Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese. As a result, their group identities are fluid and group memberships are negotiated during an interaction through the processes of convergence and divergence. Nevertheless, the strategy of convergence used by Arthur and Bill seem to cause the loss of their American identity because they use Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese instead of English.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Motivations and Objectives of the Study

Recent decades have seen growing importance placed on research in heritage languages in the United States as a result of the increasing number of immigrants whose mother tongue is not English. According to the U.S. census data in 2010, the estimated population of Americans of Chinese ancestry numbered approximately 3.8 million, comprising 1.2% of the total U.S. population. They became the largest ethnic group of Asian Americans, and the Chinese language has become the third most frequently used home language, next to English and Spanish (Li, 2005, p. 198). Despite the rapid increase of the number of people who speak the Chinese language in the United States, research on Chinese/English bilingual education has received little attention. Based on McGinnis (2008), in 2007, between 140,000 and 150,000 students were enrolled in Chinese community schools, 70% of which are Chinese language schools, where Chinese language instruction is offered from kindergarten to grade 12. Since 2010, the U.S. Government has designated 13 languages as “critical languages” because of the national need for trained speakers in those languages, as well as for U.S. national security and economic competitiveness. Mandarin Chinese is one of the critical languages, showing that there is a large demand for professionals in Mandarin Chinese (Carreiro, 2010).
Accordingly, there is an urgent need to understand Chinese language development among the Chinese-speaking immigrants’ children.

As a native speaker of Mandarin Chinese, I was intrigued by how Taiwanese immigrants’ children who were born in the United States learn the Chinese language. During my observation at a Chinese heritage language school in a Midwestern U.S. city, I observed the students’ language behaviors that could sometimes be evaluated negatively and viewed as disruptive and uncooperative; they even corrected their teacher’s English. Normally, students are expected to cooperate with and show respect and politeness to their teachers, and students correct their teacher’s errors in conversation, which is a quite rare occurrence. Additionally, I was also interested in their use of different languages in the classroom. I noticed that during class, the majority of the students frequently spoke English with their peers, and the teachers often code-switched between Mandarin Chinese and English when teaching. Interestingly, the students at times expressed their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching (e.g., switch from English to Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese) when arguing with their teacher.

When interviewing the Taiwanese immigrant parents, most of them told me that they desired to maintain their children’s Mandarin Chinese and culture, but as their children grew older, they showed more resistance and began struggling to attend the Chinese heritage school. I found some students were not fully motivated to learn about the Chinese language and culture for two possible reasons. One is that many of them attend the Chinese heritage language school under pressure from their parents, and the other is that they have been focusing more on their studies and activities in American
public schools. While Cho (2000) noted that “a heritage language (HL) is the language associated with one’s cultural background” (p. 369) and HL development can help one’s identity formation, Abdi (2011) argued that HL students may not be willing to use their HL since they do not necessarily perceive the significance of the heritage language. In this Chinese heritage language school, the fact is that the students and the teachers spend much of their day in an English-speaking macro environment, immersing themselves in American language and culture outside the Chinese heritage language school, so the socio-cultural settings of heritage language classrooms are bi/multilingual and bi/multicultural. What is the students’ self-identification in more than one language and ideological environment? Do they identify with the Chinese language and culture? What are their attitudes toward learning the Chinese language?

The aim of this thesis is therefore threefold. First, in Chapter 4, I examine what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at. Second, in Chapter 5, I explore how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, and how they express convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. Third, I investigate the relationship between language ideology and ethnic identity as well as the link between their language behaviors and their self-identification and language ideologies.

In Chapter 4, through the examination of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, it is concluded that they seem to be at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE) or between Stage 2 and Stage 3 – Ethnic
Emergence. The findings enhance Tse’s (2000) findings by providing a more detailed examination of the focal students’ language ideologies. Tse (1997) examined the possible links between ethnic identity and language attitude and suggested that language attitude toward the majority and heritage language shifts as individuals’ sense of their ethnic identity changes over time. In addition to language attitude, I assume that language ideology may also be connected to ethnic identity during one stage based on Bakhtin’s ideological becoming - Individuals’ language ideologies emerge from social contexts and from the voices of different individuals in the social contexts.

In Chapter 5, the students’ uncooperative language behaviors, including giving wrong answers and using taboo words, lead to the violations of the normal classroom interactional patterns. They purposely behave uncooperatively and seem to “miscommunicate” and try to be “bad” communicators (Ladegaard, 2009, p. 650). Their corrective actions can be regarded as a favor from the native speakers (Paul and Jack) to the nonnative speaker (the teacher Lily). They intend to help the teacher because they perceive their roles in correcting errors due to their language ability and the relationship with the teacher. Additionally, when arguing with their teacher, Arthur switched to Mandarin Chinese from English and Bill code-switched between English and Taiwanese. They use both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese.

Finally, I suggest that language ideology may also be connected to ethnic identity. From a theoretical perspective, Bakhtin’s dialogic theory of discourse can offer us an opportunity to better understand how the students are conscious of language and social
worlds. Their language ideologies can also reflect how they are aware of their heritage language and ethnic group. Additionally, the students’ self-identification and language ideologies appear to affect their language behaviors. For instance, in Chapter 4, Arthur expressed his ideological resistance to studying Mandarin Chinese, which may influence his attitudes toward classroom activities and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. As native English speakers, Paul and Jack other-corrected their teacher’s nonnative English in an attempt to offer a friendly help, and simultaneously, their American identity is embedded in the corrections, echoing their ideological affiliation with English. Through code-switching, Arthur and Bill used both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. They also converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language – Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese. As a result, their group identities are fluid and group memberships are negotiated during an interaction through the processes of convergence and divergence. Nevertheless, the strategy of convergence used by Arthur and Bill seem to cause the loss of their American identity because they use Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese instead of English.

1.2 The Conceptual Frameworks for Analysis

In this current study, I make two assumptions. One is that language ideology may be connected to ethnic identity; language ideology shifts as individuals’ sense of their
ethnic identity changes over time; the other is that the students’ self-identification and language ideologies may be linked to their language behaviors.

In Chapter 4, I explore what stage the four focal students’ ethnic identity development may be at, using Tse’s (1998a) four stage model of ethnic identity development. Tse (1997) examined the relationships among ethnic identity, attitudes and motivation, and HL development. She developed one descriptive model by incorporating components of the work of other researchers to depict how individual identity factors affect heritage language development. She added a component, language attitude, in an attempt to describe how language attitude toward the majority and heritage languages shifts as individuals move from one stage of development to another. She pointed out that group membership was an important factor in determining attitudes toward one’s own ethnic identity and the heritage language.

In this present study, I likewise attempt to add a component, language ideology, to examine the relationship between ethnic identity and language ideology. As Fine and Sandstrom (1993) argued, “the crux of ideology is its potential for use – the translation of an affective and cognitive domain into human action” (p. 36) since ideological beliefs are connected to attitudes which “contain components of cognition, behavior, and affect” (p. 23) and can guide “people’s conceptions of and actions in the social and political realm” (p. 24). In other words, they can be linked to lived experience and to social interaction, and people “act them out” (Jeon, 2008, p. 55). Additionally, I employ Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse so as to see how the students negotiate or struggle between the two forms of discourses in
developing their ideologies since in this Chinese heritage language school, the students live at the crossroads of two languages (English and Mandarin Chinese) and two school environments (American school and Chinese school) with various voices and ideologies. Like language attitude (Tse, 1997), I assume that language ideology may be connected to ethnic identity during one stage, and the patterns of the students’ ideological becoming may enhance Tse’s (2000) analysis of her participants’ language attitudes and can provide more detailed descriptions of the students.

In Chapter 5, I investigate the students’ uncooperative language behaviors, their corrections of the teacher’s English, and their use of code-switching as convergent (accommodative) and divergent strategies. I assume that the students’ language ideologies about heritage language and language learning may affect their language behaviors in the classroom because linguistic ideologies shape language use patterns, thereby affecting social communication process (Woodford, 2002). Song (2007) argued that “people explicitly articulate, or implicitly embody their perceptions in their communicative practices, through which people rationalize their uses of the language” (p. 26).

Finally, I suggest the possible links between the students’ self-identification and their language behaviors. Some previous studies have argued that identity is multivalent, dynamic, dialogic process rather than unified, fixed, static, and one-dimensional phenomenon (e.g., Mendoza-Denton, 2002; Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) emphasized the fluidity of language and explicated linguistic behavior acts as “a series of acts of identity in which people reveal both their personal
identity and their search for social role” (p. 14). Identity may be linguistically constructed both through the use of particular languages and linguistic forms (e.g., Standard English, Arizona Tewa) (Kroskity, 2000, p. 111). The students’ identities are revealed and constructed in their other-corrections and convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors, indicating that their multiple ethnic identities are fluid or lost and their group memberships are negotiated during the dynamic process.

1.3 Significance of the Study

Most previous studies on ethnic identity have been carried out within psychology and social psychology (Erikson, 1968; Phinney, 1989; Taifel & Turner, 1979; Tse, 1986b). Phinney (1990) reviewed 70 studies on ethnic identity since 1972, and most of them were conducted based on three conceptual frameworks: “social identity theory, as presented by social psychologists; acculturation and culture conflict, as studied by social psychologists, sociologists, or anthropologists; and identity formation, drawn from psychoanalytic views and from developmental and counseling psychology” (p. 501). She also pointed out that components of ethnic identity include ethnic self-identification, sense of belonging, positive and negative attitudes toward one’s ethnic group, ethnic involvement (social participation and cultural practices), ethnic identity development, and so on. Language, friendship, religious affiliation and practice, structured ethnic social groups, political ideology and activity, ethnic/cultural activities and attitudes, and so forth are the most common indicators of ethnic involvement (p. 503-506).
Nevertheless, Tse’s (2000) noted that few in-depth descriptions of Stage 2, Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EM), have been reported yet, even though this stage has been discussed in numerous studies. Wortham (2001) argued that language ideology might influence classroom behavior (p. 254), but unfortunately, there has not been much research that examined the role of language ideology among Chinese heritage language students. Since ideological beliefs are connected to attitudes and “attitudes… contain components of cognition, behavior, and affect” (Fine and Sandstrom, 1993, p. 23), I explore the students’ ethnic identity from the perspective of Bakhtin’s ideological becoming instead of psychological views mentioned above in order to offer a more detailed description of the students during one stage, including their ideologies about heritage language and language learning. By combining these two approaches – Tse’s (1997) model and Bakhtin’s theory, this study aims to provide more sights into the students’ ethnic identity.

As aforementioned, one problem with research of classroom discourse is that most studies have focused the analysis on the teacher’s perspective (Cazden, 1986; Wells, 1993). Wells (1993) noted that in secondary classrooms, this IRF structure accounts for approximately 70% of all the teacher-student discourse. The IRF structure is the teacher-dominated interactional sequence in classroom discourse, through which teachers initiate questions, elicit students’ response, and give feedback to their students’ answers (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji and Wells, 2000). Yet, the IRF structure is not always in teachers’ favor. In contrast, students may mean to have objection to the teacher’s requests and even evaluate the teacher’s arguments (Candela, 1999); they may
initiate the IRF pattern or provide feedback in the follow-up turn (Sunderland, 2001). This study thus investigates students’ uncooperative language behaviors and other-corrections in the IRF pattern from the student’s perspective.

In early sociolinguistic studies, code-switching was conceptualized as a deficit; that is, speakers employ the first language (L1) because of their lack of sufficient proficiency in their second language (L2), resulting in language mixing. In recent years, however, code-switching has been viewed as discourse strategies to serve social functions. In terms of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), speakers use communication strategies of convergence and divergence “to signal their attitudes toward each other and their respective social groups” (Giles and Ogay, 2007, p. 294). Code-switching turns out to be an important additional communicative resource because “it engages a delicate balance between convergence – to demonstrate willingness to communicate – and divergence – to incur a healthy sense of group identity” (Sachdev and Giles, 2004, p. 360). Unfortunately, most previous studies have focused on language choice in immersion programs or by teachers, and this study is an attempt to add to our understanding of students’ language choices in heritage language classrooms.

1.4 Research Questions

This study is an ethnographic study of four focal students at the Chinese heritage language classrooms in a Midwestern U.S. city, exploring their ethnic identity and language behaviors by employing participant observation, audio recordings of classroom
discourse, and semi-structured interviews with four focal students and two teachers. To address the issues and fill the gaps already mentioned in section 1.1, the following are the research questions guiding this study.

1. At what stage of ethnic identity development are the four focal students?
   1.1 How do the students identify themselves?
   1.2 What are the students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning?
   1.3 What is the role of language ideology in the students’ ethnic identity during one stage?

2. What kinds of language behaviors do the four focal students perform?
   2.1 What kinds of uncooperative language behaviors do the students express?
   2.2 How do the students other-correct the teacher’s English?
   2.3 How do the students display their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors?

3. What are the possible links between the students’ language behaviors and their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning?

1.5 Overview of the Chapters

For these objectives above to be achieved, I have organized the rest of this study in the following way.

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature, addressing both empirical and theoretical aspects of student ethnic identity development and language behaviors. The research
methodology is presented in Chapter 3, describing the details of the participants in the study and procedures for the data collection and analysis. I begin with a discussion of the ethnography of communication and classroom ethnography as my research method. The results for the various analyses are then presented. Chapter 4 offers a more detailed description of student ethnic identity through the examination of the four focal students’ self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, as well as through the combination of Tse’s (1998a) four stage model of ethnic identity development and Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. Chapter 5 contributes to our growing understanding of how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, how they express convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching, and how their language behaviors above are related to their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. Finally, the findings are summarized, conclusions are presented, and suggestions are made for future research in Chapter 6.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the relevant empirical and theoretical literature for this study. As described in Chapter 1, the aim of this thesis is threefold. First, I examine what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at. Second, I explore how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, and how they displayed their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. Third, I investigated whether their self-identification and language ideologies may affect their language behaviors. In what follows, I first present a review of the learning of Chinese as a heritage language. In turn, according to these three objectives, I review the literature on ethnic identity development, including Tse’s (1998a) ethnic identity development model, language ideology, and Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming. This is followed by the discussion of language use and identity. In the section of convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors, I introduce language choice and the notion of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT).
2.2 The Learning of Chinese as a Heritage Language

In the United States, the term "heritage language" is being used to refer to a language with which individuals have a personal connection, including immigrant languages, indigenous languages, and colonial languages (Fishman, 2001). “Heritage language speaker” first became a term of general use in the Standards for Foreign Language learning (National Standards for Foreign Language Education project, 1996). Heritage students are also characterized as follows.

These (heritage) students may come to class able to converse in the language in home and community situations but may lack the abilities to interact comfortably in more formal settings. Further, they may be quite comfortable with oral language but possess limited skills in reading and writing.


Valdés (2001) defined HL students as students who are “raised in a home here a non-English language is spoken, who speak or only understand the language, and who have some proficiency in English and are to some degree bilingual” (P. 39-40).

Following Valdés’ (2001) definition of heritage language learner, He (2006) defined the Chinese Heritage language (CHL) learner broadly as “a language student who is raised in a home where Chinese is spoken and who speaks or at least understands the language and is to some degree bilingual in Chinese and in English” (p. 1).

More lately, the United States is becoming more multilingual as a result of growing numbers of immigrants who speak a language other than English. The U.S. Census Bureau (2000) results show that “18 percent of the total population aged 5 and
over, or 47.0 million people, reported they spoke a language other than English at home, an increase of 47 percent since the 1990s” (Li, 2006, p. 355). The Chinese language is now ranked the third most frequently spoken language in the United States, behind English and Spanish (also as cited in Li, 2006). For this reason, recent research has drawn attention to heritage language learning, and Chinese is an increasingly prominent part. Nevertheless, one of main challenges is that Chinese heritage language learners embody a wide range of linguistic varieties apart from the standard Mandarin, and many of these Chinese dialects are mutually unintelligible. Chinese is “an umbrella term that subsumes numerous dialects grouped under Wu, Xiang, Gan, Min, Cantonese, Hakka, and Mandarin”, and Mandarin refers to “the majority dialect family of China; its pronunciation and grammar are associated with the speech of Beijing and the surrounding countryside, regions which for centuries have enjoyed political and cultural significance” (He, 2006, p. 3). In addition to the dialect differences, there are two versions of the writing system: simplified characters for Mainland China and Singapore as well as traditional characters for Taiwan, Hong Kong, and other Chinese-speaking regions (He, 2006). In order to preserve Chinese linguistic and cultural heritage, Chinese and Taiwanese families established Chinese heritage language schools here in the United States to promote their children’s education in the Chinese national language. One significant difference between the weekend schools run by Taiwanese immigrants and Chinese immigrants lies in the type of Chinese characters. Traditional characters and simplified characters are taught respectively in those schools run by Taiwanese immigrants and Chinese immigrants. According to a 1995 survey conducted by the
National Council of associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS), 82675 students are enrolled in Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States (Wang, 1996).

When it comes to motivations for learning heritage languages, Han (2003) noted that instrumental motivation and cultural motivation are two main motivational orientations. Instrumentalists underscore the links between HL development and academic and economic success. The instrumental motivation for both a second language and a heritage language is similar, yet students’ motivation for heritage language learning can be extended to a functional purpose, such as seeking high academic achievement and job-related competency. Multicultural theory stresses the importance of cultural motivation associated with ethnic identity and cultural awareness. Cultural motivation is characterized by intrinsic interest in the heritage language culture and the desire to understand one’s own culture heritage. Multiculturalists also see “ethnic identity as a critical cultural motivation for learning heritage languages and a desire to understand one’s ethnic identity leads students to learn HL” (Han, 2003, p. 16).

In her study, Tse (2000) explained the relationships among ethnic identity, attitudes and motivation, and HLLs’ development. Since HL is closely associated with the ethnic group, attitudes toward the ethnic group affect HLLs’ language ability and their interest in maintaining and developing their HL. By examining the effects of ethnic identity formation on attitudes toward the HL among a group of Americans of Asian descent, she concluded that language acquisition is facilitated when an individual has positive attitudes toward the language and feels positively about his/her ethnic group.
In this current study, I collect more relevant opinions from the students through interviewing them in order to better understand their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, examining what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at and if their self-identification and language ideologies are related to their language behaviors in the classroom.

2.3 Ethnic Identity Development

In the United States, many ethnic minority individuals grow up in an environment with more than one language and culture, and the challenge facing them is how they identify themselves, especially at a time when ego identity is developing (Erikson, 1968). The models of adolescent and adult ethnic identity formation have been proposed in previous studies. In Kim’s (1981) study, the process of Asian American identity development consists of five stages: Ethnic awareness, White identification, Awakening to social political consciousness, Redirection of Asian American consciousness, and Incorporation. Atkinson et al.’s (1983) model also involves five stages: Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance and immersion, Introspection, and Synergetic articulation and awareness. Phinney’s (1989) four stages of ethnic identity development encompass Diffuse, Foreclosed, Moratorium, and Achieved. Those models are similar in the process of moving from preference for the dominant culture to identity and cultural exploration, finally ending in ethnic identity incorporation – resolving ethnic identity conflicts and accepting oneself as an ethnic minority.
By integrating components of several other models (e.g., Phinney, 1989; Kim, 1981), Tse (1998a) proposed a four stage model of ethnic identity development to describe the identity-related experiences of the ethnic minorities (EMs), focusing on their attitudes toward the heritage and majority language. Tse (2000) also pointed out that insufficient heritage language exposure and affective reasons are the two reasons for ethnic minority students’ shift to English without acquiring their heritage language. In particular, at this stage of Ethnic Ambivalence/Evasion, students’ emotional and psychological characteristics may help us understand their attitudes toward attending heritage language programs.

In order to understand how these students at the Chinese heritage language school develop their ethnic identity, in this present study, I adopt Tse’s (1998a) framework to examine what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at on basis of the interviews with them. Tse’s (1998a) four major stages are summarized as follows.

### 2.3.1 Tse’s (1998a) Ethnic Identity Development Model

Stage 1, Unawareness, is a relatively brief period when EMs are not conscious of their minority status and / or of the subordinate status often associated with it. This stage typically occurs before substantive contact with other ethnic or racial groups, for example, before attending school or leaving an ethnic enclave (p. 15-16).

The first stage typically takes place in childhood, and EMs are unaware that they belong to a minority group.
Stage 2, Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion, is characterized by ambivalent or negative feelings toward the ethnic culture and the EM’s own association with it, while preferring identification with the dominant societal group. This stage may span a relatively long period, for example, childhood through adolescence, and even through adulthood (p. 16).

In other words, EMs may reject the ethnic culture and heritage language and prefer assimilation into the mainstream group and the use of the majority language, but are often unable to achieve acceptance into the mainstream social group.

Stage 3, Ethnic Emergence, is a time when EMs explore their ethnic heritage after confronting the fact that they are members of an ethnic minority group. In contrast to the previous stage where EMs prefer association with the majority group, the exploration during stage 3 leads some EMs to embrace their ethnic heritage sometimes in favor of the mainstream group (p. 16).

In this stage, EMs have realized that they cannot be fully accepted by mainstream society. This process of exploration comprises two steps: “(a) awakening to one’s own minority status, followed by (b) searching for an alternative group to join” (p. 23). They also become more interested in learning their heritage language.

In stage 4, Ethnic Identity Incorporation, EMs discover and join the ethnic minority American group (e.g. Mexican Americans, Iranian Americans) and resolve many of the ethnic identity conflicts that became salient in the previous stage. Because much of the confusion and uncertainty experienced during stage 2 and 3 are resolved in stage 4, the last stage is characterized by acceptance of oneself as an ethnic minority and by improved self-image (p. 16).

After a period of identity exploration and search, EMs enter this stage and have realized that they do not belong in that dominant group.
Tse (1998a) pointed out the limitations of the model. First, “not all racial minorities go through this development process” (p. 16) because they are raised in settings where a strong ethnic minority group exists and never want to become a member of the mainstream group. Second, “not all EMs who go into the developmental process pass through all four stages of the model” (p.17) because they may still remain in stage 2 or another stage, or their ethnic identity continues to evolve throughout their lifetime, so the process may not end with stage 4.

Through an interview study of 91 African American, Asian American, and Latino high school students, Phinney (1989) found that about one-half of them had not explored their ethnicity (diffusion / foreclosure). One Asian-American male made the comment, “If I could have chosen, I would choose to be American White, because it’s America and I would then be in my country” (p. 44). Likewise, Tse (1998b) found that at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion, the narrators expressed their feelings of rejection toward themselves, their parents, and other members of the ethnic group.

By interviewing four Korean American children who were born in the United States, You (2005) examined their ethnic identity as Korean Americans so as to investigate their thoughts and attitudes about learning and maintaining their heritage language and culture. She used Tse’s (1998a) ethnic identity development model and emphasized the close connection between ethnic identity and a heritage language. She found that the participants in her study were between Stage 2 and Stage 3. Although the participants expressed that they were struggling to learn Korean and appeared ambivalent
toward their ethnic identity, they also seemed to be exploring their heritage language and culture at the same time.

Additionally, I also examine the students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning in this current study based on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse, so as to enhance Tse’s (1998a) model from the perspective of language ideology. In the next section, I provide a review of language ideology, followed by the discussion of Bakhtin’s concepts.

2.3.2 Language Ideology

The term ideology was first coined by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy at the end of the eighteenth century to develop a science of ideas and their basis in sensation. As explicated by Woolard (1998), in contemporary uses, ideology has to do with “consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, and ideas”, and is taken to be “the more intellectual constituent of culture”, or a conceptualization of ideology “derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position”, which is “a direct link to inhabitable positions of power – social, political, economic”. Ideology is thus used to acquire or maintain power (p. 5-7).

Bucholtz and Hall (2004) noted that from the linguistic-anthropological perspective, “ideology organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as the power relations that result from these” (p. 379), and also “the issue of power as a social phenomenon is central in the concept of ideology, which has become the preferred
Language ideology, as explicated by Woolard and Schieffelin (1994), functions as a “bridge between linguistic and social theory” (p. 72). It refers to “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979, p.193) as well as “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). In other words, “people explicitly articulate, or implicitly embody their perceptions in their communicative practices, through which people rationalize their uses of the language” (Song, 2007, p. 26), and linguistic ideologies shape language use patterns, thereby affecting social communication process (Woodford, 2002). Woolard (1998) emphasized the importance of language ideology to the analysis of language in social life because it is “a mediating link between social forms and forms of talk” (p. 3), and “ideologies of language are not about language alone…they envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology” (p. 3).

Kroskrity (2004) identified language ideologies as a cluster concept, consisting of a number of converging dimensions. The five levels are “(1) group or individual interests, (2) multiplicity of ideologies, (3) awareness of speakers, (4) mediating functions of ideologies, and (5) role of language ideology in identity construction” (p. 501). He articulated that sociocultural groups have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group memberships and language ideologies are thus grounded in
social experience (p. 503). Also, language ideologies can be “explicitly articulated or embodied in communicative practice” and are typically “multiple, context-bound, and necessarily constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker” (p. 496). In this sense, language ideologies are multiple and diverse across cultures and individuals. Additionally, language users’ ideologies “bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience” (p. 507). Shared linguistic forms indicate that “language is used in making of national or ethnic identities” (p. 509).

Shenk (2007) noted that multiple, overlapping, or even competing ideologies can be held by as members of a given contact community (p. 78). Woodford (2002) stated that “beliefs about language can refer to language as an abstract system (i.e., structure, nature), or they can be articulated to support or defend concrete linguistic actions (i.e., use)” (p. 13). Riley (2011) suggested that we should consider the impact of ideologies about the symbolic and/or pragmatic value of linguistic forms on language socialization, including mode, code or genre (p. 498). According to her definition, varietal ideologies include the beliefs about languages, dialects, and code-switching codes (p. 499).

Fine and Sandstrom (1993) argued that “the crux of ideology is its potential for use – the translation of an affective and cognitive domain into human action” (p. 36) since ideological beliefs are connected to attitudes which contain components of cognition, behavior, and affect (p. 23) and can guide “people’s conceptions of and actions in the social and political realm” (p. 24). In other words, they can be linked to lived experience and to social interaction, and people “act them out” (Jeon, 2008, p. 55).
2.3.3 Bakhtin’s Concepts of Ideological Becoming

In his writings, Bakhtin defined “ideological becoming” as how people develop their way of viewing the world and system of ideas, which is not the development of isolated concepts or ideas, but rather, the development of the whole person and complex concepts or ideas, including political ideas. As noted by Bakhtin and Medvedev (1978), “Human consciousness does not come into contact with existence directly, but through the medium of the surrounding ideological world” (p. 14). Ideological becoming happens within “the ideological environment” (p. 14) or “contact zones” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345), which provides opportunities for people to develop their essential concepts or ideas; it could be the classroom, the workplace, the family, or some other community gathering place, and so on, where the voices of the different individuals interact and expand their understanding of the world. But at the same time, individuals need to struggle with the tensions and conflicts, develop their own ideologies, and assimilate two distinct categories of discourse: (a) authoritative discourse and (b) internally persuasive discourse (Bakhtin, 1981). Authoritative discourse refers to “official discourses such as official government policy and legislation, the discourse of tradition, and generally acknowledged beliefs and voices of authority” whereas internally persuasive discourse refers to “the everyday discourse of social interaction; it is the discourse of personal beliefs and ideas that influence responses to the world and others” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 53). Bakhtin characterized internally persuasive discourse as opposite to authoritative discourse.
Freedman and Ball (2004) noted that in U.S. schools, the contact zone inside the classroom is where the diverse populations bring their internally persuasive discourses, and there are also tensions between the authoritative discourses and the internally persuasive discourses. It includes the diversity within the world that surrounds the classroom, and the multiplicity of voices shapes the ideologies that all students will develop.

Drawing on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse, Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) provided an understanding of ideological positionings of a group of Chinese children who attend a heritage language school. They focused on the patterns of alignment that emerged in the children’s identity accounts. Following the definition of Bourdieu (1991) and Hall (2003), identity accounts in their studies refer to “representational accounts of speakers and writers about aspects of themselves, their reference points, subject positionings, and perceptions of linguistic socio-cultural capital” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 52). Through these children’s identity accounts in their Chinese written texts, Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) explored these children’s language ideologies. The data were collected from thirty-seven pieces, short essays and/or diary entries, and family letters in Chinese. Five patterns of ideological becoming were presented, including (i) ideological tacit double voicing; (ii) ideological allegiance; (iii) ideological conflicts and dilemmas; (ix) ideological affiliations; (x) ideological resistance. Those patterns reflect the children’s school experiences, friendships, teachers’ discursive practices, family situations, and so on, indicating their ideological stances toward prevailing authoritative
discourse and their voice to their own sense of agency and internally persuasive discourses. Most of the children considered “learning Chinese a necessary part of growing up, aligned themselves with Chinese culture, and expressed their allegiance to China and being Chinese” (p. 74-75). In other words, learning Chinese is viewed as “an important part of their identity” (p. 75).

As noted by Bucholtz and Hall (2004), “the study of linguistic anthropology is the study of language and identity” (p. 369), which is concerned with “the variety of culturally specific subject positions that speakers enact through language” and “not merely kinds of speech but kinds of speakers, who produce and reproduce particular identities through their language use” (p. 369). In this light, identity takes a central position in research on language use. The link between language use and identity is illustrated in more detail in the next section.

2.4 Language Use and Identity

Mendoza-Denton (2002) defined the term identity as “the active negotiation of an individual’s relationship with larger social constructs” (p. 475) and as “an individual and collective-level process of semiosis” (p. 475). That is, identity can be defined both at the level of the community and of the individual. It includes national, ethnic, racial, class and rank, professional, and gender identities, and may be linguistically constructed both through the use of particular languages and linguistic forms (e.g., Standard English, Arizona Tewa), and through the use of communicative practices (e.g., greeting formulae) (Kroskity, 2000, p. 111). According to Tabouret-Keller’s (1997) definition, identity is “a
network of identities, reflecting the many commitments, allegiances, loyalties, passions, and hatreds everyone tries to handle in every-varying compromise strategies” (p. 321).

Notice that identity is viewed as undergoing a continual process of construction; it is multivalent, dynamic, dialogic process rather than unified, fixed, static, and one-dimensional phenomenon (e.g., Mendoza-Denton, 2002; Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) emphasized the fluidity of language and explicated linguistic behavior acts as “a series of acts of identity in which people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social role” (p. 14). In the case of Belize in their study, the people of the interior reveal themselves as being more or less Spanish, more or less Creole, more or less educated, and so on; “they still move quite considerable distances within a multidimensional sociolinguistic space in order to accommodate to different encounters and different topics of conversation” (p. 14), which reflects an evolution of newly-focused norms with each group of each generation according to their needs for various identities. Such an evolutionary linguistic process is not a linear progression.

Ochs (1993) argued that “social identity” encompasses social statuses, roles, positions, relationships, and institutional and other relevant community identities (p. 78), and speakers “attempt to establish the social identities of themselves and others through verbally performing certain social acts and verbally displaying certain stances” (p. 79). Social act refers to “any socially recognized, goal-directed behavior” (e.g., making a request) (p. 79), while stance refers to “a display of a socially recognized point of view or attitude”, including displays of epistemic attitudes and affective attitudes (p. 79).
Affective stances include “a person’s mood, attitude, feeling, or disposition as well as well as degrees of emotional intensity”, while epistemic stances refer to “a person’s knowledge or belief, including sources of knowledge and degrees of commitment to truth and certainty of propositions” (Ochs, 2002, p. 109).

Additionally, from a sociolinguistic perspective, in order to explain how social identities are created and constructed through language, Bucholtz and Hall (2004) provided an anthropological understanding of language and identity by proposing four semiotic processes: practice, indexicality, ideology, and performance (p. 377). Like Bourdieu (1977), who considered language a practice, not distinct from other forms of everyday social activity, Bucholtz and Hall (2004) noted that identity forming is through habitual action (i.e., practice), and language is a practice which contributes to identity forming. In this vein, identity is also considered a social phenomenon; it may be the outcome of social agency through activities rather than categories. Recent studies in linguistic anthropology have thus begun taking into consideration individual subjectivity and social agency in the linguistic construction of selfhood (p. 377).

In summary, from those researchers’ perspectives above, identity may be revealed and constructed through the use of communicative practices (Kroskity, 2000), through linguistic behavior (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985), or through verbally performing certain social act and verbally displaying certain stances (Ochs, 1993); it may be the outcome of social agency through activities (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004).
2.5 Convergent (Accommodative) and Divergent Language Behaviors

In addition to student uncooperative language behaviors and initiations in the IRF pattern examined in this current study, I also explore the focal students’ language choices, especially their code-switching to see how they negotiate with their teachers during an interaction through the processes of accommodation from the notion of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT). In bilingualism and multiculturalism, it is of great significance to understand patterns of language choice and code-switching and why they occur. In the following, I review the relevant literature that explains the factors affecting speakers’ language choice and code-switching in different ways. Then I provide a review of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT).

2.5.1 Language Choice

As noted by Saville-Troike (2003), diglossia is “a situation in which two or more languages (or varieties of the same language) in a speech community are allocated to different social functions and contexts” (p. 46). The H (high) language generally has more prestige and is learned at school; in contrast, the L (low) language is learned at home. For example, the choice of language code (language variety) by many Spanish speakers in the U.S. can be the ‘low variety’, Spanish, at home and the ‘high variety’, English, at school. Just like L and H language varieties, the minority culture (L) is first learned by Spanish children at home, and the dominant US “mainstream” culture (H) at school. Although many studies have shown that minority language speakers shift to the
dominant language within the second and/or third generations (Schecter and Bayley, 2002; Valdés, 1996), most of the Spanish families agreed that Spanish is an important resource in maintaining their ethnic identity and cultural traditions (Valdés, 1996; Zentella, 1997; Bayley and Schecter, 2005), which is another decisive factor determining their children’s language choices.

Factors such as topic (a primary determinant of language choice in multilingual contexts), setting (including locale and time of day), participants (including their age, sex, and social status, etc.) are also responsible for language choice (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 42-43). “Language choice is also importantly influenced by social and political identity” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 43). Fishman’s (1972) central concept is domains, which are characterized by the role relationships between the participants (i.e., social statuses), the setting of the interaction (i.e., locales), and the general subject area under discussion (i.e., topics), and are also linked to particular linguistic varieties.

Additionally, despite the fact that bilingual speakers must have some level of fluency in two languages, the strength and weakness of their two languages is a determinant factor in making a language choice (Shenk, 2007, p. 57). In addition to their lack of proficiency, speakers make their language choices in terms of their interlocutors’ language proficiency level and expressed language preference. The adult interlocutor’s language choice was the most significant variable in determining that of the child (Zentella, 1981). As Saville-Troike (2003) argued, the speaker’s identification with a given language and culture also plays a significant role in language choice, especially an ethnic or national identity (Giles and Byrne, 1982), and ethnic identity is one important
component of the interlocutor’s role in determining language choice (Shenk, 2007, p. 59). For example, people simply expect Anglo-looking people to have better proficiency in English (Carranza, 1995).

In Ballinger and Lyster’s (2011) study, the findings indicated that students’ sensitivity to others’ need for language accommodation affected their use of Spanish with peers. Based on Communication Accommodation Theory, the speaker’s assessment of the interlocutor can lead to convergence toward or divergence from the latter’s communicative style (Giles, 1973). Therefore, Giles argued that the interlocutor’s effect on the speaker should be taken into account. In bilingual classrooms, for example, a teacher’s authority is potentially more significant, affecting the bilingual students’ language choices. Sometimes they comply with their teacher’s language choice in that they choose to speak the same language that the teacher initiates conversation in, or the language the teacher switches to. Also, some studies have indicated the differences between students’ language choices for their peers and for their teacher interlocutors (e.g., Broner, 2000; Heller, 1994).

For example, in Potowski’s (2007) work conducted over two years at a Spanish/English dual immersion school in Chicago, she seeks to explain the patterns of Spanish and English use by four dual immersion students (two Spanish L1 and two Spanish L2) in fifth grade and again in eighth grade, as well as their Spanish proficiency in eighth grade, their final year at the school, along with the Spanish proficiency of the rest of their classmates. Qualitative research methods were utilized in this study, including interviews and long-term participant observation, audio and video recordings of
natural classroom speech, journals and questionnaires, as well as the combination of standardized and specially designed language proficiency measures. Potowski found that students matched their language use to comply with the teacher’s language expectations most often when responding to their teachers publicly. When speaking to peers in class, however, they showed a preference for English. It was due to the fact that English was the dominant language of the majority of the students. Through language choice, therefore, identity performances locate students within a peer group’s social hierarchy.

Code-switching is another common bilingual behavior. Grosjean (1982) defined code-switching (CS) as “the alternative use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation” (p. 145). Speakers switch languages when “they cannot find an appropriate word or expression or when the language being used does not have the items or appropriate translations for the vocabulary needed” (p. 150), or when they desire to “mark and emphasize group identity (solidarity)” (p. 152). Just as noted by Myers-Scotton (2006), speakers’ motivations for choices include two basic factors, “power” and “solidarity”, which influence interpersonal interactions and language choices that speakers make (p. 150). According to her definition, solidarity refers to “an attribute of relationships that arises through a shared membership with another person” (p. 150). A shared membership coming from the same family, working in the same office or factory, etc. is a source of solidarity.

Burt (1992) suggested that code-switching plays a role in the development of shared norms. L2 speakers may adjust to L2 norms to communicate effectively or diverge from L2 norms to stress their linguistic differences. The degree of L2 speakers’
convergence and divergence is a function of their linguistic repertoire and subjectivity (Beebe and Giles, 1984). Similarly, Myers-Scotton (1983) argued that established norms alone do not determine speakers’ choices in that speakers may either follow or ignore the norm. Speakers may make “Rational Choices”; that is, “they weigh relative costs and rewards of speaking one language rather than another” (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 161), suggesting that speakers make mental assessments and cognitive calculations to get the best outcome, and thus rational choices are subjective. As noted by Garrett (2007), “the notion of subjectivity serves to conceptualize the dynamic tension between the individual as social actor or agent and the subject position that she or he occupies within a given social order (which inevitably places certain constraints on agency)” (p. 235); “all aspects of subjectivity, including affective stances, morality, gender identity and ethnic identity, are shaped in culturally specific ways" (p. 236). The agency of language learners may also involve their capacity for creativity, improvisation, resistance, etc. Resistance, for instance, may lead to the language learners’ divergence from the language they are learning, and dissociate them from the interlocutor, thereby emphasizing a group membership different from that of the interlocutor (Gallois et al., 1995).

2.5.2 Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT)

Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) emerged in Giles’ (1973) work and was ultimately renamed Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) because the focus has been broadened “from exploring specific variables to encompass nonverbal and
discursive dimensions of social interaction” (Giles et al., 1991, p. 7). Within the past few decades, some research has focused on code choice within the framework of Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), such as Genesee and Bourhis (1988), Giles and Powesland (1975), Giles and Smith (1979), and so on. The framework of speech accommodation theory (SAT) is specifically concerned with the problems of interaction between members of different groups. As defined by Giles and Powesland (1975),

The essence of the theory of accommodation lies in the social psychological research on similarity-attraction. This work suggests that an individual can induce another to evaluate him more favorably by reducing dissimilarities between them. The process of speech accommodation operates on this principle and as such may be a reflection of an individual’s desire for social approval.

(Giles and Powesland, 1975, p. 233)

According to their definition, they view the desire for social approval as the heart of accommodation (p. 234). Speakers try to accommodate to their interlocutor(s) in order to become more alike in the language or linguistic characteristics of the interlocutor(s). In other words, “people may be converging their speech to how they believe others in the situation best receive it’ (Giles and Smith, 1979, p. 47). Beebe and Giles (1984) summarized the theory as follows.
People will attempt to converge linguistically toward the speech patterns believed to be characteristic of their recipients when they (a) desire their social approval and the perceived costs of so acting are proportionally lower than the rewards anticipated; and/or (b) desire a high level of communication efficiency, and (c) social norms are not perceived to dictate alternative speech strategies (Giles, 1973; Giles et al., 1973; Beebe, 1981; Katz, 1981; Thakerar et al., 1982; Beebe and Zuengler i.p.)

(Beebe and Giles, 1984, p. 8)

Among the different accommodative strategies, convergence has been extensively studied and has also been defined “as a strategy whereby individuals adapt their communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic (e.g., speech rate, accents), paralinguistic (e.g., pauses, utterance length), and nonverbal features (e.g., smiling, gazing) in such a way that they become more similar to their interlocutor’s behavior” (Sachdev and Giles, 2004, p. 355). Conversely, divergence refers to an accentuation of speech and nonverbal differences between themselves and others (Giles et al., 1991, p. 8). Both convergence and divergence can be upward or downward. Upward convergence can be illustrated by the adoption of the prestigious dialect of an interviewer, and downward convergence would be indicated by the shift to street language in certain minority communities (Giles et al., 1991, p. 11). Adopting a swifter speech rate and more cultured accent with someone nonstandard-sounding is an example of upward divergence, whereas emphasizing one’s low-prestige minority heritage is an example of downward divergence (Giles and Ogay, 2007, p. 295).

Additionally, Burt (1992) noted that “listeners within a speech community will share norms for the interpretation of discourse phenomena such as code choice and code-switching, but listeners from different groups may not necessarily do so” (p. 170). In the
absence of shared norms for code choice and for the interpretation of choices, previous research has shown that speakers’ language choices are influenced by a variety of factors, such as speakers’ language proficiency, the effect of peers and authority, sociocultural norms, and so forth (e.g., Shenk, 2007). In Ballinger and Lyster’s (2011) study, the findings indicated that students’ language background, culturally relevant teaching activities, teacher language use, and students’ sensitivity to others’ need for language accommodation affected their use of Spanish with peers. Burt (1992) suggested that code-switching plays a role in the development of shared norms. To exhibit compliance, speakers establish a shared code or shared norms for future conversations.

In Woolard’s (1989) book, she reported one language norm in Spain - Catalan should only be spoken between Catalans. If Castilian speakers attempted to speak Catalan, they often received a reply back in Castilian. Although they receive objective convergence, the act was felt as decisively divergent because of the psychological intent to keep Castilians in their own social-linguistic space (cited in Sachdev and Giles, 2004, p. 359). Additionally, prior empirical studies have suggested that “under certain condition interlocutors’ shifts of speech, objectively measured as divergence, more accurately reflect their subjective attempts integrate linguistically and psychologically with their partners than to dissociate from them” (Thakerar et al., 1982, p. 205). In their study, Thakerar et al. (1982) provided the formulation of a systematic distinction between the linguistic and the psychological processes, suggesting that speech convergence does not necessarily imply social integration and speech divergence does not necessarily imply social differentiation (p. 247). That said, speakers may converge to their hearer
objectively, but the psychological intent behind may show social distance, not intimacy (Sachdev and Giles, 2004, p. 359). In this sense, the linguistic and the social-psychological processes may not go in the same direction – one is convergent yet the other is divergent.

Sachdev and Giles (2004) concluded from the findings of many previous studies that “accommodation can vary (e.g., as ‘full’ of ‘partial’) to the extent that speakers approximate the communication patterns of their receivers” (p. 359). “Partial accommodation”, for example, refers to a strategy that is “neither full convergence nor divergence”, involving code-switching – “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation” (p. 359). Also, there are different types of (non)-accommodation in CAT, such as “counter-accommodation” and “over- and underaccommodation” (Ladegaard, 2009, p. 659). Normally, it has been found in the prior studies that older adults do not make many accommodations to their younger partners or even underaccommodate them, whereas younger communicators often reluctantly overaccommodate or adjust too much to their older partners (Giles and Ogay, 2007, p. 301).

In summary, focusing on the students’ ethnic identity, their ideologies about heritage language and language learning, and their language behaviors in the Chinese heritage language classrooms, the current study is an attempt to shed light on the links between ethnic identity and language ideology as well as between their language behaviors and their self-identification and language ideologies. In Chapter 4, Bakhtin’s theory may enhance Tse’s (2000) findings and add to our understanding of how the
students are conscious of language and social worlds and develop their own ideologies through authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse (Bakhtin, 1981) because individuals’ language ideologies emerge from social contexts and from the voices of different individuals in the social contexts. Tse (1997) examined the possible links between ethnic identity and language attitude and suggested that language attitude shifts as individuals’ sense of their ethnic identity changes over time. In addition to language attitude, I assume that language ideology may be connected to ethnic identity during one stage based on Bakhtin’s ideological becoming.

In Chapter 5, I explore how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, and how they express convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. I suggest that this Chinese heritage language school may provide a unique and safe space for the students to practice their multilingual languages and identities. I also assume that their self-identification and language ideologies may affect their language behaviors in the classroom.

In order to address these issues discussed above, I conducted an ethnographic study that involved the use of participant observation, and audio-recordings of classroom discourse, and semi-structured interviews, details of which are presented in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This study is an ethnographic study of four focal students and two teachers at the Chinese heritage language classrooms in a Midwestern U.S. city, exploring the students’ ethnic identity and classroom language behaviors. As stated by Schiffirin (1994), “the ethnography of communication…offers a contextual approach to the analysis of utterances … what is said is always constitutive of a larger social and cultural reality” (p. 408). Carbaugh (1996) explicated that through ethnography of communication, “one tries to interpret the participants’ meanings of their communicative practices, how they cohere through their communicative actions and their ideas about who they are and what they are doing” (p. 26). Consequently, I employed an ethnographic approach which contributes to the understanding of the students’ ideologies shaped in the bi/multilingual and bi/multicultural educational settings and the account of their classroom language behaviors in the teacher-student interaction.

As I discuss in Chapter 4, I conducted semi-structured interviews with the students to elicit their opinions and to describe and interpret their perceptions of self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, thereby examining their ethnic identity. As described in Chapter 5, through participant
observation and audio recordings of classroom discourse, I focus on their classroom language behaviors to examine how they expressed their uncooperative language behaviors, how they other-corrected their teacher’s English, and how they displayed their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching.

3.2 What is Ethnography of Communication?

According to Saville-Troike (2003), “ethnography is a field of study which is concerned primarily with the description and analysis of culture, and linguistics is a field concerned, among other things, with the description and analysis of language codes” (p. 1). However, ethnographers and linguists failed to deal with the interrelationship of language and culture, which led Dell Hymes to call for a synthesizing approach, the ethnography of communication, first conceptualized in his essay entitled “The Ethnography of Speaking” in 1962, focusing on the patterning of communicative behavior in specific cultural settings and the social meaning of language within the context of particular groups. He asserted that attention should be paid to the people in the speech community, not the code, and it is important to identify the speech events, constituent factors of speech events, and the functions of speech in the community. He placed an emphasis on the communicative behaviors and on a speaker’s ability to know how to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community, which is an important part of communicative competence. “This ability involves a shared knowledge of the linguistic code as well as of the sociocultural rules, norms and values which guide
the conduct and interpretation of speech and other channels of communication in a community” (Farah, 1997, p. 125).

In other words, the ethnography of communication is an approach to language research which is concerned with the questions of “what a person knows about appropriate patterns of language use in his or her community and how he or she learned about it” (Farah, 1997, p. 125). It originated from the view in anthropology that “culture to a large extent is expressed through language” and from the view in linguistics that “language is a system of cultural behaviors” (Farah, 1997, p. 125). Drawing on social and cultural anthropology, linguistics, sociology, and education, it brings together etic and emic analyses of communication, and sometimes macro- and micro-level analyses of discourse as well (Farah, 1997). The principal concerns in the ethnography of communication include “patterns and functions of communication, nature and definition of speech community, means of communicating, components of communicative competence, relationship of language to world view and social organization, and linguistic and social universals and inequalities” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 10). As Saville-Troike (2003) stated,

The focus of the ethnography of communication is the speech community, the way communication within it is patterned and organized as systems of communicative events, and the ways in which these interact with all other systems of culture. A primary aim of this approach is to guide the collection and analysis of descriptive data about the ways in which social meaning is conveyed…

(Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 2)
We now turn to the discussion of how the ethnography of communication is applied in classroom research.

### 3.2.1 Classroom Ethnography

According to Watson-Gegeo’s (1997) definition, classroom ethnography refers to “the application of ethnographic and sociolinguistic or discourse analytic research methods to the study of behavior, activities, interaction, and discourse in formal and semi-formal educational settings such as school classrooms, adult education programs, and day-care centers” (p. 135). In contrast to quantitative research designs that “were inadequate to address culture and moment-by-moment classroom interaction” (p. 135-136) as well as “failed to encompass the complexity of classroom life or the perspectives of teachers and students” (p. 137), classroom ethnography “emphasizes the sociocultural nature of teaching and learning processes, incorporates participants’ perspectives on their own behavior, and offers a holistic analysis sensitive to levels of context in which interactions and classrooms are situated” (p. 135). Its research methods involve the intensive, detailed observation of a classroom over the period of its duration (e.g., semester or year) and the use of audio- or video-recordings of classroom activities. Interviews with teachers and students are used to supplement observations. In this regard, analytic categories used in classroom ethnography are more emic than etic because they are “derived from teachers’ and students’ own concepts and categories” rather than “imposed from the analytic language of the social sciences” (p. 136).
Watson-Gegeo (1997) also discussed four basic approaches to classroom ethnography: ethnography of communication, micro-ethnography, discourse analysis, and critical ethnography, all of which focus primarily on culture and language data. In particular, ethnography of communication studies is considered “the most comprehensive in their treatment of community culture, values, and interactional norms” (p. 137). For instance, Philips (1972) provided a core concept for examining classroom interaction in her study of Warm Springs’ Indian children’s contrasting behavior in different classroom speech activities because of the lack of the social conditions for participation to which they have become accustomed in the Indian community and the absence of the appropriate social conditions for communicative performances that affect the most common and everyday speech acts in the classroom. Also, in the 1980s and 1990s, a variety of ethnic and mixed-ethnic classrooms have been studied by applying the ethnography of communication/sociolinguistic approach (Watson-Gegeo, 1997).

Most ethnographic classroom research usually involves a combination of micro-analysis or discourse analysis. Micro-ethnography is concerned with “the formal analysis of interactional events and with understanding how lessons, classroom organization, and school success or failure are jointly constructed by participants as interactional accomplishments” (Watson-Gegeo, 1997, p. 137-138). In comparison to ethnography of communication’s holistic examination of interactional patterns across many contexts, a micro-ethnography offers a detailed analysis of only one type of event or a single instance of an event. Some researchers, for instance, have introduced the three-part I(nitiation)-R(esponse)-E(valuation) format (e.g., Mehan, 1979) and the four-part lesson
structure of I(nitiation)-R(resentation)-Rx (Reaction)-E(valuation) (e.g., Anderson, 1995) in the classroom. Anderson (1995) argued that the four-part structure reflects multi-party interaction with reactions and evaluations from peers. Additionally, discourse analysis was undertaken by many classroom ethnographers in the mid-1980s and has also been applied to second language classrooms. Conversational analysis and Halliday’s (1976) systemic/functional linguistics are the discourse analysis approaches used by most classroom ethnographers (Watson-Gegeo, 1997).

Critical classroom ethnography focuses on “the relations of power in language use, how social differentiation in the larger society is reproduced in the classroom through language and discourse, and the dialectical relationship between social structural constraints and human agency” (Watson-Gegeo, 1997, p. 139). Critical ethnographers have argued that ethnographic research should be concerned with applying its findings to bring about change in addition to understanding the world. For example, as passive victims of a discriminatory social system, oppressed peoples are able to take action to improve their situation. In other words, “the overriding goal of critical ethnography is to free individuals from sources of domination and repression” (Anderson, 1989, p. 249). Critical ethnography has raised serious questions about the role of schools in the social and cultural reproduction of social classes, gender roles, and racial and ethnic prejudice (Anderson, 1989, p. 251). Most critical classroom ethnography studies put emphasis on empowerment for students and teachers.

One of the basic methods of data collection within ethnography is participant observation, to which we now turn.
3.2.2 Participant Observation

Participant observation is at the core of ethnographic research, which is the primary research technique of the description of cultures. Stocking (1983) described the main features of traditional participant observation research: “Entering as a stranger into a small and culturally alien community, the investigator becomes for a time and in a way part of its system of face-to-face relationships, so that the data collected in some sense reflect the native’s own point of view” (p. 7). The distinction between participant observation and casual looking around is that participant observation is associated with “the nature of the researcher’s participation in the group being studied and the care and systematicity with which records are made and analysis undertaken” (Johnstone, 2000, p. 81-82). Participant observers come to a social situation with two purposes: (1) to engage in activities appropriate to the situation and (2) to observe the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation (Spradley, 1980, p. 54). They also try to uncover the “immediate and local meanings of actions” in the local group they are studying (Erikson, 1986, p. 119). In contrast to survey research following a linear process, which begins with defining a research problem and formulating hypothesis, and then a research instrument is designed, followed by data collection from a specific group of subjects sampled, and in the end, the data are coded. Li (1994) described the methodology of participant observation as follows.
In participant observation, the investigator (participant observer) begins with -- some general problem in mind, learns something in the field (data collection) tries to make sense of it (analysis), then goes back to see if the interpretation makes sense in the light of new experience (more data collection). The interpretation is refined (more analysis), and so forth.

(Li, 1994, p. 69)

In other words, data collection and analysis are carried out consecutively in survey research but concurrently in participant observation (Li, 1994, p. 69).

For example, through participant observation, Schieffelin (1990) conducted a longitudinal study of language socialization among the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea in 1975-1979. The micro-ethnographic methods were used in this study. She tape-recorded a total of eighty-three hours of spontaneous speech samples in order to investigate the patterns of verbal interaction between children and members of their families, and document cultural situations and children’s acquisition of social and linguistic skills. The three children’s mothers repeated what they heard on the tape for her and answered her questions during the transcription sessions. Also, following Bloom’s longitudinal speech-sampling procedures (1970), she took detailed written contextual notes on the setting, scene, participants, nonverbal behavior, and objects in order to coordinate speech with action. Furthermore, the language samples consisting of three to four hours of speech were recorded within a four- to seven-day period at intervals averaging five weeks in order to reflect the child’s maturation, language development, and situational changes. Several months after the initial transcription, Kulu, a young Kaluli man who had not been a participant in any recording sessions, helped interpret the
significance of many interactions such as affect-marked affixes and expressives, the
pragmatic use of word order, etc.

Moreover, due to the degree of the ethnographers’ involvement, both with people
and in the activities they observe, there are different modes of participant observation,
from “passive participation”, in which the ethnographer does not participate or interact
with other people to any great extent, to “complete participation”, in which researchers
intensively interact with other participants and might even get to participate in and
perform the very activity they are studying (Spradley, 1980, p. 58-62; Duranti, 1997, p.
99). In linguistic fieldwork, complete participation means “being able to interact
competently in the native language and even perform the verbal genres one is studying”
(Duranti, 1997, p. 100). As well, complete participation is the highest level of
involvement for ethnographers because they are already “ordinary participants” in a
situation which they study (Spradley, 1980, p. 61). Participation requires that “the
researcher take on authentic roles and develop reciprocal relationships with the members
of the community being researched and the opportunity to come close to the perspective
of the insider who observes and experiences language use in real situations” (Farah, 1997,
p. 128). Likewise, as Davies (2008) noted, the hallmark of participant observation is
“long-term personal involvement with those being studied, including participation in their
lives to the extent that the researcher comes to understand the culture as an insider” (p.
81). Nevertheless, she also contended that complete participation is not a guarantee that
the researcher is not unduly influencing the data even when the researcher’s identity is
disguised (p. 83). The researchers’ participation, as such, is just part of their developing understanding of the people they study.

In addition, there are many dilemmas over how to strike a balance between the insider and outsider perspectives. Farah (1997) emphasized that even when a researcher is working in his/her own community or one similar to it, he/she must take on the role of “an outsider” verifying her own perceptions and hypotheses with those of other members through observation and interviews (p. 128). Hornberger (1994) also pointed out that “too much participation by the researcher may change the nature of the events and the course of action of the culture, classroom, or event being studied, but too little participation may lead the researcher to miss the course of action and lose important data” (p. 689). An ethnographer may “distort interpretation toward shared biases” if he/she becomes too familiar with the culture; on the other hand, being a stranger may restrict access to significant events and “inhibit an emic understanding” (p. 689). In addition to participant observation, another basic method of data collection within ethnography is formal and informal open ended interviews with community members, depicted in the next section.

3.2.3 Ethnographic Interviews

As defined by Heyl (2001), ethnographic interviewing includes “those projects in which researchers have established respectful, on-going relationships with their interviewees, including enough rapport for there to be a genuine exchange of views and enough time and openness in the interviews for the interviewees to explore purposefully with the researcher the meanings they place on events in their worlds” (p. 369). She
further explained that “interviewing involves a complex form of social interaction with interviewees and interview data are co-produced in these interactions” (p. 370). Central to this process is “how interviewees reconstruct events or aspects of social experience and how interviewers make their own sense of what has been said” (p. 370).

Spradley (1979) viewed an ethnographic interview as “a particular kind of speech event” because this kind of talking takes place in many social occasions of every culture (p. 55), and it shares many features with the friendly conversation (p. 58). Accordingly, ethnographic interviews are seen as “a series of friendly conversations into which the researcher slowly introduces new elements to assist informants to respond as informants” (p. 58). He proposed three most important ethnographic elements: (1) Explicit purpose. Because ethnographic interviews involve purpose and direction, the ethnographer needs to direct the talking in those channels that lead to discovering the cultural knowledge of the informant; (2) Ethnographic explanation. The ethnographer must repeatedly offer explanations to the informant about the project, the reasons for tape recording the interviews, encouraging the informants to speak in their cultural scene instead of using their translation competence, and so on; (3) Ethnographic questions. They include descriptive, structural, and contrast questions (p. 59-60).

Following Briggs’ (1986) basic insights in his book Learning How To Ask, Blommaert and Jie (2010) underscored that an interview is a conversation. It is an “ordered” conversation, one that “is structured by questions or topics you may want to see discussed”, and one in which “you (the interviewer) will have to make sure that a particular order is being followed” (p. 44). Also, a conversation is not an interrogation,
and it is more like talk between people on a variety of topics. Thus, they emphasized the importance of topics, not questions because not all can be found out by just “asking” (p. 49). They noted that “the interview is not just the part in which your respondent speaks; it is very much a dialogue with you, and you also build, construct and make the interview into what it is” (p. 49). That is, the interviewer is also part of the interview. An analysis of the interview is an “analysis of a dialogue between you and the interviewee” (p. 49), not just of what the interviewee said. In this light, “cooperativity” plays an important role since the interviewer and the interviewee must have a shared desire to talk to one another (p. 44).

Like Spradley (1979) and Blommaert and Jie (2010), Davies (2008) considered unstructured interviewing close to a “naturally occurring” conversation (p. 105). However, ethnographers still tend to direct the conversation with the research in mind without imposing much structure on the interaction. On the other hand, semi-structured interviewing has recently become a very popular form of qualitative research, which requires attention to the interview context and relationship between the researcher and the interviewee. For this reason, this form of interviewing is also sometimes referred as ethnographic interviewing, usually conducted by the researcher with just one individual at a time. Many researchers also combine this method with participant observation. Fairclough (1989) suggested that the interview must be understood at three levels: “the level of discourse produced, the text; the level of interaction, that is, the processes of production and interpretation that go on between the individuals involved in the interview;
and the level of context, that is, the social conditions that affect both interaction and the

text” (cited in Davies, 2008, p. 110).

Moreover, as Duranti (1997) noted, interviews are a common form of interaction
during fieldwork, and ethnographers ask questions, many of which are about topics and
issues they are trying to make sense of. For linguistic anthropologists, the interview is a
time to obtain background cultural information for understanding particular speech
exchanges they are studying. Most linguistic anthropologists “do not use interviews as
their main technique for collecting speech samples, but as occasions for eliciting native
interpretations of speech already collected in other situations, mostly in spontaneous
interactions” (p. 107).

For instance, in Kim’s (2011) study, she conducted semi-structured interviews
with individual teachers by providing a general direction to their stories while at the same
time allowing the interviewees to express themselves freely, so as to gather the teachers’
narratives of their learning and teaching experiences. The interviews were recorded for
transcription, and the transcripts were sent to the interviewees for member checking.
These participating teachers were asked to correct any mistakes made in the transcription
and also to clarify the parts that were not clear to the researcher. They could add any
comments at the end of their transcript to elaborate on what they had said in the first
interview.
3.3 Why an Ethnographic Approach?

Over the past decade, a variety of research methodologies have been employed in classroom research in ESL, second language acquisition, and bilingual education; in recent years, ethnographic methods have become more prevalent in language classrooms and educational research (Anderson, 1989; Watson-Gegeo, 1988). Ethnography is the study of people’s behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, and in classroom ethnography, many studies detailed the characteristics and patterns of teacher-student interaction.

A sub-field of ethnography, the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1974), is an integrative method for conducting qualitative research in various settings, and it incorporates both macro- and micro-level analyses of discourse in order to examine patterns and functions of communication in any given speech community. The former (macro) examines “the discourse contexts and ideological worlds in which members of a culture or group operate, often over a substantial period of time” (Duff, 2002, p. 293), whereas the latter (micro) focuses on communication action, such as speech acts, turn-taking, code-switching, personal pronouns and their sociolinguistic or discursive functions, grammatical particles, silence and its significance, Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) interaction patterns, etc. (Duff, 2002, p. 294). Farah (1997) contended that the ethnographer of communication needs to obtain information about “the larger context – social structures, cultural values, roles and relationships – as well as closely analyze the linguistic and non-linguistic features of interaction in a particular speech event” (p. 128). Most ethnographic classroom research also involves a combination of
ethnographic description, macro- and micro-level analyses of discourse. Through ethnographic methods, we can better understand the ideological worlds surrounding the students – the social contexts outside and inside this Chinese school, their ideological becoming and ethnic identity development, as well as their interactions with their teachers in the classroom in this study, including their uncooperative language behaviors, other-corrections, and convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching.

The ethnography of communication also incorporates both etic (outsider) and emic (insider) perspectives in analysis of language and community practice. As defined by Watson-Gegeo (1988), etic analyses and interpretations are based on “the use of frameworks, concepts, and categories from the analytic language of the social sciences and are potentially useful for comparative research across languages, settings, and cultures” (p. 579). Emic refers to “culturally based perspectives, interpretations, and categories used by members of the group under study to conceptualize and encode knowledge and to guide their own behavior. Emic terms, concepts, and categories are therefore functionally relevant to the behavior of the people studied by the ethnographer” (p. 580). In second language acquisition (SLA), Firth and Wagner (2007) provided insights on the issues with an increased use of an emic (insider) approach in this field in order to better understand L2 learners’ language use and transmission of meanings through interactions and communication with other interlocutors. An emic analysis incorporates “the participants’ perspectives and interpretations of behavior, events, and situations and does so in the descriptive language they themselves use” (Watson-Gegeo,
Focusing on the students’ self-identification, language ideologies and classroom language behaviors, the study thus particularly values the emic perspective. According to Malinowski’s (1922) definition, the goal of ethnography is “grasp the native’s point of view, his relation to life, to realize his vision of his world” (p. 25, cited in Spradley, 1980, p. 3). In this light, conducting interviews is a good way to approach the topic of language ideology in this study - to listen to and record what my participants said about how they identify themselves and their ideologies about heritage language and language learning, thereby eliciting their beliefs and attitudes toward heritage language and language learning. When interviewing the students and the teachers, I also played back the classroom conversations for their interpretations since there is a need to portray the group studied from their points of view. As Gumperz (1970) suggested, the application of the ethnographic framework in recorded speech can contribute to an understanding of the social significance of the linguistic data. In addition to interviewing the students and the teachers, I also observed, audio-recorded, and detailed the meaning and function of individual instances of language behaviors in natural conversation in the classroom.

3.4 Current Study

3.4.1 Demographic Context

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the total population of this Midwestern U.S. city was 787,033, and Asian residents comprised 4.1% of the city’s population. This Chinese Saturday school is located in the northwest area of this city, close to a suburb of
this city called the D city (pseudonym). Some of the teachers and parents told me that they lived in the neighborhood. Bill, one focal student, also went to the Chinese language program at one public school in the D city. Bill’s mom reported in the interview that more and more public schools in the D city began offering Chinese courses as a foreign language for Americans. According to the U.S. census data in 2000, the total population of this D city was approximately 30000, including 438 Chinese residents and 65 Taiwanese residents, comprising 1.40% and 0.2% respectively of the city’s population. Also, data from the 2006-2008 American Community Survey (ACS) reported that the total population of this D city had grown to 39,310, and 1013 Chinese-speaking residents constituted 2.57% of the area’s population, indicating that the total number of Chinese was increasing. In 2000, of 7542 people ages 5 to 17 years in this city, almost 1.64% indicated that they spoke Chinese. Also, in this D city, among the 21189 who were 18 years of age or older, 419 people spoke Chinese, comprising 2% of the population. As of the census of 2010, there were 41,751 people, 15.3 % of which were Asian, and Chinese residents constituted 3.1% of the Asian population.

3.4.2 Research Site

This Chinese heritage language school is a Saturday school, located in a Midwestern U.S. city. It was founded in 1973 by Taiwanese immigrants, and its goal was to offer Chinese language and cultural classes for children from 3 to 18 years old. The total number of students in this school is over two hundred students, and there are more females than males. It offers Chinese classes from pre-kindergarten through the twelfth
grade, Chinese adult conversation, and several CFL (Chinese as a Foreign Language) classes. A school year consists of two semesters. Most of the students here were born in the U.S. and have different family backgrounds, grew up in different communities, and go to different schools. The majority of the parents here are immigrants from Taiwan; a small number of parents are from Hong Kong and China.

This school is registered as a non-profit organization, and the financial support is mainly from the government in Taiwan, student tuition, parents, etc. The staff members are parent volunteers and almost all the teachers are mothers of the students. Due to a lack of permanent location, this school has to rent classrooms for Saturdays in one local elementary school. The textbooks are provided by the Taiwanese government’s Overseas Community Affairs Council. The teachers can also choose other materials like MeiZhou Chinese, which was edited by Taiwanese immigrant teachers and parents. The school teaches traditional Chinese characters and Zhuyin (Mandarin phonetic symbols). The students are also taught to recognize simplified characters and Pinyin (the phonetic system of Romanization), but they are only required to write in traditional Chinese characters. In addition to regular Chinese language courses, this school also offers extracurricular courses on Chinese culture such as Tai-Chi, Chinese yo-yo, Kung-Fu, and Chinese instruments. It also organizes annual activities like Chinese New Year celebration and Chinese culture summer camp.
3.4.3 Participants

The participants in this study were two Taiwanese immigrant teachers, Vivian and Lily (pseudonym), as well as twenty-one students, including two classes with 8th graders and 9th graders respectively. Table 1 provides specific details about the students’ home background and family information, collected from the teachers.

Table 1: Student Participants’ Home Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>The total number of students</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Parents’ immigration to U.S.</th>
<th>Biracial family: American &amp; Taiwanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan (most) Hong Kong China Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighth-grade class included four boys and three girls, a total of seven. All the students were born in the US. Most of the students’ parents were immigrants from Taiwan, and only one student’s father was American and her mother was Taiwanese. The teacher, Vivian, commented that her students speak more English in class mainly because the students can only speak Chinese words; they have little confidence in making Chinese sentences.

In the ninth-grade class, there were a total of fourteen students, seven boys and seven girls included. All the students were born in the U.S. Two students were brother
and sister, and their father was from Hong Kong and mother was from Taiwan. One student’s father was American and his mother was Taiwanese. One student’s father and mother were both from China, but the mother was not literate; she could speak Cantonese but could not speak Mandarin Chinese well. Two other students’ parents were Malaysian but were of Chinese descent, and the rest of the parents were Taiwanese immigrants. Like the eighth graders, the ninth graders speak more English in class; they talk to each other almost in English after class.

At home, some of the participants did not speak Mandarin Chinese, and some were forced to speak Chinese by their parents. Thus, many of them lacked the motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese. The Taiwanese immigrant teachers, Vivian and Lily (pseudonym), had much experience in teaching and could communicate with their bilingual students in both Mandarin Chinese and English. The names used for all the participants here are fictitious to protect the participants’ confidentiality.

The following are brief descriptions of each of the focal participants of the study, including four students and two teachers.

3.4.3.1 Four Focal Students

The four focal students are four boys: Arthur, Bill, Paul, and Jack.

Arthur (eighth grade)

Arthur is 13 years old and was born and raised in this Midwest U.S. city. Both of his parents emigrated to the U.S. from Taiwan and have been in the U. S. for almost twenty years. His mother got her bachelor’s degree in Taiwan and master’s degree in the
United States. Her mother tongue is Mandarin Chinese and she can speak a little Taiwanese. At home, she speaks Mandarin Chinese with her children, but they respond mostly in English. Arthur reported that his first language was English and he spoke English in the home while he was growing up although his parents spoke Mandarin Chinese. He began learning at this Chinese school in kindergarten (at about age 5-6). He seldom spoke Mandarin Chinese except for the holidays like Chinese New Year or when speaking to his grandparents, who cannot speak English. Arthur and Paul are brothers, and they went to a junior high school in Taiwan once for four to five weeks during one summer, but they both did not like that experience since they thought that the teachers in Taiwan were strict. Arthur admitted that the teacher spoke Mandarin Chinese a little fast, yet when asked if he likes going to Taiwan, he said yes because Taiwanese food is delicious and he can visit his cousins, with whom he uses Mandarin Chinese more often. He spoke more Mandarin Chinese in Chinese class than in the home and the most difficult part of learning Mandarin Chinese for him was reading and writing. When asked to rate his language ability in Mandarin Chinese from 1 to 5, he rated his listening, speaking, reading, and writing as 5, 4, 2, and 2 respectively.

**Bill (eighth grade)**

Bill is 13 years old and was born and raised in this Midwest U.S. city as well. His mother got her bachelor’s degree in the United States, but his father obtained education only in Taiwan. They emigrated to the U.S. after they married in Taiwan. His mother reported that her mother tongue is Mandarin and Taiwanese, and she also speaks English
and a little Spanish. Bill’s first language was English, and he went to Taiwan only once for three weeks when he was very young (less than 2 years old), so he got little impression about Taiwan. He talked to his father in Chinese most of the time since his father is not good at speaking English; he used Mandarin Chinese more often with his mother since she would be angry if he did not respond in Mandarin Chinese; he spoke to his little brother in English. He reported that the proportion of his use of English and Mandarin at home was about 50 percent to 50 percent. He began attending this Chinese school at age 7 (the first grade), and the most difficult part of learning Mandarin Chinese for him was writing. Additionally, he has attended the Chinese program in another American high school 40 minutes per day (8:00-8:40 a.m.) for one semester. This Chinese program was for American students who have never learned Mandarin Chinese. However, he liked this Chinese school better than that Chinese program because he learned more in this Chinese school and he felt it was boring in that Chinese program. He also learned Mandarin Chinese in Tzu Chi Foundation (a Buddhist organization) for a short period of time when his mother was teaching Mandarin Chinese there. When asked to rate his language ability in Mandarin Chinese from 1 to 5, he rated his listening, speaking, reading, and writing as 4, 4, 4, and 3 respectively. He identified himself as American-born Taiwanese and spoke a little Taiwanese. He liked speaking Taiwanese and was aware of the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese – other people would talk with him in Mandarin Chinese because of his Asian appearance.
**Paul (ninth grade)**

Paul, Arthur’s older brother, is 15 years old and was also born and raised in this Midwest U.S. city. He reported that his first language was English and he could not understand Mandarin Chinese until he started this Chinese heritage language school at age 7 (the first grade). Yet, his mother commented that she and her husband have kept talking to him in Mandarin Chinese since he was born, and Paul may forget it and be confused probably because he was taken to the daycare center at age 2 or 3. From then on, he began to be exposed to English. Paul also reported that he spoke English and Mandarin Chinese at home now, and the proportion of use of the two languages was 60 percent to 40 percent; that is, Mandarin Chinese was used more at home. He spoke Mandarin Chinese with his parents and English with his brothers, Arthur and Mike. At home, Peter and Arthur would watch the cartoons from Taiwan after they got up in the morning. Additionally, they both attended Chinese summer camp three or four times. Peter has been to Taiwan three times (every two or three years). When he came to Taiwan, he could not recognize many Chinese characters, and he did not really like watching Taiwanese TV programs. Like Bill, he also began attending the Chinese program in another American high school in eighth grade. He reported that its curriculum was so simple that he learned little. The most difficult part of learning Mandarin Chinese for him was also reading and writing. He rated his Chinese ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing as 4, 4, 3, and 2 respectively. Arthur and Peter did not speak Taiwanese, but their parents did. His mother commented that Paul’s Mandarin Chinese is better than Arthur’s, and he is able to write a Chinese composition.
**Jack (ninth grade)**

Jack is 14 years old. His father is American and his mother is also his teacher, Lily, from Taiwan. He was born in another city but raised in this Midwest city. He went to elementary school with only more than one hundred students, where the school especially focused on science and math. His first language was both English and Mandarin Chinese because he learned the two languages together - his father taught him English and his mother taught him Mandarin Chinese when he was a baby. When his father was around, he spoke English; when it was his mom, he spoke Mandarin Chinese, but English was still his most frequent language of use at home since his father did not understand Mandarin Chinese. His father could only understand what he and his mother were saying when he spoke English. When he went back to Taiwan, he spoke Mandarin Chinese most of the time since his grandparents and relatives did not understand English. Like Paul and Arthur, he went to take Chinese classes in elementary school for two or three weeks in Taiwan before. That was a second or third-grade class in Taiwan, and he found that it was like the seventh-grade class here in the U. S., but then he was in the second or third-grade in this Chinese heritage language school, so it was hard for him to really understand what they were saying and the teacher spoke too fast. He started attending this Chinese heritage language school in preschool (at age 3 or 4), and he rated his Chinese ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing as 4, 4, 3, and 2. Grammar and sentence structures were the most difficult for him in learning Chinese in that he did not know how to speak the sentences fluently without pauses. In order for Jack to speak
more Mandarin Chinese, his mother, the teacher Lily, took him back to Taiwan almost every year.

3.4.3.2 Two Focal Teachers

Vivian (eighth grade)

Vivian was a veteran teacher, originally from Taiwan, with thirteen years of teaching experience in this Chinese heritage language school. She reported herself as a Mandarin speaker. She got her bachelor’s degree in international business in Taiwan and master’s degree in human resources development at university in the U.S. She also completed the OSU (Ohio State University) alternative licensure program - teaching Chinese as a second language. She used to teach English at a famous language school (Hess International Educational Group) for two years in Taiwan before coming to the U.S. and teaching ESL lessons deeply influenced how she taught Mandarin Chinese from the perspective of “immersion” – she insisted on using Mandarin Chinese as much as she could in class, and English was just used to clarify her meanings and helped her students understand what she was teaching. When she was an OSU student, she taught Chinese at Our Lady of Peace School and All Saints Academy for ten weeks respectively. During the period of thirteen years in Chinese heritage language school, she also taught Mandarin Chinese in Tzu Chi foundation (a Buddhist organization) youth program - Chinese cultural and language program for ten years.
Lily (ninth grade)

Lily was a teacher with eight years of teaching experience in this Chinese heritage language school, which was her first time to teach Mandarin Chinese. She originated from Taiwan and reported that she is a native Mandarin speaker, but her mother tongue is Taiwanese because she speaks Taiwanese before she learned Mandarin Chinese in elementary school. She arrived in the United States during her college years and got her bachelor’s degree in international finance. She was now a U.S. citizen and also teaching math in high school as a substitute teacher. She is dedicated to her work and always spends a lot of time preparing lessons. Many parents in this Chinese school think highly of her teaching. She is also proud of her students’ performances because their reading and writing skills are better than many other students’. According to my observation, Lily used English sometimes in class; she explained that it was when her students did not understand what she was saying in Mandarin Chinese. English was like a teaching tool and helped her students understand Mandarin Chinese. However, if she could, she really hoped that Mandarin Chinese was used only in class without English. In fact, each of her students did not reach the same level in learning Chinese, and that was why she needed to use English to explain what she was teaching. During class, her students communicated with her more in English, and after class, all in English.

3.4.3.3 Selection of the Focal Students

Along with observing the interactions and audio-recording the conversations among all the students and the two teachers in the two classrooms, the four focal students
from the two classrooms were selected for one-on-one interviews based on the following criteria:

1. The students’ willingness and their parents’ approval.

2. The students possessed better oral proficiency in Chinese according to the teachers’ understanding of the students’ oral language skills and the researcher’s observation in class. They were able to produce simple sentences in Mandarin Chinese.

3. The students’ ethnic-language household composition. Out of four focal students, one student was born in biracial families, meaning one parent from Taiwan and the other was not. Even though he did not have good oral proficiency in Chinese, he was still selected as a focal student in an attempt to understand whether his self-identification and language ideologies are different from three other students’.

3.4.4 Data Collection

Data collection in this ethnographic study took place through the following three methods.

1. Conducting participant observation of teacher-student conversations and interactions in the classroom.


3. Conducting semi-structured interviews with the four focal students and the teachers.
This study was carried out for six months from the beginning of January, 2012.

The following was the timeline for this study.

Table 2: Timeline for This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Each classroom</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Biweekly 2 hours</td>
<td>January to April, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording</td>
<td>Biweekly 2 hours</td>
<td>January to April, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>Once 20-30 minutes</td>
<td>After April, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td>Once 30-60 minutes</td>
<td>After April, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playback</td>
<td>During Student interviews and Teacher interviews</td>
<td>After April, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the study</td>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>January to June, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this time, I made biweekly visits to each classroom (one classroom a week), taking field notes and audio-recording. After finishing my participant observation in the two classrooms, I started interviewing the students and teachers. Each student was interviewed for about 20-30 minutes, and each teacher for about 30-60 minutes. Their classroom talk was also played back to them for their interpretation during the interviews.

3.4.4.1 Participant Observation in the Chinese Heritage Language Classrooms

Participant observation took place one Saturday afternoon (two hours) a week in one of the two classrooms. The data were collected through audio-taped recordings and field notes on conversations and interactions among the students and teachers in class, during a ten-minute break in the classroom, and after class but before the teachers and students left their classroom. During each individual observation, field notes were taken in order to describe the participants’ speech and actions that were uncooperative,
convergent (accommodative), or divergent, and observations were audio recorded in order to collect the data from the participants’ conversations in the classroom, including the strategies they used, like giving wrong answers, using taboo words, other-correction, or code-switching. Also, I could go back to my data at any point during and/or after the data collection period.

Nevertheless, natural speech data are hard to obtain if speakers are being recorded. In fact, the “observer’s paradox” cannot be completely avoided (Labov, 1972). As pointed out by Maxwell (2005), “in qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument of the research, and the research relationships are the means by which the research gets done” (p. 83), and “the researcher is part of the world he or she studies – is a powerful and inescapable influence” (p. 109). It is unlikely that the researcher has no direct participation in the group being studied. As a participant observer, I could not deny the effect of my presence in the classroom, but I tried my best to position myself in an unobtrusive spot and make my participants feel as comfortable as possible.

3.4.4.2 Semi-structured Interviews

The main purpose behind my interviews was to elicit the participants’ opinions, describe and interpret their perceptions of heritage language and language learning, as well as examine what stage of ethnic identity development they may be at. The two groups - the four focal students and the two teachers were interviewed one-on-one by the researcher. Each interview with the focal students required approximately twenty to thirty minutes, and each interview with the teachers lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour. The
interview questions for the students and the teachers were designed differently, and each participant in the same group was interviewed once and was asked the same questions in the same order. Each interview was audio-recorded. The semi-structured interview was open-ended in that some predetermined questions just served as a general guide to generate more information, and the interviewees could talk more freely rather than simply respond to the questions. But I still directed the conversation with the research in mind.

At the beginning of each interview, some general background information was requested by the researcher. For example, the questions for the students were about what language they spoke first as a child and what languages or Chinese dialects they spoke. The teachers were asked about their experience of Chinese teaching (for the list of the questions, see Appendix A). The interviews were conducted in English or Chinese, whichever the participants felt more comfortable with, and they could thus express themselves freely. I also played back the classroom discourse during the interview and the participants would be able to listen to themselves on the tape recordings and reflect aloud on their language behaviors and strategies in the classroom.

3.4.5 Data Analysis

The previous section described the data collection process, detailing what types of data were collected. This section discussed the methods of data analysis. The types of data I analyzed in this study are as follows.

1. Field notes of teacher-student conversations and interactions in the classroom.

3. Audio-recordings of the interviews with the four focal students and the two teachers.

First, I transcribed audio-recordings of teacher-student conversations and the interviews with the four focal students and the two teachers. The classroom discourse data obtained through audio recordings and field notes during participant observation were first reviewed for the forms of the students’ language behaviors – uncooperative language behaviors, the correction of their teacher’s English, and convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors. For the four focal student participants, semi-structured interviews with the researcher were transcribed for analysis of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, thereby examining what stage of ethnic identity development they may be at. I attempted to find the connection between language ideology and ethnic identity as well as between their language behaviors and their self-identification and language ideologies. Finally, the interviews with the two teachers were also transcribed for analysis of their teachers’ expressed attitudes toward their students’ language behaviors as well as toward the use of other languages in the classroom in addition to Mandarin Chinese.

The critical step in interpretation and analysis is the transcription of data. Discourse transcription is “the process of creating a written representation of a speech event so as to make it accessible to discourse research” (Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 45). Transcriptions can also help indicate the nonlinguistic cues in addition to people’s speech. After I had a rough transcription of the classroom discourse, I went back and checked my
work. It was then that I decided what conversations may be related to the focal students’ self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. Certainly, I went back and forth during the process of transcription at least several times. Additionally, I used the pinyin system of Romanization to transcribe Mandarin Chinese and provide English translations. With respect to the audiotapes of all the interviews, they were transcribed with a focus on content. The transcription was selective in that this study attempted to describe and interpret the participants’ beliefs and attitudes toward the relevant topics. In addition to providing English translations, the interview transcripts were sent to the interviewees for member checking.

After the transcription process was finished, the next more crucial step was coding – “identify and group similar instances of a phenomenon together for systematic study” (Lampert and Ervin-Tripp, 1993, p. 169). According to the steps outlined by Corbin and Strauss (1990), the analysis began with Open Coding, where “event/action/interaction, and so forth, are compared against others for similarities and differences; they are also conceptually labeled…conceptually similar ones are grouped together to form categories and their subcategories” (p. 423). After Open Coding, Axial Coding was used to identify relationships among categories, i.e., what subcategories are related to a category, through “the ‘coding paradigm’ of conditions, context, strategies (action/interaction), and consequences” (p. 423).

For the classroom interaction recordings, what I coded were the instances of the students’ language behaviors in the classroom, which could be broken down into subtypes such as giving wrong answers, using taboo words, other-correction, and code-
switching. These categories emerged and developed from the data as I sought the meanings of the students’ language behaviors. After re-reading and re-coding, I found that giving wrong answers, using taboo words, and other-correction were the strategies through which the students expressed their resistance and humor or offered a friendly help; code-switching was their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors when they were arguing with their teacher. These language behaviors were also brought back to the participants for member checks during the interviews. To confirm my interpretations, I discussed my findings with the participants. For example, I played back Arthur’s conversations and asked him why he always used taboo words in class.

For the interview recordings, what got coded included (1) instances of talk about the students’ self-identification, which was assessed with multiple-choice items with possible alternative labels; (2) instances of talk about the students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning, where I identified authoritative and internally persuasive discourse and categorized the students’ potential patterns of ideological becoming by employing Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming; (3) segments identified for play-back with participants, including the students’ expressed attitudes toward their classroom language behaviors, as well as the teachers’ expressed attitudes concerning their students’ classroom language behaviors and their use of other languages in addition to Mandarin Chinese. Data from (1) and (2) were used to determine whether they were indicative of Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE).

Segments identified for play-back with participants were used to check findings generated from participant observation and uncover processes that could not be observed,
such as the conscious thought process behind their classroom language behaviors. If the participants’ interpretation of their classroom discourse was different from my analysis, this study would be based on the former in that a researcher should not rely on the surface and need to work with the participants’ interpretations. As noted by Maxwell (2005), “for observation, rich data are the product of detailed, descriptive note taking of the specific, concrete events that you observe” (p. 110), and “respondent validation is systematically soliciting feedback about your data and conclusions from the people you are studying” (p. 111). In this regard, my interpretation of the field notes and tape recordings were done by employing a process of coding where I reread them several times and also asked my participants about their interpretations in addition to my own ethnographic and linguistic knowledge. For instance, when I analyzed the other-corrections by Paul and Jack, in the beginning, it seemed to me that they both seized on their superior competence at English to correct their teacher’s English in order to gain a more powerful position in the conversations. Nevertheless, after I played back their conversations, Jack told me that he just wanted to help the teacher Lily have better English, and Lily reported that she was used to being corrected by her students and did not feel embarrassed. She could also learn English from her students.

In sum, this study employed an ethnographic approach to gain an in-depth understanding of student ethnic identity and language behaviors in the Chinese heritage language classroom. Through semi-structured interviews with the students, I interpreted their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning; through participant observation and audio recordings of classroom discourse, I focused
on how the students performed their uncooperative language behaviors, how they other-
corrected their teacher’s English, and how they expressed convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. These discussions are presented in Chapter 4 and 5.
Chapter 4: Student Ethnic Identity and Language Ideologies

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explore what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at through the examination of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. In previous articles, ethnic identity was thought of as “the ethnic component of social identity” (Phinney, 1990, p. 500) and was defined as “a subjective sense of belonging to an ethnic group and the feelings and attitudes that accompany this sense of group membership (Phinney, 2001, p. 136). That is, self-identification was considered the key aspect, and feelings of belonging like attitudes toward one’s group were emphasized (Phinney, 1990, p. 500). Many researchers examined the ethnic identity development of adolescents because they “must balance the demands of competing worlds as they progress from home to school and beyond” (Chik, 2010, p. 15). Tse (1997), for example, explored how language attitude toward the majority and heritage languages shifts as their sense of their ethnic identity changes over time. Her four stages of ethnic identity development encompass Unawareness, Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion, Ethnic Emergence, and Ethnic Identity Incorporation, showing that the ethnic minorities’ (EMs’) self-identification with their ethnic group changes during the four stages. The EMs who identify more strongly with
their ethnic group have more positive attitudes toward its language, and vice versa - those who reported more positive attitudes toward the use of their heritage language also identified more strongly with their ethnic group.

Likewise, “children are exposed to an array of overt and covert language ideologies through media, politics, parents, peers, and schooling” (Gonzalez and Arnot-Hopffer, 2003, p. 220). Like language attitude (Tse, 1997), I add a language ideology component to describe the students’ sense of their ethnic identity during one stage based on Bakhtin’s dialogic theory (1981, 1986) of discourse that “assumes a fusion of languages and social worlds in consciousness” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 75), because individuals’ language ideologies emerge from social contexts and from the voices of different individuals in the social contexts. Bakhtin’s concepts may thus provide a more in-depth analysis and enhance Tse’s model.

In the Chinese communities, they have had a long tradition of embracing language maintenance, and Taiwanese immigrant parents have hopes for their children to learn Mandarin Chinese. In this Chinese heritage language school, however, I noticed that some students were not fully motivated to learn about the Chinese language and culture and even displayed uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom in part because their parents wanted them to attend Chinese class. It may also be in part because they were at the developmental stage during which ethnic minority youths are not interested in their heritage and culture. A number of studies have shown that some ethnic minorities (EMs) follow a particular path in their ethnic identity development. They have suggested that most members of ethnic minority groups go through a process where at
first they prefer the dominant culture and language, then gradually become more aware of their ethnicity, and finally explore this culture and their identity (Kim, 1981; Phinney, 1989; Tse, 1997).

Tse (1998a) summarized previous research and proposed a four stage model of ethnic identity development, focusing on their attitudes toward the heritage and majority language. She used retrospective data and published personal stories to discover feelings and attitudes of the informants. The published personal stories included autobiographies and oral history compilations. Stage 2, called Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE), occurs primarily in childhood and adolescence. During this period, ethnic minorities (EMs) favor identification with the dominant ethnic / cultural group and distance themselves from or reject their ethnic culture. Such feelings may extend to their heritage language and affect their language beliefs, behaviors, and interest in developing their heritage language (Tse, 2000). Through interviews with four Korean American children who were born in the United States, You (2005) concluded that they seemed to be at Stage 2 since they expressed that they were struggling to learn Korean as their heritage language and sometimes appeared ambivalent and even negative toward their ethnic identity.

In order to understand how the four focal students at this Chinese heritage language school develop their ethnic identity, I adopt Tse’s (1998a) four stage model of ethnic identity development to examine what stage they may be at. They appear to be at Stage 2 or between Stage 2 and Stage 3 in terms of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. In Tse’s (2000) study, she examined
published narratives of a group of Americans of Asian descent at Stage 2 and summarized their views of the ethnic and dominant groups as (i) American and ethnic group identification; (ii) seeing themselves and others through borrowed eyes; (iii) distancing from the ethnic culture; (ix) alienation. The participants in her (2000) study self-identified as members of the “American” group and felt negatively toward association with the EM group. They had the desire to look more like the mainstream group, to disassociate from the EM culture, and to be accepted by the dominant group. In this current study, the interviews with the four focal students were used to discover their feelings, attitudes, and language ideologies. I first examined their self-identification so as to offer an understanding of their views of American and ethnic groups, using Tse’s (2000) framework. I found that Arthur identified himself as Chinese American, Bill as American-born Taiwanese, Paul as American-born Chinese (ABC), and Jack as American. Arthur told his mother that he wished his face had looked more like American Whites, suggesting that he might not be accepted by the dominant group. Jack reported that he was not that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture, indicating his disassociation from the ethnic culture.

In turn, I explore their ideologies about heritage language and language learning, building on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. Bakhtin (1981) argued that “The importance of struggling with another’s discourse, its influence in the history of an individual’s coming to ideological consciousness, is enormous” (p. 348). “Our ideological development is…an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and
ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values” (p. 346). Ideological becoming refers to “developing ways of viewing the world, belief systems, positionings and values, and their interacting and aligning with others” (Maguire & Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 52). Bakhtin (1981) defined authoritative discourse as follows.

The authoritative word is…so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already acknowledged in the past. It is a prior discourse…for example, the authority of religious dogma, or of acknowledged scientific truth or of a currently fashionable book.


Internally persuasive discourse is “denied all privilege, backed by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged in society” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342). It is what people think for themselves and is persuasive to the individual (Assaf and Dooley, 2010, p. 157). The discourse of others contributes to forming what is internally persuasive for us. “A variety of alien discourses enter the struggle for influence within an individual’s consciousness (just as they struggle with one another in the surrounding social reality)” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 348). I present the students’ three patterns of ideological becoming – (i) ideological affiliation: I prefer English; (ii) no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language; (iii) ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese. Those three patterns reveal that they may have negative feelings toward the ethnic culture and heritage language and prefer assimilation into the mainstream group and the use of the majority language.

The three categories, ideological affiliation, no ideological inheritance, and ideological resistance, are based on Rampton’s (1990) definitions of language affiliation
and inheritance as well as Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2007) analysis of ideological resistance. Rampton (1990) suggested replacing the terms “native speaker” and “mother tongue” with the notions of “language expertise”, “language inheritance”, and “language affiliation” (p. 97). Language affiliation refers to “the attachment or identification they feel for a language whether or not they nominally belong to the social group customarily associated with it”; language inheritance refers to “the ways in which individuals can be born into a language tradition that is prominent within the family and community setting whether or not they claim expertise in or affiliation to that language” (Leung, Harris, and Rampton, 1997, p. 555). Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) presented five patterns of ideological becoming and one of them is ideological resistance. They examined trilingual Chinese children’s ideological resistance in different ways. For example, they have to learn Chinese well due to their parents’ expectations; Chinese is the infrequently used language; studying Chinese is boring based on memorization and repetition, etc.

Based on Tse’s (2000) analysis of her participants’ language attitudes at Stage 2, the categories of language attitudes included (i) language and group membership: language is a sign of group membership; (ii) attitudes toward the dominant language: the favoritism toward English in interaction and viewing English as a sign of prestige; (iii) attitudes toward the heritage language: ambivalent or negative feelings toward the heritage language; (ix) parental influence on language attitudes: the parents encouraged their children’s Chinese learning or they want their children to learn the best English. In this current study, we found that the focal students’ self-identification reveals that
Taiwanese is a sign of group membership. In terms of Bakhtin’s theory, the students have no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language, which is different from her participants’ language attitudes toward the heritage language in Tse’s (2000) study - EMs at Stage 2 may have ambivalent or negative feelings toward the heritage language, falling anywhere along this “continuum” ranging from ambivalence to evasion (Tse, 1998b, p. 29). In this study, however, the students’ ideology does not fall anywhere along this “continuum”. And their ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese may help us understand more about how they may negotiate or struggle between the two forms of discourses – authoritative discourse (parents’ beliefs) and internally persuasive discourse (students’ views) in their ethnic identity development. However, Tse (2000) did not discuss her participants’ attitudes toward attending Chinese schools.

In order to understand the students’ ethnic identity during one stage and language behaviors, the present chapter examines the socio-cultural context of the Chinese heritage language schooling and discusses parents’ goals in sending their children to the Chinese school as well as the teachers’ language ideologies. Next, I report on the four focal students’ self-identification using Tse’s (1998) model and their ideologies about heritage language and language learning drawing on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. Finally, I examine what stage of ethnic identity development they may be at. The socio-cultural context of the Chinese heritage language classrooms may provide opportunities for teacher and student to use more than one language to accommodate each other in the classroom. Language ideology
may be connected to ethnic identity because the students’ language ideologies can also reflect how they are aware of their heritage language and ethnic group. Additionally, the stage the students may be at may lead to their lack of motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese, influence their attitudes toward classroom activities, and cause them to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the four focal students displayed their uncooperative language behaviors, other-corrections, and convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors. The findings seem to indicate the connection between their language behaviors and their self-identification and language ideologies. For instance, Arthur’s ideological resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese may affect his attitudes toward classroom activities and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. As native English speakers, Paul and Jack other-corrected their teacher’s nonnative English, suggesting that their American identity motivates the corrective actions. Through code-switching, Arthur and Bill converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language, implying that their group identities are fluid and cogroup memberships are negotiated during the processes of accommodation. These issues will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

4.2 The Socio-cultural Context of the Chinese Heritage Language School

Li and Wu (2008) reported that the policy of “Chinese only” in eleven Chinese heritage schools in the U.K. was taken very seriously by most teachers (p. 229). In contrast, Zhou and Li (2003) noted that in American Chinese schools, English is
habitually spoken by teachers, parents, and students. In such a bilingual and bicultural context like this Chinese heritage language school, are monolingual ideologies (one-language only, i.e., Chinese-only) still the guiding principle in the classrooms? What are teachers’ attitudes toward using other languages in addition to Mandarin Chinese? The analysis of the interview discourses from the teachers and parents shows that there seems to be no Chinese-only policy, and the two teachers appear to adopt perspectives of multilingualism and accommodation - English as a pedagogic tool and Taiwanese as part of the culture. Lily also regards the Chinese school as an informal educational setting. Parents send their children to the Chinese school for the maintenance of their children’s ethnic identity, the communication between family, and their children’s future.

4.2.1 Parents’ Goals in Sending Their Children to the Chinese Heritage Language School

A number of studies have found that immigrant parents’ positive attitudes toward their heritage culture and language help maintain their children’s heritage language and develop their positive cultural identity. For instance, the conclusion that Siu and Feldman (1995) drew from their study is that the parents and the family play a crucial role in educational success in that they provide social and emotional support to the children. Lee (2013) explored how Korean immigrant parents’ perspectives influence their children’s cultural identity and heritage language maintenance. The parents viewed Korean as a resource, including (i) a factor contributing to shaping their child’s ethnic identity; (ii) a resource to reinforce their children’s positive self-esteem in school; (iii) a factor
contributing to family cohesion; (ix) a key resource for their children’s future. The majority of the participating parents reported that they sent their children to the Korean Culture School mainly because it would allow their children to socialize with other Korean children more than just that their children would learn Korean. However, Chik (2010) investigated the effect of the parental ideologies on Chinese mother-tongue maintenance and suggested that “the parents adopt an ‘accommodation to’ perspective that focused not on maintenance of ethnic traditions but on adjustment to mainstream society” (p. xvi). Their children’s English dominance was also recognized as “integral to second generation identities” (p. xvi) and their use of English was accepted by adults in this school, indicating that English may play a central role in second-generation American lives and identities.

By contrast, the parents in this current study had positive attitudes about the heritage language, Mandarin Chinese, but in slightly different ways, viewing Mandarin Chinese as (i) a way to maintain their children’s ethnic identity; (ii) a tool to communicate with family; (iii) a resource for their children’s future.

A Way to Maintain Their Children’s Ethnic Identity

Almost every parent agreed that their children should speak Mandarin Chinese to maintain their ethnic identity. Alice’s father believed that Mandarin Chinese is their heritage, related to their culture, so it is necessary for his child to be exposed to Mandarin Chinese. In other words, language and culture are closely connected to each other. Jane’s mother identified herself as a Chinese from Taiwan, so she hoped that her children would
speak Mandarin Chinese. Her perspective reflected the close relationship between language and identity, implying that their child’s ethnic identity needs to be maintained through speaking the heritage language. The following are direct quotes from the interviews with the parents.

**Jane’s mother 0043 (0:07:48-0:08:05)**

Because I am Chinese, a Chinese from Taiwan, and I feel that it should be a little better to speak Mandarin Chinese. Because I identify myself with where I am from, I hope that they ((her children)) speak Mandarin Chinese too.

Arthur and Peter’s mother hoped that her children could know that their parents come from Taiwan, and they are both American and of Chinese descent.

**Arthur and Peter’s mother 0068 (0:48:15-0:48:47)**

I hope that he (her child) agrees on the both sides. You know, he knows he is American and of Chinese descent; that is, he has dual roles. I hope that they don’t say, “I want to be American”. I don’t hope that he has such an idea. I hope that he agrees that he has two identities.
In addition to maintaining their children’s ethnic identities, Arthur and Peter’s mother seems to adopt a perspective of accommodation that focuses not only on maintenance of ethnic identity but also on adjustment to mainstream society in that she wants her children to have dual identities.

_A Tool to Communicate with Family_

In Lee’s (2013) study, the participating parents reported that maintaining Korean language skills could help their children to communicate, share inner emotions and express themselves, which would make cohesive their relationship with their own family and relatives in Korea. In my informal conversations with some nonparticipating parents in this Chinese heritage school, they also viewed Mandarin Chinese as a tool to communicate with family. The teacher Lily, Jack’s mother, stated that the top reason why she sent Jack to the Chinese heritage language school was that Jack could communicate with family members at home and relatives in Taiwan. Below is the quote from the interview with her.

*Jack’s mother: Lily 0051 (0:40:31-0:42:24)*

兩個語言一起講是最好的，妳也知道小孩子學語言最快。所以我們當初的想法是說，就兩個一起學，而且我們還有家人在台灣，打電話跟阿公阿媽講話，你必須跟家人溝通。小時候沒有想那麼多，純粹是家人的溝通，多一種語言多一種選擇。

It is the best that two languages can be spoken together because kids learn languages the fastest. So we think that Jack can learn the two languages together. We have family in Taiwan, so when calling Grandfather and Grandmother, you have to communicate with your family members. I didn’t think about it that much.
when Jack was little; it is just because of communicating with family members. One more language means one more choice.

_A Resource for Their Children’s Future_

With China’s economic development in the global market, the increasing importance of Mandarin Chinese makes more and more parents in this Chinese heritage school believe that maintaining the Chinese language would serve their children as an advantage in their future. Alice’s father reported that having his child knowledgeable in Mandarin Chinese is necessary as English, Mandarin Chinese, and Spanish are of great importance in the United States. Edison’s mother emphasized that the importance of competition when I asked her why learning Mandarin Chinese is important. She said in the interview, “多個機會啊！將來跟人家出去競爭也是不一樣啊！” (One more opportunity! It will make a difference when you compete with others!). Arthur and Peter’s mother stated that being bilingual is the best for her children’s future and work.

_Arthur and Peter’s mother 0068 (0:43:05-0:43:25)_

我是希望說他就是兩個語言都能夠很溜，因為我覺得是..bilingual 這個是最好的啦，就是你自己有另外一個語言能力的話，那對你將來，做事啊，什麼發展都會比較好。

I mean, I hope that he ((her child)) can be fluent in both languages because I feel..being bilingual is the best, meaning that it is better for your future, work, or development if you have another language skill.

In summary, this study suggests that Taiwanese immigrant parents in the USA tend to have positive attitudes about the heritage language maintenance of their children
in general. Many researchers have claimed that immigrant parents have much influence on their children’s heritage language maintenance and their cultural identity development (Lee, 2013, p. 1587). In addition to immigrant parents, immigrant children’s teachers also play such a role by helping the immigrant children to develop positive attitudes toward their heritage language and a positive cultural identity (Lee, 2013, p. 1587). Thus, there is a need to explore the teachers’ language ideologies, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.2.2 Two Teachers’ Language Ideologies

In Chik’s (2010) study, the use of English at a Chinese Saturday school is seen as “a prominent indicator of accommodation toward mainstream demands and considerations” (p. 164) because of its help in teaching the heritage language. The quotations from the interviews with the teachers Vivian and Lily showed that they commonly chose to switch between Mandarin Chinese and English in order to arouse students’ interest and attention in learning Mandarin Chinese or for classroom management. Even though they expressed the view that using Mandarin Chinese only was the ideal teaching and learning method, it was still necessary that English was used as a pedagogic tool because of the students’ lack of proficiency in Mandarin Chinese.
4.2.2.1 English as a Pedagogic Tool

*Vivian (eighth grade)*

Vivian was an English teacher at one language school in Taiwan before she came to the United States. It was an immersion program where English was used only in class. When the students did not understand what their English teacher (an English native speaker) was saying, Vivian needed to jump in to make clarification in Mandarin Chinese. Such an experience has an influence on how she teaches Mandarin Chinese in this Chinese heritage language school. In other words, she speaks Mandarin Chinese as much as possible in class, but English can be used to help her explain Chinese words.

0062 (0:01:59-0:02:27)

1. T: So now my teaching method is like this and I copy ((the experience in Taiwan)). I keep speaking Mandarin Chinese as possible as I can, and it is OK if they don’t understand. But I will notice that if they withdraw and pay no attention, and I may begin guessing if they don’t understand what I am saying. My philosophy is that I keep speaking Mandarin Chinese, but you need to ask me if you don’t understand.

(Translation)

1. T: 所以現在我在班上教法就是這樣，copy 過來，我盡量用中文一直講一直講一直講，他們不懂就算了，可是我會看嘛，我用中文一直講，然後如果我看他們已經 withdraw 了，他們沒有在 pay attention 了，那我可能就要開始要猜想說，他們是不是不知道我在講什麼，那我的 philosophy 就是要問，老師會一直講中文，可是你不懂就要問我。

Like an immersion program, Vivian’s policy was also to keep speaking Mandarin Chinese in class. She hoped that her students could ask her if they could not follow her
Mandarin Chinese. She felt that her students understood her although they all answered her questions in English when she asked them in Mandarin Chinese. They would not reply in Mandarin Chinese unless she requested them to. She further provided an explanation about why her students would not do so in the following excerpt.

0062 (0:02:45-0:03:18)

1 T: 可是我會堅持說你用中文講，他會回我中文，可是只有單詞。
2 他的整句不會，所以他們詞會，他們詞英中互換可以。可是是 syntax, 那個
3 structure 他們沒有沒有那個 practice 去 construct 它的 sentence,
4 他們不 feel comfortable 用中文組句，
5 他們是因為這樣不肯講(中文)。

(Translation)

1 T: But I will insist that you ((her students)) talk in Mandarin Chinese. He/she will reply in Mandarin Chinese, yet only in words. He/she cannot make whole sentences, but they can exchange English and Chinese words. About the syntax and structure, they don’t practice constructing Chinese sentences. They don’t feel comfortable to make Chinese sentences. That’s why they don’t want to speak it.

The major reason was that her students had problems with speaking Mandarin Chinese. They used Chinese words in reply rather than Chinese sentences because they practiced constructing Chinese sentences less. In this context, it seems that using more than one language in teaching is necessary for Vivian.

0062 (0:03:56-0:04:20)

1 R: 基本上你覺得在你教書的這個過程中，
2 妳覺得使用一個語言以上其實是有必要的？
3 T: 對對。

4 R: 那原因為什麼？你是覺得幫助他們理解嗎？
5 用英文輔助這樣子。

6 T: 我覺得一定是堅持用中文，全部，可是英文只是來 clarify, 來輔助，可是
7 應該是要用中文一直講。

(Translation)

1 R: Basically, when teaching, you feel that it is actually necessary to use more than one
2 language?

3 T: Yes.

4 R: What is the reason? Do you think it helps them understand ((Mandarin Chinese))?
5 English is an assistant aid.

6 T: I feel that I have to insist on using Mandarin Chinese, all, but English is used only
7 to clarify and to assist. I should keep speaking Mandarin Chinese.

Vivian still insisted on using Mandarin Chinese and English was just used as a
tool to assist in teaching. However, based on my observation, Vivian used more English
than she thought, and mixed Mandarin Chinese and English together sometimes. When
asked the purpose of using English, she reported that she intended to arouse her students’
attention to correct her students or for classroom management. As their dominant
language, English is powerful and persuasive to the students in the classroom. Like
Vivian, Lily offered the same explanation that she used English in teaching.
Lily (ninth grade)

When asked her motivation to use English in class, Lily explained that she viewed English as a teaching tool to help her students understand what she was saying in Mandarin Chinese. At least, the students could hear two languages being spoken together. It was really very difficult for her to teach exclusively in Mandarin Chinese since her students’ communicative skills in Mandarin Chinese were totally different, although she really hoped that Mandarin Chinese was used only in class.

0051 (0:36:40-0:37:02)

1 R: 所以妳覺得這樣子很OK, 所以兩個語言都有聽到, 最主要目的是幫助他們理
2 解, 這個中文的意思, 他們的學習。
3 T: 因為我不要讓他們說聽不懂我在講什麼, 那也不好。
4 R: 所以其實英文有點像教學的工具啦。我聽妳這樣講就是說, 它幫助讓學生理
5 解中文, 所以基本上妳不排斥用到英文這樣。
6 T: 對。

(Translation)

1 R: So you think that it is OK and two languages can be heard. The main purpose is to
2 help them understand Chinese and learn ((Chinese)).
3 T: Because I don’t hope that they don’t understand what I am saying. That’s not fine.
4 R: So in fact, English is like a teaching tool. My understanding is that it helps the
5 students to understand Chinese, so basically, you won’t resist using English.
6 T: Yes.
T: In our class, every student’s proficiency in Mandarin Chinese is totally different. You cannot talk only in English.

Overall, the findings from these above quotations suggest that two teachers’ use of English appear to be a necessary strategy since it is not feasible to use Mandarin Chinese only in their classrooms. In other words, Vivian and Lily did not follow the policy of “Chinese-only” as Li and Wu (2008) reported. As a matter of fact, they both told me in private that there was no so-called “Chinese-only” policy in this Chinese heritage language school; their principal never requested the teachers in this school to execute such a policy. The teachers never prohibited their students from speaking English in class either. Silver (2003) noted that the use of English during Chinese classes is “an accommodation to the American cultural and linguistic identities of these children” (p. 197), which seems appropriate to a bilingual context like this Chinese school where Chinese and American identities exist together and English is the students’ dominant language.

Next, it is noteworthy that Taiwanese is another language used in the eighth and ninth grade classrooms, indicating that this Chinese school is like a multilingual space for more accommodation of languages in teacher–student interaction.
4.2.2.2 Taiwanese as Part of the Culture

Taiwan is a multicultural and multilingual country. Based on Tien (2009), Mandarin Chinese is the official national language for education, government, business and administration, etc. Other local languages/dialects include Taiwanese, Hakka, and all the aboriginal languages. Mandarin Chinese is the only one language with a writing system. Taiwanese, spoken in the Southern Min, China, is also called the Southern Min language and used in everyday situations between family members and friends or in other informal settings. In recent years, the educational reform has been implemented in elementary and junior high school education (Grade 1-9). English is taught from grades five to nine, and Taiwanese is an optional course in elementary school and is taught one hour per week (Tien, 2009, p. 176).

Both the teachers come from Taiwan and the interviews with them revealed that they do not reject the use of Taiwanese in class because it is part of the culture, meaning that Taiwanese is seen as a marker of community/ingroup membership. Like the multilingual development in Taiwan, the teachers’ attitudes toward Taiwanese appear to reflect this view as well.

According to my observation, the teachers and several of their students used Taiwanese words in the two classrooms at times, like “遜腳” (xun ka, loser), “蚵仔麵線” (e a mi sua, oyster thin noodles), and so on. In the following excerpt, the teacher, Vivian, used Taiwanese first, and interestingly, her students also responded in Taiwanese.
Taking a quiz (0084 Vivian - You are so lucky 0:05:04-0:05:13)

The teacher, Vivian, was walking around the classroom to check on the students’ answers.

1  T: (pointing to the word in the paper) Yes, um, 好。 Hao ‘Good.’

2  Jean: 好。 Hao ‘Good.’

3  T: 什麼字？ She mo zi ‘What word?’

4  Xm: <F 好 F>。 Hao ‘Good.’

5  T: 好。 (2) 什麼事？ Hao She mo shi ‘OK.’ ‘What thing?’

4  Ss: 什麼？ <F 呀呀呀 F>... She mo Yiyiyi ‘What?’ ‘Well…’

In this exchange, Vivian just chatted with her students in Taiwanese. Here, the use of Taiwanese for informal communication seems to help lighten the atmosphere and break down the boundary of the teacher and the students. Additionally, in Vivian’s view, the Taiwanese language was part of the culture in Taiwan, and she did not reject the use of Taiwanese in class. She even hoped that her students could be exposed to Taiwanese.
Vivian (eighth)

0062 (0:34:48–0:37:24)

1 T: 可是你回去台灣過的話，你多少你的親戚裡面你會講嘛，所以我也會覺得說
2 希望他們也有一些這些的 exposure 這樣。

(…)

3 R: 所以其實妳也不排斥說用第三種語言。

4 T: 對，我不排斥，對，因為我覺得就像我講的，它已經是文化的一種了。
(Translation)

1 T: If you have been back to Taiwan, some of your relatives speak ((Taiwanese)), so I
2 also hope that they can have some exposure to it.

(…)

3 R: So actually, you don’t resist using the third language.
3 T: No, I don’t. Well, because I feel that it has been part of the culture, just as I said.

That the students can have a little exposure to Taiwanese suggests Vivian’s
multilingual perspective. This may provide a “safe” space (Li and Wu, 2008) for Bill to
use Taiwanese to deal with tensions and conflicts with Vivian in the classroom, which
will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Lily (ninth grade)

In addition to using English, I found Lily also used a little Taiwanese in the
classroom sometimes when talking about Taiwanese food or terms of address like “阿嬤”
(A-ma, grandmother), “阿伯” (A-bei, uncle), etc. She reported that a few of her students
could speak several Taiwanese words, and she was fine with their use of Taiwanese in class, yet she did not intend to teach Taiwanese.

0094 (0:19:22-0:19:50)

1 T: 我對台語，就是說他們台語這個我沒有，我不是特別加強在裡面。

2 R: 但是如果上課中偶而使用到台語，妳覺得 OK?

3 T: OK, 沒問題。

4 R: 那學生如果也冒出台語，使用台語妳也覺得 OK 這樣子？

5 T: 沒問題啊！畢竟我們都是台灣來的啊！爸爸媽媽其實都是台灣人，很多都是台語人。

(Translation)

1 T: I don’t intend to teach them Taiwanese. I don’t emphasize it.

2 R: But if you use Taiwanese occasionally in class, do you feel it is OK?

3 T: OK. No problem.

4 R: If the students also speak Taiwanese, do you feel it is OK too?

5 T: No problem! After all, we are all from Taiwan! Their parents are in fact Taiwanese; many of them are Taiwanese.

In this Chinese school, most of the parents are from Taiwan and can speak Taiwanese. Like Vivian, Lily also concurred that the Taiwanese language is part of the culture in Taiwan, as the basis of being Taiwanese.
To summarize, the views of the two teachers in these quotations signal that the students’ use of Taiwanese is also legitimate in this Chinese classroom. In other words, the students are more active and the use of other languages like English and Taiwanese is not viewed negatively and can be allowed. In Tien’s (2009) study, Taiwanese was sometimes used by Teacher B for solidarity. He sometimes used Taiwanese to interact with students when walking around the classroom to check on students’ pair or group activities. He replied in Taiwanese when students initiated conversation in Taiwanese. Likewise, in the above excerpt “taking a quiz”, Vivian’s students replied in Taiwanese when she was walking around the classroom to check on their answers and chatted with them in Taiwanese. Taiwanese seemed to play such a role in establishing or maintaining solidarity. In Chapter 5, the two conversations between Vivian and Bill indicate that their language convergence was used as an accommodating way to avoid conflicts. As noted previously, Taiwanese seems like a sign of community/ingroup membership. Subsequently, Lily’s “informal education” ideology is explicated in the next excerpt. Her view shows that it is less formal in this Chinese school than in the formal educational settings.

4.2.2.3 The Chinese School as an Informal Educational Setting

In Chinese culture, Confucianism has been accentuated in the formal educational setting for over two thousand years; it includes “an authoritarian ideology and hierarchical relationships within the family, society and the state” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 55). That said, in Confucian tradition, teachers are the powerful
party and take control of the classroom, and students have to respect them and their teachings. Nevertheless, the following response by the teacher, Lily, reflects the opposite view.

**0094 Lily (0:06:03-0:06:54)**

1 T: 在中文學校這個環境裡面，不像是說，不像那個什麼國外，就是說妳在那個
2 什麼課堂，在正式的課堂上那麼那個什麼 (.2) 那麼正式妳知道嗎？

3 R: 哦...那像在台灣那樣子就是很正式。

4 T: 對，那我們這個中文學校最主要只是，
5 老實講對我跟他們來講只是互相。

6 R: 哦哦哦。

7 T: 對啦，我教他們中文，他們教我英文。

8 R: 哦 @，所以妳覺得妳跟他們的那個 status,
9 就是那個位子地位其實是很接近的嗎？沒有說老師比較高，
10 學生比較低？

11 T: 沒有，像他小時候的話我比較權威性的，因為我必須壓著他們，那現在他們
12 長大了，懂事了，我就不會用那種方式。

(Translation)

1 T: In this Chinese school, it is not like, not like in the foreign countries; in other words,
2 it is not that formal as in the formal classrooms. Do you know?

3 R: Oh...it is very formal in Taiwan.

4 T: Right, our Chinese school is mainly just, to be honest, just ((a place)) where they
5 and I learn from each other.

6 R: Oh-oh-oh.
T: Yeah, I teach them Mandarin Chinese and they teach me English.

R: Oh, so you feel that the statuses of yours and theirs, that said, the statuses are actually very close? You don’t think that the teacher’s is higher and the students’ are lower?

T: No, I was more authoritative when they were little because I had to control them. Now they grow up and mature, and I won’t (teach them)) in that way.

Here, Lily’s “informal education” ideology positions her in the heritage language classroom as a teacher with less authority, giving rise to the shift of power dynamics - the teacher may not have a higher status than the students. Additionally, this Chinese school is a place for bilingual development, where Lily and the students learn from each other – she teaches the students Mandarin Chinese, and the students teach her English. This indicates her “bilingualism” ideology - Mandarin Chinese is not the dominant language, and English is still influential in the classroom.

In what follows, I turn to the four focal students by exploring their self-identification and their ideologies about heritage language and language learning to assess what stage of ethnic identity development they may be at. Through examining published narratives of Americans of Asian descent and the retrospective interviews with them, Tse (2000) discovered that these feelings when they were at Stage 2 (EAE) extended to the heritage language and affected their language beliefs and behaviors. If the focal students in the present study are also at Stage 2, they may have little or no interest in their ethnic heritage and language, leading to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. In Chapter 5, I will discuss their uncooperative language behaviors such as giving wrong answers, using taboo words, and arguing with the teacher.
4.3 Four Students’ Self-identification and Ideologies about Heritage Language and Language Learning

In Tse’s (1998) four stage model of ethnic identity development, Stage 1, Unawareness, typically occurs before attending school or leaving an ethnic enclave. During this relatively brief period, ethnic minorities (EMs) are not conscious of their minority status (p. 15-16). At Stage 2, Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion, EMs may feel ambivalent or have negative feelings toward their ethnic culture and prefer identification with the dominant societal group. This stage may evolve over a relatively long period, for example, childhood through adolescence, and even through adulthood (p. 16). Stage 3, Ethnic Emergence, is a period when EMs explore their ethnic heritage after they realize the fact that they are members of an ethnic minority group. (p. 16). Through examining the students’ self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, we can better understand whether or not they are conscious of their minority status, have negative feelings toward their ethnic culture, or begin to explore their ethnic heritage, as well as whether they reject or become more interested in learning their heritage language. The following interviews with the four focal students illuminate their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning.

4.3.1 Self-identification

Arthur (eighth grade)

Arthur and Paul are brothers and were born and raised in the United States. Their parents are Taiwanese immigrants. Arthur identified himself as Chinese American.
When asked about why he did not choose American-born “Taiwanese”, Arthur reported that he does not speak Taiwanese. In contrast, Bill identified himself as American-born Taiwanese.

**Bill (eighth grade)**

0054 (0:19:05-0:20:07)

1 R: 那你自己覺得自己到底是哪一國人啊？

2 Bill: 中國人。

3 R: 中國人？讓你選好了，Taiwanese, Chinese-American,

4 Bill: Taiwanese.

5 R: Taiwanese 還是 ABC?

6 Bill: ABC.
R: ABC is American-born Chinese,可是我是想要講 American-born Taiwanese,
不曉得你覺得你自己比較像因為你是這邊出生，
但爸媽都是 immigrants,都是移民，所以我不知道你對自己的角色，
自己覺得我到底是哪一國人？

Bill: 哦…ABC.

R: 又改了。@@@

Bill: 我不知道 all choices.

R: 還是 American, 就只有 American? 我給你很多選擇，再說一次，至少有 5 個，
Taiwanese, Chinese-American, ABC (American-born Chinese), American-born
Taiwanese, American.

Bill: 第四個。

(Translation)

1 R: What do you think your nationality is?
2 Bill: Chinese.
3 R: Chinese? You have the options to choose from, Taiwanese, Chinese-American,
4 Bill: Taiwanese.
5 R: Taiwanese or ABC?
6 Bill: ABC.
7 R: ABC means American-born Chinese, but I would like to mention American-born
Taiwanese. I don’t know you think you are more like…because you were born
here but your parents are immigrants, I don’t know how you identify yourself, and
where do you think you are from?.
8 Bill: Oh…ABC.
9 R: You changed ((your choice)) again. @@@
10 Bill: I don’t know all choices.
R: Or American? Only American? I provide many choices for you to choose from.

Bill: The fourth one.

In this excerpt, Bill changed his answer several times, and later on, he asked me to provide all the choices for him to choose from. It seemed that he did not really speculate his self-identification before. Like Arthur, Paul also gave the same reason for why he did not choose American-born “Taiwanese”. He identified himself as American-born Chinese (ABC).

Paul (ninth grade)

0065 (0:34:51-0:35:17)

1 R: Taiwanese 和 Chinese 你分得清楚嗎？你有沒有看到它後面那一個，
2 就是 ABC 跟後面的 American-born Taiwanese，
3 你有沒有覺得有差別？

4 Paul: 有差別，因為我是台灣人，可是我不知道怎麼講台語，
5 我也不知道怎麼聽台語，
6 可是我知道怎麼講還有聽[中文]話。

(Translation)

1 R: Can you tell the difference between Taiwanese and Chinese? Did you see the one behind it? ABC and American-born Taiwanese behind it. Can you see the difference between the two?

4 Paul: There is a difference because I am Taiwanese, but I don’t know how to speak Taiwanese, and I don’t know how to understand Taiwanese either. However, I know how to speak and understand Mandarin Chinese.
Jack’s father is American and his mother is Taiwanese. He was born and raised in the United States as well. Jack identified himself as American.

*Jack (ninth grade)*

0049 (0:21:18-0:21:55)

1 R: How would you describe yourself? Do you think you are Taiwanese, Chinese-American…

2 Jack: (.2) Mostly, American.

3 R: Not Taiwanese or Asian?

4 Jack: I mean,

5 R: But your mom is Taiwanese, and your father is American, so…

6 Jack: Yeah.

7 R: Most of the time, you think you are American?

8 Jack: Yes, because I mean, I live in America, and I mean, I go on a vacation in Taiwan and stuff, but I am not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture, I think. I mean I understand Taiwanese culture so far, but I am mostly American.

When asked why he did not identify himself as Taiwanese or Asian, Jack reported in line 10 that he was not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture although he understood Taiwanese culture.

In the four interview excerpts above, Arthur and Paul viewed the Taiwanese language as an ethnic group symbol. As noted earlier, “Whatever choice is made regarding group membership, language is a key factor – an identification badge – for both self and outside perception” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 199). In other words, language is
often viewed as a sign of group membership and whether the speaker uses a certain language or not may embody his/her particular cultural identity. Jack explained why he identified himself as American from the perspective of culture – he was not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture, suggesting his distance from the ethnic culture. Bill is the only one who identified himself as American-born “Taiwanese” since he reported that he could speak a little Taiwanese when I played back his conversations where he used Taiwanese in response to his teacher Vivian, which is discussed in Chapter 5.

Using Tse’s (1998a) framework, the students’ views of the ethnic group indicate that Arthur and Paul seem to be at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE). Regardless of how they identify themselves, Chinese American or American-born Chinese, at least they are aware that they are of Chinese descent and speak Chinese. Interestingly, they do not speak Taiwanese, so they do not identify themselves as Taiwanese. Taiwan is a multicultural and multilingual country, where Mandarin Chinese is the official national language and Taiwanese is the local language. As discussed earlier, both the teachers view Taiwanese as part of the culture, meaning that Taiwanese is seen as a marker of community/ingroup membership because “the heritage language is a sign of ethnic group association” (Tse, 1997, p. 78-79). In other words, not only Mandarin Chinese but also Taiwanese can be regarded as the basis of their ethnic identity. They are not at Stage 3 - Ethnic Emergence in that they seem to be aware that they are members of the Chinese ethnic group, but they do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language, which is discussed in the next section. They do not have ideological affiliation
with Mandarin Chinese because Arthur does not quite understand what “heritage” means; Paul reported that his Mandarin Chinese is not good enough; Jack stated that he is not part of the ethnic culture. Based on Tse’s modal, at Stage 3, EMs explore their cultural heritage and lead some of them to embrace their ethnic heritage. As a result, “language became an important part of establishing a link to that group” (Tse, 1997, p. 76). Nevertheless, the students are still at Stage 2 since they prefer the use of the majority language, English, and have no ideological inheritance with Mandarin Chinese. They even prefer assimilation into the mainstream group. For example, Arthur prefers identification with the dominant societal group – the U.S. Arthur’s mother mentioned in the interview that she was surprised at what Arthur told her a couple of years ago - he wished his face had looked more like American Whites. She was wondering if he was bullied at school, but he said no. Yet, it appeared that Arthur was unable to achieve acceptance into the dominant group at that time. Arthur also expressed this feeling in the following excerpt.

0083 (0:00:56-0:01:26)

1 R: 那你覺得你自己像美國人嗎？
2 Arthur: 嗯 (.1), No. /
3 R: 是嗎？
4 Arthur: Yeah.
5 R: 那你覺得自己像什麼人？
6 Arthur: 哦 (.1), half American, half Chinese.
R: 就一半一半。

Arthur: 嗯嗯。

R: OK. 那你比較喜歡做哪一種人？有沒有特別喜歡做美國人還是…

Arthur: 美國人。

R: 那有沒有原因？這個沒有對錯，你講沒有關係，姐姐想知道。

Arthur: 哦，學校比較簡單。

(Translation)
1 R: Do you feel that you are American?
2 Arthur: Um (.1), No. /
3 R: Really?
4 Arthur: Yeah.
5 R: What kind of person do you think you are?
6 Arthur: Oh (.1), half American, half Chinese.
7 R: Half and half.
8 Arthur: Uh-huh.
9 R: OK. What kind of person do you prefer being? Do you especially like being American or…
11 R: What is the reason? It’s no judgment. I would like to know that.
12 Arthur: Oh, school is easier.
In this exchange, Arthur expressed that he liked being American, showing the desire to be accepted into the dominant group. Additionally, he preferred not only assimilation into the mainstream American group but also the use of the majority language, English, because school was easier for him.

I reason that Jack may be at Stage 2 (EAE) too. Although he identified himself as American, he must be aware of his mother’s ethnicity and just seems to prefer to identify with his father’s. He reported that he understood Taiwanese culture but was not really that culturally affected by it, so he was mostly American and preferred identification with the dominant societal group. Bill identified himself as American-born Taiwanese probably because his parents are from Taiwan and he can speak a little Taiwanese, supporting the argument discussed earlier that Taiwanese may be a marker of community/ingroup membership and the basis of his ethnic identity. He appears to be at Stage 2 because he prefers the use of the majority language, English; he also seems to demonstrate Stage 3 because he views Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language, meaning that he has ideological inheritance with Mandarin Chinese. I reason that Bill may be between Stage 2 and Stage 3 since he originally identified himself as American and did not like speaking Mandarin Chinese according to his mom’s comments in the interview, which is discussed in the next section. It seems that he has not fully embraced his ethnic heritage yet but his exploration during Stage 3 may be in progress. In turn, the next section provides more insights into the four focal students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning and further examines whether they are at Stage 2 - EAE.
4.3.2 Ideologies about Heritage Language and Language Learning

Drawing on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse, Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen’s (2007) study focused on the identity accounts of trilingual Chinese children at a Chinese heritage language school in Canada by examining a selection of thirty-seven pieces, short essays and/or diary entries, and family letters in Chinese. Five patterns of ideological becoming were presented, including (i) ideological tacit double voicing: I like both schools (Chinese and French schools) – the children ideologically position themselves in more than one location and language, and their utterances are double voiced in that they are responding to their own internally persuasive discourse and the authoritative discourse of parents, teachers and children from other language communities; (ii) ideological allegiance: I am Chinese and I miss China – the children’s language inheritance is associated with their teachers’ discursive practices within the Zhonguo School, and “going to Chinese school” is connected to the child’s self-acknowledged Chinese identity, meaning that different schools can serve as contact zones for language encounters, where the children can appropriate or resist the discourse or words of others; (iii) ideological conflicts and dilemmas: I use my broken French for communication – conflicts and dilemmas may arise when authoritative and internally persuasive discourses interact in children’s ideological becoming. In a Chinese heritage language environment, some children still tend to use English and French more than Chinese for social communication in that they are socialized in English and French at their “everyday” schools and English and French languages are sometimes more valued; (iv) ideological affiliations: I like English more. I
like my French school – the children use English and French as mediational tools as a result of their daily practices in the two languages, which may also constrain their ideological allegiance to their heritage language and culture; (v) ideological resistance – it is often the parents who decide that their children have to attend a Chinese heritage language school and learn Mandarin Chinese well. Additionally, the children express their resistance because they perceive the discursive practices in the heritage school as boring, meaningless dictations and memorization tasks.

Like Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007), I also use the definition of language ideology from Woolard (1998): “representations whether explicit or implicit that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (p. xxii). In this present study, Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming also frame my exploration, and I examine how the four focal students negotiate or struggle between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses in their interview discourses. The findings show that Arthur, Paul, and Jack prefer English and do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language, which can be categorized as ideological affiliation and no ideological inheritance, based on Rampton’s (1990) distinction of two aspects of language loyalty: (the first language) inheritance and (the second language) affiliation (p. 99). They also express that they do not really like learning Mandarin Chinese, which can be seen as a symbol of ideological resistance. The three focal students are still at Stage 2 because they may have negative feelings toward the ethnic culture and heritage language and prefer assimilation into the mainstream group and the use of the majority language. Compared to the three students, Bill expresses ideological inheritance and no ideological resistance.
since he views Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language and likes attending this Chinese school. It seems that Bill is developing his ethnic identity.

4.3.2.1 Ideological Affiliation: I prefer English

The following excerpts from the interview with Arthur, Paul, Bill, and Jack reflected their preference and liking for English. Extensive contact with English in American public school and outside Chinese classrooms was one of their common explanations. As noted by Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007), “Schools as mainstream ideological environments in socialization and ideological becoming transmit not only academic knowledge but also the socio-cultural knowledge and practices of mainstream society” (p. 67). Another reason for their preference and liking for English was that their Chinese proficiency also affected the motivation to use Mandarin Chinese. For them, English was simpler to use.

Arthur (eighth grade)

Arthur reported that he always responded in English even though the interlocutor spoke Mandarin Chinese since he preferred English to Mandarin Chinese. When asked about the reason why he preferred speaking English, he said that English was simpler for him.

0069 (0:05:12-0:05:50)

1 R: 還是有一個情況就是，人家開口第一句話跟你講中文，
2 那你會不會回答中文？
Arthur: 不會。

R: 不會？你還是回答英文喔？你是不是覺得自己中文不好？

Arthur: 因為我不喜歡說中文。

R: 為什麼？是因為講得不好的關係嗎？

Arthur: 我比較喜歡說英文，講英文。

R: 對，那原因，the reason 是因為你中文不好嗎？

Arthur: 哦..不知道，我比較喜歡英文。

R: 你就是比較喜歡英文。那你會覺得英文比較好，比較 better 嗎？

Arthur: 比較簡單。

(Translation)

R: One more situation: when someone begins to talk with you speaks in Mandarin Chinese, will you respond in Mandarin Chinese?

Arthur: No.

R: No? You still respond in English? Don’t you think that your Mandarin Chinese is good? @@@

Arthur: Because I don’t like speaking Mandarin Chinese.

R: Why? Is that because you don’t speak good Mandarin Chinese?

Arthur: I prefer speaking English, using English.

R: Right, that reason, the reason is because your Mandarin is not good?

Arthur: Oh..I don’t know. I like English better.
R: You just like English better. Do you think English is better?

Arthur: Simpler.

The majority of the students at the Chinese heritage language school had similar comments that they felt more comfortable with English than with Mandarin Chinese for the same reason - English was easy for them to express themselves. In the following, I asked Arthur again about the reason why he preferred English.

0083 (0:00:42-0:00:50)

1 R: 那還有沒有其他理由？

2 Arthur: 在美國有比較多的人說英文啊。

(Translation)

1 R: Are there any other reasons?

2 Arthur: More people speak English in the U.S.

Here, the reason that more people speak English in the U.S. implies that Arthur’s affiliation with English is a result of years of contact and socialization in an English context in that he spends much of his day in an English-speaking macro environment, immersing himself in American language and culture outside the Chinese heritage language school. I reason that his daily discursive practices in English may constrain his ideological allegiance to his heritage language and culture. He also commented that he was a little more like American when speaking English, just as shown below.
R: Do you think when you speak English, it means you are good and smart? Then I am like American? Do you have such a feeling?

Arthur: A little bit. /

In their study, Maguire & Curdt-Christiansen (2007) examined the identity accounts of a group of Chinese children who attended a heritage language school in Canada and also argued that “their daily discursive practices in English and French may lead them to use the languages as mediational tools in their own positioning” (p. 67). In this interview excerpt, Arthur remarked that when he spoke English, he felt that he was a little more like American and even good and smart, indicating that the language one uses...
may reflect his/her self-identification since language, as an ethnic identity marker and an ethnic group symbol, “is central to the establishment and maintenance of group boundaries” (Tse, 1997, p. 11). Additionally, it seems that Arthur views English as a sign of prestige and has a sense of superiority in that English is used to position him as a competent person. Such a social viewpoint, or the larger authoritative discourse, becomes internalized in his consciousness.

Likewise, Bill preferred English because he had to use English for communication in public school, and his English was better than Chinese. Yet, he did not express that he did not want to speak Mandarin Chinese.

**Bill (eighth grade)**

0054 (0:16:18-0:17:05)

1 R: 你比較 prefer 講哪一種語言？不管任何人啊，
2 他會不會中文或英文。

3 Bill: 英文。

4 R: 那你比較 prefer 英文這樣子，那為什麼？

5 Bill: 因為我是學校都是英文的，他這個就是一個星期兩個小時就沒有了，so 一
6 天 I have to 講英文。

7 R: 最後一句是什麼？

8 Bill: 講英文比較多。

9 R: 那你講英文比較多。那這邊中文課就只有兩小時就沒了。
10 可是那你會不會覺得，那時候覺得自己中文不好，自己不太想講中文？有沒
11 有這種感覺？
R: Which language do you prefer speaking? No matter who can or cannot speak Mandarin Chinese or English.

Bill: English.

R: You prefer English. But why?

Bill: Because English is spoken at school. Here ((in this Chinese school)) it is just two hours a week, and that’s all, so I have to speak English all day.

R: What is the last sentence?

Bill: I speak more English.

R: You speak more English. Here Chinese class only lasts two hours ((every week)).

But don’t you think that your Mandarin Chinese was good at that time, so you didn’t really want to speak Mandarin Chinese? Did you have such a feeling?

Bill: No.

R: No. Because you prefer speaking English and everyone speaks English in this ((American)) environment?

Bill: Hum.

Additionally, unlike Arthur, Bill commented that he did not get the feeling that he was more like American when speaking English. He spoke English as a language for
communication, just like speaking Spanish. Speaking Spanish did not mean that he was from Spain.

Paul (ninth grade)

Although Paul also preferred English because everyone speaks English in school, like Bill, he did not agree that speaking English signaled that he was American.

0065 (0:05:02-0:05:24)

1 R: 那你喜歡講中文嗎？

2 Paul: Uh (.3), I just find that is a way of talking. 沒有特別喜歡。

3 R: Oh…其實姐姐應該也不能講「喜歡」，應該說 “prefer”. 就是說你通常在跟人家溝通，communicate 的時候，你比較 prefer 用哪一個語言？

4 Paul: 我比較 prefer English.

(Translation)

1 R: Do you like speaking Mandarin Chinese?
2 Paul: Uh (.3), I just find that is a way of talking. ((I do)) not especially like doing that.

3 R: Oh…Actually, I shouldn’t say “like” and should say “prefer”. That is, usually, when you communicate with others, which language do you prefer using?

4 Paul: I prefer English.

Aside from positive feelings toward English, Paul also commented that speaking Mandarin Chinese was just “a way of talking”, implying no ideological affiliation to the heritage language because he also reported that Mandarin Chinese is his second language,
not heritage language in the section 4.3.2.2. Although he speaks Mandarin Chinese at home and in this Chinese school, it seems that Mandarin Chinese is used just as a communicative tool.

0065 (0:29:48-0:30:10)

1 R: 那為什麼的話，姐姐希望 confirm 一下，你可以講一下原因嗎？再稍微講一
2 下那個原因？

3 Paul: 因為我學校大家都是講英文的，
4 很少的人都是講中文。

5 R: OK, 所以基本上你講中文的情況應該是在這邊，
6 跟在家裡。

7 Paul: 嗯嗯。

(Translation)

1 R: I hope to confirm why, and can you tell me the reason? Can you say a little more about the reason?
2 Paul: Because everyone speaks English in school, and few people speak Mandarin Chinese there.
3 R: OK, so basically, you speak Mandarin Chinese here ((in this Chinese school)) and at home.
4 Paul: Uh-huh.

As well, Paul cannot escape the dominant American societal group, so English is still his main language. As Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) noted, “the children construe their language ideologies by appropriating from the language and cultural
communities in which they participate or aspire to belong” (p. 52). In this light, I reason that most of the students in this Chinese school are more likely to prefer identification with the majority group and its language.

**Jack (ninth grade)**

In the following excerpts, Jack also expressed his preference and liking for English. His explanations were that English was his main language, and he spoke it at school six hours a day, so it was easy for him to use English. In contrast, it was harder for him to speak Chinese fluently since he did not speak Chinese as much as English.

**0049 (0:07:33-0:08:19)**

1 R: But your mom is teaching Chinese, why didn’t you respond to her in Chinese?

2 Jack: I don’t really know. I just..English is my main language. So it’s just…

3 R: It’s easy for you to use that language.


5 R: Or, so do you think Chinese is more difficult than English?

6 Jack: Oh, yeah, because I don’t speak Chinese as much, so it will kind of become harder than remember and like..speaking it fluently, because, I mean, at school, you can’t really speak Chinese, so there is really…

7 R: You mean in public school?

8 Jack: Yeah, not much Chinese, though.
Nevertheless, Jack expressed in the next excerpt, “I should I should speak more Chinese” in line 3, and it would probably be better for him if he spoke more Chinese, but he never did so even though he could learn Chinese faster.

0049 (0:20:15-0:21:06)

1  R: I just want to know if you really like speaking Chinese. Do you think it’s better, speaking Chinese? Or it depends on the context or the people you talk with?

2  Jack: What? I think it’s better that I should I should speak more Chinese, but…

3  R: But you can’t. You are not willing to…because you prefer to speak English.

4  Jack: Yes, I prefer speaking English but I mean it will probably be better for me if I spoke more Chinese because I learned it faster.

5  R: Uh-huh.

6  Jack: But I mean I have six hours a day at school speaking English.

7  R: So, you are right. That’s true.

8  Jack: Yeah. And then..I could speak more Chinese. It will probably be better for me and I learn Chinese faster, but I never do so.

It is interesting to speculate whether “I should I should speak more Chinese” is related to the authoritative discourse because it appears to echo his remarks about the importance of Mandarin Chinese in the later section 4.3.2.3. His mom forced him to attend this Chinese school as well.

From the four focal students’ internally persuasive discourse, I reason that their preferences for English may be linked to the larger authoritative discourses in the dominant society. Through the process of extensive contact with English, their desire to
be part of the dominant society and communicate with others may lead them to show positive attitudes toward English and even internalize English as a powerful global language. Like the EM’s language attitudes at Stage 2 of Tse’s (1998a) model, the four focal students’ ideological affiliation shows their preference for the majority language and identification with the dominant societal group.

I now turn to how the four students view Mandarin Chinese. Interestingly, they do not see Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language except Bill.

4.3.2.2 No Ideological Inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language

Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) suggested that the bilingual children in Chinese heritage language schools have to choose more than one language in their ideological becoming, and for some children, “the Chinese language enters their consciousness and influences their ideological becoming and positioning as ‘Chinese’” (p. 63). However, it seems that the Chinese language does not enter the focal students’ consciousness in the contact zone inside the classroom except Bill, and they do not express ideological allegiance to the Chinese language in their internally persuasive discourse when asked whether it is their heritage language or not.

Arthur (eighth grade)

0083 (0:03:02-0:03:11)

1 Arthur: 我覺得中文是我的 second language, 可是…

2 R: 也是 heri…
Arthur: 前我英文是先學的。

R: 對，可是...

Arthur: 再學中文的。

(Translation)

Arthur: I feel that Mandarin Chinese is my second language, but…

R: Also heri…

Arthur: Because I learn English first.

R: Right, but…

Arthur: And then learn Mandarin Chinese.

Generally speaking, we take it for granted that Mandarin Chinese is definitely these Chinese school students’ heritage language, but it is not always so. Arthur reported that Mandarin Chinese was his second language because he learned English first, but his mother told me that Arthur and Paul learned Mandarin Chinese first at home, and they might forget it after learning English in American public school.

0083 (0:03:37-0:04:31)

R: 可是你覺得 Chinese 是你的 second language, 是不是也是你的 heritage language, 是因為你爸媽的關係? 因為 second language, 比如說 Spanish, 也是你的 second language 呀，你說你今天學西班牙文，它也是你的 second language, 可是它沒有 culture, 因為你不是西班牙人，你懂我的意思嗎？可是你今天要學 Chinese 是因為你爸媽這個 culture, 你爸媽的關係，所以這個叫做 heritage. 你這樣有弄清楚嗎？

Arthur: 咦…
R: 有這個血統，有這個 culture，有這個文化。所以你覺得 Mandarin 是不是你的 heritage language?

Arthur: 哦…(.2)

R: 不曉得？

Arthur: 我不曉得。

R: 你不曉得？那可是因為這題很重要，你要不曉得它是不是你的 heritage language 還是 second language? 你覺得？你選哪一個？

Arthur: 我覺得是 second language.

(Translation)

R: But you think Chinese is your second language. Is it also your heritage language because of your parents? Because second language, like Spanish, is also your second language. You learn Spanish and it is also your second language, but you don’t have its cultural background because you are not Spanish. Do you understand? But now you need to learn Chinese because of your parents and their cultural background, and that is why this is called heritage. Do you get it?

Arthur: Eh…

R: Because of this blood, this, this culture. So do you think that Mandarin is your heritage language?

Arthur: Eh…(.2)

R: You don’t know?

Arthur: I don’t know.

R: You don’t know? But because it is important, do you think it is a heritage language or a second language? What do you think? Which one do you choose? Or both?

Arthur: I feel that it is a second language.
As noted by You (2005), “one of the main markers of belonging to a particular ethnic group is language” (p. 713). In this excerpt, it appears that Arthur does not know what “heritage” really means. If Mandarin Chinese is not seen as Arthur’s heritage language, we can posit that he may not identify positively with his own ethnic group and culture.

In contrast, Bill reported that he understood the meaning of “heritage” and viewed Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language, indicating that he may identify more positively with his own ethnic group and culture than Arthur.

*Bill (eighth grade)*

0054 (0:17:32-0:18:08)

1 R: 那你會覺得 Mandarin Chinese 就是中文是你的 heritage language 嗎？
2 你知道 heritage 的意思嗎？

3 Bill: 嗯。

4 R: 對，那你自己覺得是不是，中文是不是，還是英文？

5 Bill: 中文，中文是。

6 R: 你覺得中文是。
7 那英文你覺得它是你的什麼語言？

8 Bill: 嗯…

9 R: First language?

10 Bill: First language.

11 R: 那 mother tongue 呢？你覺得是？Mother tongue，
12 你會覺得是哪一個？
Bill: 英文。

R: 英文，你覺得是英文，可是你覺得中文是你的 heritage language，是因為爸媽都是台灣來的？

Bill: 嗯。

(Translation)
1 R: Do you think Mandarin Chinese is your heritage language?
2 Do you know the meaning of heritage?
3 Bill: Hum.
4 R: Well, do you think if Mandarin Chinese is or English is ((your heritage language))? 
5 Bill: Mandarin Chinese. It is ((my heritage language)).
6 R: You think that Mandarin Chinese is ((your heritage language)). What language do 
7 you think English is for you?
8 Bill: Um…
9 R: First language.
10 Bill: First language.
11 R: How about mother tongue? What do you think it is? Mother tongue, 
12 which ((language)) do you think is mother tongue?
13 Bill: English.
14 R: English, you think it is English, but you think Mandarin Chinese is your heritage 
15 language, and is that because your parents are from Taiwan?
16 Bill: Hum.
In the next excerpt, I first asked Paul if he knew what “heritage” means, he said yes. However, Paul still viewed Mandarin Chinese as a second and foreign language, not his heritage language.

Paul (ninth grade)

0065 (0:32:16-0:32:54)

1 R: 那你認為中文 Mandarin 是你的 heritage language 嗎？
2 Paul: (搖頭)。
3 R: 不是喔？那你覺得它是怎麼樣的語言？那你為什麼要來學中文？那你可以進一步講一下嗎？
4 Paul: 我來學中文的是因為 (.4)
5 因為我是一個中文的學生。
6 R: 你是中文的..所以你把中文當成一個 second language, foreign language 嗎？
7 Paul: 嗯嗯。
8 R: 是這樣嗎？
9 Paul: 是啊。

(Translation)

1 R: Do you think that Mandarin is your heritage language?
2 Paul: (shaking his head.)
3 R: No? Do you feel that what kind of language it is? Why do you want to learn Mandarin Chinese? Can you explain it further?
4 Paul: The reason why I come learn Mandarin Chinese is because (.4) because I am a
Chinese language student ((a student who learns the Chinese language)).

R: You are a Chinese..so you see Mandarin Chinese as a second language, foreign language?

Paul: Uh-huh.

R: Is it so?

Paul: Yeah.

In lines 8-9, Paul reported that Mandarin Chinese was his second language because he was just a student who learned the Chinese language. In the next two excerpts, he further explained that his Chinese was not better than English.

0065 (0:30:30-0:31:01)

Paul: 我覺得英文比較…我覺得英文比中文的好太多了。

R: 這是什麼意思？我好訝異你的回答，那你講一下為什麼？你所謂的好是指什麼？它的語言的使用還是…?

Paul: Meaning I can speak English more fluently than Chinese, like Chinese I stagger through it. English, I can just, oh, I am through it in English.

(Translation)

Paul: I think English is more..I think English is much better than Mandarin Chinese.

R: What do you mean by that? I am surprised at your answer. Can you explain why? What do you mean by better? Its language use or…?

Paul: Meaning I can speak English more fluently than Chinese, like Chinese I stagger through it. English, I can just, oh, I am through it in English.
1 R: Do you think Mandarin Chinese is your heritage language? So you feel that you are American-born Chinese, but why don’t you think Chinese is your heritage language now that you think that you are Chinese?

4 Paul: Because I was born in the U.S., but I am also Chinese, but my Mandarin Chinese is still…

6 R: Not good? Not better than English?

7 Paul: Uh-huh.

In Tse’s (2000) study, the narrators described that “acceptance by the dominant culture was often contingent upon language ability” (p. 195). In a similar vein, it seems that Paul’s Mandarin Chinese is not good enough to be an ethnic group symbol. For Jack, Mandarin Chinese is not his heritage language either, and speaking other languages is “just learning stuff”, just as shown in the following excerpt.
R: You speak Chinese. Because you think you are American, when you speak Chinese, will you feel it is a little strange to you?

Jack: No.

R: No? Because of your mom?

Jack: It is nothing wrong with speaking other languages, I mean, that’s just learning stuff, I mean, I am learning Spanish in school too.

R: OK, so you think Chinese is just another language?

Jack: Mean it’s the whole another culture, but I mean speaking isn’t doesn’t mean you are part of that culture and anything.

R: So you just mentioned that you don’t really like Taiwanese culture?

Jack: I’m fine with Taiwanese culture. I am just not really part of it because I haven’t lived in it and anything. I was born and raised in America…

R: So you can’t identify with Taiwanese culture because you don’t live in that place.

Jack: Yeah.

Bucholtz and Hall (2004) contended that “language, as a fundamental resource for cultural production, is hence also a fundamental resource for identity production” (p. 382). Saville-Troike (2003) stated that many Navajo teachers believe that the Navajo language is integrally related to the culture, including religious beliefs, which are fully expressed only in Navajo (p. 43). In lines 8-9, Jack explained that the Chinese language means “it’s the whole another culture” and speaking “doesn’t mean you are part of that culture”. In lines 11-14, therefore, Jack reported that he could not identify with the Taiwanese culture and he was not really part of it because he had not lived in Taiwan, even though he was
fine with Taiwanese culture. He did not have affiliation with Mandarin Chinese and speaking it was just “learning stuff” – learning another language.

As discussed previously, the participating parents in this current study tend to have positive attitudes about the heritage maintenance of their children. The parents in Chik’s (2010) study believed that this school provided a setting as a basis for bilingual development “in terms of both linguistic acquisition and of fostering a positive attitude toward the heritage language” (p. xvi). Nevertheless, the focal students except Bill do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language, meaning that this Chinese heritage language school does not successfully serve as a socializing space and ideological environment for the students’ heritage language ideological development since the authoritative discourses of the parents and the teachers do not strongly affect the students’ attitudes toward learning Mandarin Chinese either. In other words, the process of translating “authoritative discourses” into “internally persuasive discourses” is not successful. Additionally, this Chinese school operates in a rented space two hours a week may not offer their students enough culture immersion.

Based on Tse’s (1998a) model, Stage 2, Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE), is a period during which the attitudes of EMs toward ethnic group can be represented on a “continuum”, ranging from “a lack of interest in the ethnic culture (ambivalence)” to “active rejection of the ethnic group (evasion)” (Tse, 1998b, p. 29).
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Previous studies have suggested that EMs may fall anywhere along this continuum, depending on “the social environment they are in and the extent of their perceived difference from the majority group” (Tse, 1997). In the current study, the students, Arthur, Paul, and Jack, have no ideological inheritance - Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language, which is neither ambivalence (the EM has little interest in the ethnic culture and language) nor evasion (the EM distances himself from the culture and language, like through the selection of friends). Bakhtin’s theory provides a better understanding of their views and beliefs about heritage language in their ideological becoming. Arthur does not quite understand what “heritage” means, even though he already had contact with the ethnic group members after attending Chinese school. Paul reported that his Mandarin Chinese was not good enough, suggesting that the heritage language proficiency can be seen as an ethnic group symbol. Jack does not have affiliation with Mandarin Chinese because he is not part of the ethnic culture; that is, language is related to culture.

I present below the quotations from the interviews with the four focal students, showing whether or not they expressed their ideological resistance to learning Chinese.

4.3.2.3 Ideological Resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese

Of the four focal students, Arthur and Jack expressed their ideological resistance since attendance at a heritage language school was “a parental choice and took on an authoritative discourse and obligatory role” (Maguire and Curdt-Christsiansen, 2007, p. 71). That is, they are often forced to attend this Chinese school by their parents and the
significance of studying Mandarin Chinese is transmitted by the authoritative discourse of their parents. Paul did not express a strong ideological resistance about attending this Chinese school since he was aware of the importance of studying Mandarin Chinese. Bill is the only one student whose attitude toward learning Mandarin Chinese had changed and liked attending this Chinese school better. When he was in the sixth grade, he did not seem to like speaking Mandarin Chinese.

**Arthur (eighth grade)**

In lines 9-10, Arthur reported that “My dad said that I earn money by teaching people how to write Mandarin Chinese when I grow up”, which was his father’s decision on his attending this Chinese school.

0083 (0:05:00-0:05:39)

1. R: 那你覺得學中文的重要性在哪裡？
2. 你覺得它重不重要？
3. Arthur: (搖頭) 嗯嗯。
4. R: 真的喔。那為什麼不重要？
5. Arthur: 因為(.2)我沒有用啊。
6. R: 你覺得用不到？
7. Arthur: 對啊。
8. R: 真的嗎？
9. Arthur: 嗯嗯，可是爸爸說我長大，
10. 我教人家怎麼寫中文賺錢。
R: 那你接受嗎？ You agree?

Arthur: 因為我不要學中文。

R: 你只想學英文？那你有沒有想要學其他語言？

Arthur: No./

R: No?/ 可是你不太想學中文就是了。

Arthur: 對啊。

R: 你覺得它不重要，一點也不重要。

Arthur: 嗯嗯。

(Translation)

R: What do you think the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese is? Do you think it is important?

Arthur: (shaking his head) Uh-huh.

R: Really?\ Why is it not important?

Arthur: Because (.2) it is not useful to me.

R: Do you think you will never use it?

Arthur: Yeah.

R: Really?

Arthur: Uh-huh, but my dad said that I earn money by teaching people how to write Mandarin Chinese when I grow up.

R: Do you agree with that? You agree?

Arthur: Because I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese.

R: Do you just want to learn English? Do you want to learn other languages?
Arthur: No./
R: No?/ But you don’t really want to learn Mandarin Chinese.
Arthur: Right.
R: You think it is not important, not important at all.
Arthur: Uh-huh.

Here, Arthur expressed that he was struggling to learn Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language. He was unaware of the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese since he did not agree with his father’s authoritative discourse and did not think that he needed to learn Mandarin Chinese. Actually, many Taiwanese parents told their children that they should speak Mandarin Chinese or become bilingual, and they thus wanted their children to attend Chinese class in order to maintain contact with the Chinese language and culture. However, some students like Arthur feel the pressure and have a negative attitude toward learning Mandarin Chinese, and even fewer students think that they can use Mandarin Chinese in the future, e.g., in their work.

I was surprised at Bill’s report that he liked attending this Chinese school. He explained that when he was in the sixth grade, he was uncomfortable using Mandarin Chinese in front of his classmates because he would “pressure himself into speaking it well”. In other words, he might not have enough confidence in speaking Mandarin Chinese then.
Bill (eighth grade)

0054 (0:11: 54-0:12:56)

1 R: 那你喜歡上中文學校嗎？

2 Bill: 我喜歡。

3 R: 你喜歡喔？真的嗎？要說實話喔。@@@

4 Bill: 我喜歡啊！

5 R: 啊？

6 Bill: 我喜歡啊！

7 R: 你喜歡喔，可是你一開始會不會抗拒啊？

8 因為其實姐姐觀察喔，我沒有刻意啦，

9 就是我記得兩年前我剛來你們班的時候，

10 我感覺你都不太講中文，不太喜歡上課，

11 可是現在感覺差很多，我覺得你變得比較快樂，

12 而且喜歡學中文，你能不能告訴我為什麼會有這樣的改變？

13 Bill: 不知道。@@

14 R: 你不知道？

15 Bill: 兩年前是在這邊對不對？

16 R: 耶…更早，這個好像是去年，前年在一間什麼教室，

17 那時候你們班人很多。

18 Bill: Yeah.

19 R: 就是女生一群，然後男生一群這樣子。

20 Bill: 我不喜歡，因為那是以前 I’m uncomfortable,

21 很多人。

22 R: 真的喔？很多人在一起上課你會覺得 uncomfortable 喔？

23 是因為這個原因嗎？
R: Do you like attending this Chinese school?

Bill: I like it.

R: Do you like it? Really? You need to tell the truth. @@@

Bill: I like it!

R: Ah?

Bill: I like it.

R: You like it? But did you resist ((learning it)) in the beginning?

Bill: Two years ago, ((you means)) it was here (in the current classroom), right?

R: Yeah…it was earlier. It seemed to be last year or two years ago in one classroom, where there were a lot of students.

Bill: Yeah.

R: A group of girls and a group of boys.

Bill: I didn’t like ((speaking Mandarin Chinese)) because I was uncomfortable then ((in front of)) many people.

R: Really? Will you feel uncomfortable when many people attend class together? Is that the reason?
But are there also many people ((during class)) in American public school?

Bill: But they speak English. I won’t pressure myself into speaking it well.

In the next two excerpts, Bill recognized the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese: People would talk with him in Mandarin Chinese because of his Asian appearance. This internally persuasive discourse seems to be a response to the authoritative discourse of his mother.

0054 (0:18:17-0:18:30)

1 R: 你覺得為什麼學中文很重要？
2 還是你覺得它不重要？
3 Bill: 我想它很重要。
4 R: 那它重要性在哪裡？你可以告訴我為什麼嗎？
5 Bill: 因為如果我要去…因為別人看我，他們會想
6 我是講中文的。

(Translation)

1 R: Why do you think it is important to learn Mandarin Chinese? Or you don’t think it is important?
2 Bill: I think it is very important.
3 R: How is it important? Can you tell me why?
4 Bill: Because if I want to go to…Because others would think that I speak Mandarin Chinese if they see me.
The following quotation from the interview with Bill’s mother reflected Bill’s attitudes toward studying Mandarin Chinese and his self-identification were changing.

053 (0:17:24-0:18:23)

1 M: 其實 ABC 都一樣，他只要開始去美國學校的時候，
2 他回來他就開始抗拒講中文，
3 而且他不認為說他需要學中文，
4 因為在學校裡面沒有人學中文，
5 就是說我為什麼要學中文，我是 American.

6 R: 那 Bill 有跟你講過他覺得他是 American？

7 M: 對，對。I am American. 我不是在 China, 我不是在 Taiwan,
8 我為什麼要學中文？

9 R: 那你怎麼跟他…

10 M: 對，因為我跟他講就是說你是 Chinese, 人家看到你就是 Chinese, 你今天看
11 到一個 Japanese, 他這個人不會講 Japanese，
12 你不覺得很奇怪嗎？

13 R: 那他怎麼反應？

14 M: 所以小時候他不懂，但是越來越大的時候越講他就越懂，因為呢他去跟人
15 家，跟別的小孩子玩的時候，別人家的小孩子講中文講得很棒，
16 我就說，你看你的中文多爛，
17 他就自己會知道。

(Translation)

1 M: In fact, ABCs ((American-born Chinese)) experience the same situation. As long
2 as he/she begins attending American school, he/she will start to resist speaking
3 Mandarin Chinese, and he/she doesn’t think that they need to learn Mandarin
4 Chinese because no one learns Mandarin Chinese at school.
5 So, ((Bill said,)) “why do I need to learn Mandarin Chinese? I am American.”

6 R: Did Bill tell you that he thought he was American?
M: Yes. Yes. ((Bill said,)) “I am American. I am not in China, and I am not in Taiwan. Why do I need to learn Mandarin Chinese?”

R: How did you tell him…

M: Yeah. Because I told him, “You are Chinese, and people see you as Chinese. If you see one Japanese, but he/she cannot speak Japanese, don’t you think it is strange?”

R: What was his reaction?

R: So he did not understand when he was little, but when he grew older, he understood more when I told him. Because when he hung out with other kids, other kids spoke great Mandarin Chinese, and I would said, “Think about how bad your Mandarin Chinese is.” He would be aware of it.

In lines 7 and 8, Bill’s mother commented that Bill began to resist speaking Mandarin Chinese after he attended American public school. He identified himself as American and did not want to learn Mandarin Chinese, which reflected his experience and ideological stance in the American public school. Nevertheless, the authoritative discourse from his mother seems to affect his attitude toward learning Mandarin Chinese and his self-identification.

**Paul (ninth grade)**

Although Paul did not prefer identification with the ethnic group, he neither hated nor liked learning Mandarin Chinese.

---

0065 (0:10:45-0:11:17)

Paul: 我覺得學中文是不太好，可是也不是 (.1) 也不錯，

R: Not..not so good, not good not bad, 你意思是這樣？
Paul: 對。

R: 就是你沒有特別喜歡，沒有沒有懂我的意思嗎？

Paul: 嗯嗯。

R: 就是 so so, 就是..那..可是你..那你不至於討厭吧？就是不想來上課，會不會？會不會不想來上課？

Paul: 不會。

(Translation)

1 Paul: I feel that learning Mandarin Chinese is not too bad, but it’s not too, but…

2 R: Not..not so good, not good not bad, and that’s what you mean?

3 Paul: Right.

4 R: That is, you don’t especially like it, not..Do you understand what I mean?

5 Paul: Uh-huh.

6 R: That is so so, that is..that..but you..you don’t really hate it? You don’t want to attend class, right? Don’t you want to attend class?

7 Paul: No.

Paul also expressed that “he should attend Chinese class”, which is often the authoritative discourse of parents, because his parents told him the importance of studying Mandarin Chinese. In his own words, “Studying Mandarin Chinese is, of course, important.”
In line 1, Paul provided an explanation that the population of studying Mandarin Chinese is increasing. In recent years, with the growth of the Chinese economy, China is becoming an economic superpower, and thus more and more people learn Mandarin Chinese for communication, jobs, and so on; like English, the Chinese language is becoming a global language and a commodity in the global market. The following response by Paul’s mother reflected this view when I asked her why she thought that it was important for her children to learn Mandarin Chinese.
Because actually, I feel that Mandarin Chinese is very important, and particularly, I think that China will rise in the future. If you want to do business with Chinese people, at least you have the background and then have this advantage.

Not only Paul’s mother but also other parents expressed this macro perspective when I chatted with them: the hegemonic power of Chinese as a global language. This influences the students’ ideological development and their attitudes toward learning the Chinese language. In that case, compared to Arthur’s lack of motivation to study Mandarin Chinese, Paul was not fully motivated to study it, but he recognized the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese and did not express a strong ideological resistance about it.

**Jack (ninth grade)**

**0049 (0:15:31-0:15:55)**

1. **R:** Do you like attending the Chinese class? I mean here.
2. **Jack:** Not really.
3. **R:** Not really? Why or why not? Can you explain more…
4. **Jack:** I mean it’s kind of boring, but I mean I understand like why I have to learn Chinese, like it’s an important stuff, but I don’t really like it anything.
5. **R:** But your mom forced you to…
6. **Jack:** Attend to.
In this exchange, Jack reported that “I understand like why I have to learn Chinese, like it’s an important stuff” in lines 4-5. When I asked him further why it was important to learn Chinese after the interview, he told me that “it could open up a lot of job opportunities in my future. Learning Chinese also lets me communicate to my relatives in Taiwan”. The former reflects this macro perspective - the larger authoritative discourse of China’s global economic role and the Chinese language as a commodity in the global market. Additionally, “I have to learn Chinese” and his mom forced him to attend Chinese class, both taking on an authoritative discourse and obligatory role.

In a word, the four students do not really like attending the Chinese school except Paul and Bill. However, all except Arthur recognize the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese through their parents’ authoritative discourses. In Tse’s (1997, 2000) study, she examined parental influence on their children’s language attitudes toward the culture and language. Some parents encouraged their children’s Chinese learning by sending them to a Chinese school, and other parents discouraged their children from learning the heritage language and hoped they could succeed in an English dominant society. Unfortunately, Tse did not further discuss the children’s own views of learning the Chinese language. Bakhtinian concepts can help us to examine how the four focal students may negotiate or struggle between the two forms of discourses – authoritative discourse (parents’ beliefs) and internally persuasive discourse (children’s views) in developing their ideologies.
4.4 Discussion and conclusion

The analysis of the interview discourses from the four focal students except Bill reveals that they may not hold positive feelings toward their heritage language and ethnic culture but favor the dominant language and culture. First, using Tse’s (1998a) framework, I examined the four focal students’ self-identification, and it seems that Arthur and Paul are at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE). They are aware that they are of Chinese descent and speak Chinese, but they do not identify themselves as Taiwanese because they do not speak Taiwanese. In Taiwan, Mandarin Chinese is used as the official national language and Taiwanese as the local language. Both the two teachers also view Taiwanese as part of the culture. In other words, Taiwanese can be regarded as the basis of their ethnic identity in addition to Mandarin Chinese. Compared to Stage 2 when EMs prefer association with the majority group, Stage 3, Ethnic Emergence, is an important period of time of ethnic identity exploration - EMs explore their cultural heritage and some of them embrace it. Language is closely associated with group membership and “an important part of establishing a link to that group” (Tse, 1997, p. 76). As a result, the students are not at Stage 3 in that they seem to be aware that they are members of the Chinese ethnic group, but they have no ideological inheritance with Mandarin Chinese. They do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language because Arthur does not quite understand what “heritage” means; Paul reported that his Mandarin Chinese was not good enough; Jack stated that he was not part of the ethnic culture. The students are still at Stage 2 since they prefer the use of the majority language, English, and even prefer assimilation into the mainstream group.
Jack may be at Stage 2 (EAE) too. Although he identifies himself as American, he must be aware of his mother’s ethnicity and just seems to prefer to identify with his father’s and is not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture. The findings indicate that the Taiwanese language appears to be related to the EM group and viewed as an ethnic group symbol. Taiwanese culture can also be seen as a marker of group membership because ethnic groups share some elements such as culture (Phinney, 2002, p. 63), and cultural traditions is one of the common indicators of ethnic involvement (social participation and cultural practices) (Phinney, 1990, p. 505). Distancing from Taiwanese culture shows that Jack may not have positive feelings and attitudes toward the EM group.

Bill appears to be between Stage 2 and Stage 3. According to his mother’s comments in the interview, he originally identified himself as American and did not like speaking Mandarin Chinese. When I interviewed him, he identified himself as American-born Taiwanese and also expressed ideological inheritance and no ideological resistance since he viewed Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language and liked attending this Chinese school. It seems that Bill is developing his ethnic identity and identifies more positively with his own ethnic group and culture, but he has not fully embraced his ethnic heritage and still prefers the use of the majority language, English, so his exploration during Stage 3 may be in progress. Additionally, Bill identified himself as American-born Taiwanese probably because he can speak a little Taiwanese, supporting the argument that Taiwanese may be a marker of community/ingroup membership and the basis of his ethnic identity. Second, Tse (1997) added a component, language attitude, in an attempt
to describe how language attitude toward the majority and heritage languages shifts as ethnic identity changes over time. I likewise added a component, language ideology, to examine the students’ ethnic identity during one stage and enhance her model of ethnic identity development. Based on Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse, I examined the focal students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning and discovered three patterns – (i) ideological affiliation: I prefer English; (ii) no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language; (iii) ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese. They articulate a preference and liking for English in that English is spoken here in the U.S., especially in public school. Their daily discursive practices in English may lead them to show their ideological affiliation to English. They do not express a strong ideological allegiance to their Chinese roots and language inheritance since they view Mandarin Chinese as a second, foreign, or another language, not a heritage language. The authoritative discourses of their parents about the significance of studying Mandarin Chinese do not appear to influence their attitudes toward attending the Chinese school because they do not really want to study Mandarin Chinese. The authoritative discourses of the teachers seem to have no strong effect on the students’ attitudes toward learning Mandarin Chinese either. In Chapter 5, for instance, the teacher, Vivian, intended to persuade her students to speak more Mandarin Chinese in examples 11-12, yet Bill still resisted speaking Mandarin Chinese in reply (he was a sixth grader at that time). The findings above indicate that the students may assert their own ideological stances toward prevailing authoritative discourses – English is viewed as a sign of
prestige, but against the authoritative discourses in this Chinese school – Mandarin Chinese is viewed as their heritage language and important for their future. In other words, it seems that they appropriate the authoritative discourses from others in the wider American society, not in the Chinese school community. In contrast to the previous stage where Bill viewed himself as American and did not like speaking Mandarin Chinese, when he was in the eighth grade, Bill viewed Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language and recognized the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese, showing that the authoritative discourse from his mother seems to affect his attitudes toward his self-identification and learning Mandarin Chinese. In other words, his internally persuasive discourse seems to be a response to the authoritative discourse of his mother. Based on Tse’s (1998a) model, EMs’ attitudes toward ethnic group and heritage language at Stage 2 can be seen as a “continuum” ranging from ambivalence to evasion (Tse, 1998b, p. 29). Nevertheless, from the perspective of language ideology, the focal students except Bill in the current study express no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language, which does not fall anywhere along this “continuum”. That is, it can reflect how the focal students are aware of their heritage language and ethnic group. Additionally, they show their ideological resistance to learning the Chinese language, which was not examined in Tse’s study. Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) noted that learning Mandarin Chinese can be viewed as “an important part of their ethnic identity” (p. 74), so they do not have positive attitudes toward ethnic group, heritage language and language learning. Bakhtinian concepts can help us to examine how the four focal students may negotiate or struggle between the two forms of discourses –
authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse in their ethnic identity development. The three patterns of ideological becoming reveal that the students are still at Stage 2, and language ideology may be an important component in their ethnic identity development because it may be connected to ethnic identity.

Being at Stage 2 may lead to the students’ lack of motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese, influence their attitudes toward classroom activities, and cause them to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. Additionally, some researchers have examined the linguistic profile of HL learners and contrasted it with that of non-HL learners of the same language. In Weger-Guntharp’s (2006) study on Chinese heritage language learners (CHLLs) in the FL classroom, all of the CHLLs pointed out that exploring their heritage status was a major reason to study Chinese (p. 35). Li and Lu (2008) concluded that the motivation to learn the heritage language was associated with intrinsic interest in Chinese culture and the desire to understand one’s own cultural heritage. Geisherik (2004) noted that the integrative and instrumental motivations of Russian heritage language students were higher than those of non-heritage students. In this present study, however, the Chinese language is not perceived as the focal students’ heritage language. They may not have heritage-related motivations to study Mandarin Chinese and the desires to understand their cultural heritage. In other words, a learner’s heritage is an important factor because “it affects the co-construction of motivation” (Weger-Guntharp, 2006, p. 29). Bill is the only one student who views Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language. That may lead Bill to have more motivation to study Mandarin Chinese because he reported in the interview that he liked attending this Chinese school.
The socio-cultural context of the Chinese classrooms as discussed earlier in this chapter indicates that this Chinese heritage language school is like “a miniature social cosmos of trilingualism” (Magnuire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 66), and the two teachers appear to adopt an attitude of multilingualism and accommodation. In general, the principal objective of heritage language schools is to teach and maintain the minority community language, not English. However, the teachers’ use of English as a pedagogic tool has the effect of giving English more social importance and maintaining its dominance. As Li and Wu (2008) argued, the teachers’ use of code-switching indirectly helps to “maintain the English dominance and enhance English as a language of authority and knowledge” (p. 237). Additionally, I suggest that the teacher’s attitude toward her students’ behaviors of teaching her English in the classroom may also have such effect of indirectly helping “maintain the English dominance”, enhance the students’ ideological affiliation to English, and internalize English as a powerful language - “a language of authority and knowledge”.

Like the two teachers’ use of code-switching between Mandarin Chinese and English in the classroom, the students are more active and their use of other languages like English or Taiwanese is also legitimate and can be allowed. The next chapter explores how the students practice their multilingual creativity among Mandarin Chinese, English, and Taiwanese.
Chapter 5: Student Language Behaviors in the Classroom

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate how the four focal students perform their uncooperative language behaviors in the IRF pattern, how they other-correct their teacher’s English in the student-initiated IRFs, and how they express convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. The traditional studies often assume that the IRF structure allows teachers to control classroom discourse, yet it can also be seen as “contributing to student talk”, which is under-explored (Sunderland, 2001). Candela (1999) examined the IRE structure from the students’ perspective and argued that “deviation from the IRE structure in classroom discourse is actually a well-known phenomenon” (p.141).

I (Initiation)-R (Response)-F (Follow-up or Feedback) structure (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Nassaji and Wells, 2000) is the common and dominant pattern of discourse between teachers and students in teacher-fronted classroom settings. It consists of three turns: the teacher initiates the first turn, then one student responds as the second turn, and the teacher provides feedback at the third follow-up turn. The third follow-up turn also serves not only an evaluative function but also an initiating function that elicits further information from the student (Miao and Heining-Boynton, 2011, p.66). Norrick
and Klein (2008) noted that many researchers have thus argued that the teacher appears to unilaterally have talk control (p. 91). The teacher has to construct his/her turn, and the students have to infer the meaning of his/her moves and cooperate during the teaching process (p. 93). Since “the pupil turn is sandwiched between the two teacher turns” (Van Lier, 2004), “the I-R-F exchange pattern provides a stock resource for the disruptive creation of humor by pupils” (Norrick and Klein, 2008, p. 92). In this light, the student response turn can also be a resource for the disruptive creation of resistance by students. Thus, looking into the IRF sequences allows us to uncover the interactional work between teacher and student and explore whether the focal students use these units or structures such as student turns at strategic points for resistance, humor, or both in classroom interaction in the IRF pattern.

Nikula (2007) noted that Candela (1999) and Sunderland (2001) called for more attention to the students’ role in the IRF pattern. Despite the fact that student-initiated IRFs in Sunderland’s (2001) data were rarer than teacher-initiated ones, Nikula’s (2008) study indicated that questions by students were more than those in Sunderland’s (2001) data. McPherson (2005) pointed out that Sunderland (2003) re-evaluated the IRF sequence and provided a useful framework for the investigation of student-initiated IRFs because teacher talk contributions have been overemphasized in prior studies (p. 505). Sunderland (2001) provided the following model of a student-initiated IRF (p. 35).
In this current study, the student-initiated IRFs were found in the corrections by Paul and Jack. They other-corrected the teacher’s English pronunciation or stress in the conversations.

As many researchers have claimed, the use of code-switching is both inevitable and necessary in bilingual classrooms, and it can serve the functions of building solidarity. As noted by Liang (2006), “Code variation was used as a communicative resource to accomplish different social functions such as to express solidarity, to reduce social distance, to establish rapport, to build friendship, and to negotiate different identities, and cogroup membership” (p. 144). Myers-Scotten and Bolontai (2001) proposed a Rational Choice Model (RC) to explain what drives speakers to select one linguistic form over another such as code-switching. Their linguistic code choices depend largely on “assessments of possible options in terms of a cost-benefit analysis that takes account of their own subjective motivations and their objective opportunities” (p. 5). In analyzing their conversations, I found that code-switching occurred as Arthur was arguing with the teacher, switching to Mandarin Chinese from English to avoid reading a long paragraph. Likewise, Bill switched between Taiwanese and English when arguing to avoid using Mandarin Chinese. They used both strategies of convergence and divergence in language.
choice to show their resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese. In particular, Bill did not converge to Mandarin Chinese the teacher Vivian used but converged to the marker of ingroup membership, the Taiwanese language, so as to avoid offending the teacher and reduce potential conflicts.

In Chapter 4, I explored four focal students’ ethnic identity during one stage through the examination of their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. I suggested that this Chinese heritage language school may provide a unique and safe space for the students to practice their multilingual languages and identities. All the examples in this chapter have shown that the students use their language skills to follow or flout the rules and norms of behavior. Whether the students’ language behaviors are related to their self-identification and language ideologies is thus worth investigating.

As discussed below, they employed uncooperative language behaviors in Mandarin Chinese to challenge their teacher’s authority (e.g., giving wrong answers or using taboo words). As discussed in Chapter 4, Arthur expressed his ideological resistance to studying Mandarin Chinese, which may affect his attitudes toward classroom activities and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. Paul did not express a strong ideological resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese, and the teacher Lily noted that Paul enjoyed playing a class clown and attempted to make the whole class laugh. Paul’s uncooperative language behaviors may be acceptable to her and show not only resistance but also humor.
In addition, as shown below, the students other-corrected the teacher’s English since they have more competence in English. Although they appeared to exercise their English proficiency as a tool to undermine the teacher’s authority, their goal was to offer a friendly help. Based on Norrick (1991), the second speaker follows a pedagogical motivation with the corrective actions by assessing the first speaker’s language ability in order to help the corrected achieve equal status. The corrections by them in examples 6-9 show the exchanges of corrective feedback from the native speaker (NS) to the nonnative speaker (NNS) because of Lily’s nonnative English. Their American identity is thus embodied in the correction actions.

Finally, as I discuss further below, Mandarin Chinese and the Taiwanese language were utilized by Arthur and Bill respectively to express solidarity and reduce social distance, not challenge the teacher’s authority in the classroom, when they converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language. In the interviews with them, Arthur identified himself as Chinese American and Bill as American-born Taiwanese. Through code-switching, their group identities are fluid and group memberships are negotiated during the processes of accommodation. Nevertheless, the strategy of convergence used by Arthur and Bill seem to cause the loss of their American identity because they use Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese instead of English.

In the next sections, I begin with Arthur’s and Paul’s uncooperative language behaviors, including giving wrong answers and using taboo words. Then I examine Paul’s and Jack’s initiations in the IRF pattern – how they correct their teacher’s English.
Finally, I discuss Arthur’s and Bill’s convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors through code-switching. After analyzing their language behaviors in each section, I present the interview excerpts with the students and the two teachers. These interview excerpts are about their attitudes and interpretations of the classroom behaviors of the students. The discussion and conclusion are provided in the end.

5.2 Uncooperative Language Behaviors

Previous studies have assumed that the IRF structure can be considered “a hallmark of institutional discourse in classrooms” and “an effective tool for teachers to structure interaction and to manage classrooms” (Nikula, 2007, p. 181). As stated by Erickson (1986), however, students have power to resist learning what the teacher wants to teach them. In this current study, the students do not always follow what the teacher wants them to do. As examples 1-5 below show, they were not subordinated to the teacher’s orientation by giving wrong answers or using taboo words as their responses, and the teacher did not provide his/her evaluation or feedback at times after the students’ response turns.

5.2.1 Arthur (eighth grade)

In Chapter 4, I examined Arthur’s self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. He preferred being American although he identified himself as half American, half Chinese. He also expressed that more people speak English in the U.S. and speaking English made him feel more like American. His daily
discursive practices in English may lead him to show his ideological affiliation to English as a result of his immersion in an English-speaking macro environment and lack of motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese. He reported that learning Mandarin Chinese was not important at all since he perceived it as having no functioning in his daily life. Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) pointed out that some children may adopt a stance of ideological resistance to the ethnic minority group and language if they feel that the Chinese language has no functionality and connectivity to their lives (p. 70-71).

Additionally, Arthur expressed his ideological resistance because his father forced him to attend this Chinese school. In that case, it is likely that he adopts a negative attitude toward classroom activities. I found three patterns of his uncooperative behavior, including giving wrong answers, using taboo words, and arguing with the teacher. The third one will be discussed in the later section since it involves Arthur’s code-switching - convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors when arguing with Vivian.

5.2.1.1 Giving Wrong Answers

Example 1. Activity: finding Chinese words (0017 Vivian 0:11:46-0:12:21)

1 T: OK, 下一個，真是很多喔。我們今天學很多可以形容你自己身體的反應，對
2 不對？滿頭大汗，濕透透，對不對？下一個，冬天。

   Xia yi ge, zhen shi hen duo o. Wo men jien tian xie hen duo ke yi xing rong ni zi ji shen ti de fan ying, dui bu dui? Man tou da han, shi tou tou, dui bu dui? Xia yi ge, dong tian.

‘Next one, it is really a lot. We learned a lot about how to describe the reaction of your own body, didn’t we? One’s head is covered with sweat; soaking through, right? Next one, winter.’
3 Arthur: 吃大便。
   *Chi da bian.*
   ‘Eat poo.’

4 (Arthur kept making some noise.)

5 T: 不穿外套，走出去，穿一件 T-shirt，你會怎樣？
   *Bu chuan wai tao, zou chu qu, chuan yi jian T-SHIRT, ni hui ze yang?*
   ‘You don’t put on a coat and walk out wearing a T-shirt, what will happen to you?’

6 Austin: [滿頭大汗。]
   *Man tou da han.*
   ‘One’s head is covered with sweat.’

7 Arthur: [catch a cold.]

8 T: <HI 亂講 HI>, 冬天的時候下大雪，你只穿一件短袖的 T-shirt 走到外面去，
9 你會怎樣？
   *Luan jiang, dong tian de shi hou xia da xue, ni zhi chuan yi jian duan xiou de T-SHIRT zou dao wai mian qu, ni hui ze yang?*
   ‘Nonsense! When it snows in winter, you only wear a short-sleeved T-shirt and walk outside, what will happen to you?’

10 Arthur: 滿頭大汗。
   *Man tou da han.*
   ‘One’s head is covered with sweat.’

11 Ss: @@@

12 T: (with a kind of unhappy voice) 冷得發抖。
   *Leng de fa dou.*
   ‘Shivering with cold.’

In this exchange, The teacher, Vivian, was teaching some Chinese phrases, like
“滿頭大汗” (one head is covered with sweat) and “濕透透” (soaking through). In line 3,
Arthur suddenly said, “吃大便” (eat poo) and kept making some noise without patience.
Lines 5-12 comprise I (Initiation)-R (Response)-F (Feedback) sequences, where Arthur gave the close answer “catch a cold” for the first time in line 7 and then the opposite, wrong answer “滿頭大汗” (one’s head is covered with sweat) for the second time in line 10 after the teacher in line 8 responded to the same wrong answer from Austin, saying “nonsense!” with a critical voice. “滿頭大汗” (one’s head is covered with sweat) in line 10 is not a correct answer in this situation and it is more likely made to make the other students laugh and to perhaps annoy the teacher Vivian. Vivian gives the correct answer “冷得發抖” (shivering with cold) with a kind of unhappy voice in her follow-up move instead of making a rather critical comment like “nonsense” to Arthur. That is, Arthur disrupted without being reprimanded by the teacher, who seemed to ignore him.

Building on Grice’s cooperative principle, if we take the Quality maxim - “Do not say what you believe to be false” or “Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence” (Grice, 1975, p. 45), it is being flouted in example 1 since Arthur is intentionally giving an answer that he knows is false. In example 1, the teacher corrected Austin’s wrong answer first and then asked again in lines 8-9, “Nonsense! When it snows in winter, you only wear a short-sleeved T-shirt and walk outside, what will happen to you?” Needless to say, Arthur knew that Austin’s answer was wrong, but he still responded with it again, implying that he meant to perform such an uncooperative behavior. He failed to serve the teacher’s requirement and cooperate in the advancement of the lesson, which challenged the orderliness and seemed to show resistance.

The next three excerpts, examples 2-4, are similar to example 1 and all count as uncooperative behaviors, but the difference is that in these cases, Arthur used the taboo
word “poo” as a wrong answer in response to the teacher’s questions about the SAT II test, violating normal classroom interaction pattern. The Quality maxim is also being violated several times in examples 2-4.

5.2.1.2 Giving Wrong Answers and Using Taboo Words

Example 2. Practice: SAT II test (0052 Vivian 0:17:50-0:18:41)

1  T: Arthur, Arthur, 我說有哪些字，你會，你認得的 share with everybody.
   Wo shuo you na xie zi, ni hui, ni ren de de SHARE WITH EVERYBODY.
   ‘I said, what words do you recognize and then SHARE WITH EVERYBODY.’

2  Arthur: Oh, 牛排。/
    Niu pai.
    ‘Beef steak.’

3  T: Oh, 你說牛排，人家已經有人說牛排了，uh, somebody call 牛排。
    Ni shuo niu pai, ren jia yi jing you ren shup niu pai le, uh, SOMEBODY CALL niu pai.
    ‘You said beef steak, someone already said beef steak, uh, SOMEBODY CALL beef steak.’

4  Jade: 玉米。
    Yu mi.
    ‘Corn.’

5  T: 玉米，玉米怎麼煮的？
    Yu mi, yu mi ze mo zhu de?
    ‘Corn, how do you cook corn?’

6  Jade: Grill?/

7  Xf: [Grill.]

8  T: [Grill.]
9 T: Grill, 中文怎麼說？
   Zhong wen ze mo shuo?
   ‘How do you say grill in Mandarin?’

10 Sm: [烤玉米。]
   Kao yu mi.
   ‘Grill corn.’

11 T: [烤玉米。] 有看到水果嗎？
   Kao yu mi. You kan dao shui huo ma?
   ‘Grill corn. Did you see fruits?’

12 Ss: 有。
   You.
   ‘Yes.’

13 Xf: That’s here.

14 T: 有看到水果嗎？好，好。那..還有咧？
   You kan dao shui guo ma? Hao, hao. Na.. hai you lei?
   ‘Did you see fruits? OK, OK. Anything else?’

15 Xf: 下..uh like something.
   Xia.
   ‘Below.’

16 T: 有沒有炸，炸什麼？
   You mei you zha, zha she mo?
   ‘Did you see fry, fry what?’

17 Arthur: 炸魚。
   Zha yu.
   ‘Fried fish.’

18 T: Huh? 有嗎？
   You ma?
   ‘Right?’

19 Arthur: No.

20 Sm: 烤魚，烤魚。
   Kao yu, kao yu.
   ‘Grilled fish, grilled fish.’
In example 2, Vivian gave every student a SAT II test and asked them how many Chinese words they could recognize. Lines 1-3 comprise the first I-R-F sequence, where Arthur followed the teacher’s initiation move and gave the normal answer, “牛排” (beef steak). In the second I-R-F exchange of lines 16-19, when the teacher queried the students about “炸什麼” (fry what), Arthur replied, “炸魚” (fried fish), which is not the right answer, so the teacher asked Arthur, “Right?”, and he answered, “No.” However, in lines 21-24, he did not follow the teacher’s initiation move again in terms of I-R-F and replied with “炸大便” (fried poo).

The third I-R-F sequence of lines 21-24 deserves special attention. Despite Arthur’s engagement in talk with the teacher, he disrupted their talk with the taboo word “炸大便” (fried poo), which could be interpreted as intentional. Nevertheless, Arthur received no reprimand – the teacher Vivian had no feedback move and initiated another question by changing the conversation topic in line 24. Unlike example 1 where Vivian gave the correct answer “冷得發抖” (shivering with cold) in line 12, there was no
negative teacher reaction, and it seemed that Vivian did not want Arthur to get back to
the course after his inappropriate answer but tended to avoid such a conflict from
interactional resistance by Arthur. She initiated another question at her follow-up turn in
line 24 and ignored Arthur’s taboo word.

Logically, Arthur must know this taboo word “炸大便” (fried poo) is false, thus
flouting the Quality maxim. Whatever the reason is why Arthur gives the taboo word “炸
大便” (fried poo) as a response, he must know that it is not suitable for the situation and
therefore his response can be seen as challenging the norms of proper classroom conduct.
Taboo language encompasses a variety of types of so-called “bad” language such as
“expressions associated with religion, sex, and death”, “a range of body functions
(particularly excreta)”, “negative epithets”, etc. (Waterhouse, 2005, p. 9). Waterhouse
(2005) provided a brief explanation of six types of taboo or offensive language
distinguished by Mercury (1995) based on their intended functions: cursing, profanity,
blasphemy, obscenity, vulgarisms, and expletives, and “vulgarisms are similar
expressions that are restricted because they are considered crude (e.g., piss, crap)” (p. 10).
In terms of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness principle, “(b) irreverence, mention
of taboo topics, including those that are inappropriate in the context” (p.325) indicates the
speaker does not care about the hearer’s feelings, wants, etc. In this sense, Arthur’s use of
taboo words in the classroom is one “face threatening act” (FTA) (p. 326). Because of a
lack of solidarity or deference politeness, Arthur seems to purposely flout the Quality
maxim, try to miscommunicate rather than communicate successfully, and show his
resistance.
After explaining an activity notice in the same SAT II test, Vivian asked her students when lunch time was. One student answered that it was from eleven a.m. to one p.m. The next question was that if someone left early, would he/she have something to eat? In example 3, Arthur again answered the question with the taboo word “poo” in line 4. Then in line 5, the feedback move was absent – Arthur was ignored by the teacher, who went on with another initiation by asking Brian, “what was for your lunch?’ instead to get the floor back to her.

Example 3. Practice: SAT II test (0052 Vivian 0:23:27-0:23:39)

1 T: 可是你 11 點就要走，你吃不吃得到東西？
   Ke shi ni shi yi dian jiu yao zou, ni chi bu chi de dao dong xi?
   But you have to leave at 11 ((p.m.)), and can you still have something to eat?’

2 Ss: No.

3 T: Might right. OK, 那午餐是吃什麼？
   Na wu can shi chi she mo?
   ‘What is for lunch?’

4 Arthur: 大便。
   Da bian.
   ‘Poo.’

5 T: (.1) 那個，我們請 Brian, Brian 今天好快，Brian 中午吃什麼？
   Na ge, wo men qing Brian, Brian jin tian hao kuai, Brian zhong wu chi she mo?
   ‘That, we have Brian, Brian is quick today. Brian, what was for your lunch?’

Again, the Quality maxim is being flouted by Arthur in this example, and the significance of his false and inappropriate answers “大便” (poo) in examples 1-4 seems that he tries to be a “bad” communicator and question the teacher’s authority in the
interaction. IRF pattern in the classroom appears to be used as a way for Arthur to show his resistance in the interaction because he made disruptive and uncooperative moves in his response turns in the IRF pattern.

In example 4, Vivian continued asking questions about another story in this SAT II test. She asked her students what the character did not like to do. First, she did not like staying at home alone. Second, she did not like studying. And the students began answering what the third one was. Arthur disrupted with the taboo word “poo” twice in lines 6 and 8 respectively.

Example 4. Practice: SAT II test (0052 Vivian 0:33:01-0:33:29)

1 Edison: 看電視。
   *Kan dian shi.*
   ‘Watching TV.’

2 T: 看電視。
   *Kan dian shi.*
   ‘Watching TV.’

3 Ss: 看電視。
   *Kan dian shi.*
   ‘Watching TV.’

4 Edison: 不喜歡聽音樂。
   *Bu xi huan ting yi yue.*
   ‘She doesn’t like listening to music.’

5 T: 噘...她也不喜歡聽音樂，她非常好動，最後一個，她不喜歡怎樣？
   *Shi...Ta ye bu xi huan ting yi yue, ta fei chang hao dong, zui hou yi ge, tab u xi huan ze yang?*
   ‘Shi...she doesn’t like listening to music either, and she is very active. The last one is - what doesn’t she like to do?’
6 Arthur: 大便。
   Da bian.
   ‘Poo.’

7 T: 她不喜歡過安靜的生活，所以她喜歡怎樣？
   Ta bu xi huan guo an jing de sheng huo, suo yi ta xi huan ze yang?
   ‘She doesn’t like leading a quiet life, so what does she like to do?’

8 Arthur: 大便。
   Da bian.
   ‘Poo.’

9 T: 她喜歡熱鬧，對不對？她喜歡 (.3) 她喜歡很多人來家裡，OK?
   Ta xi huan re nao, dui bu dui? Ta xi huan (.3) ta xi huan hen duo ren lai jia li, OK?
   ‘She likes bustle, right? She likes (.3) She likes many people coming to her house,’ OK?

   In lines 5-9, no feedback moves were involved in terms of I-R-F sequence. Vivian queried in lines 5 and 7, but then Arthur replied with “poo” in lines 6 and 8. In line 9, without feedback and reprimand again, Vivian gave the correct answer and explanation.

   Basically, all the poo-responses in examples 2-4, which are predominant throughout the conversations between Vivian and Arthur, are examples of a violation of the Quality maxim. In addition to providing a correct answer in example 1, Vivian tended to ignore him or change the conversation topic instead in examples 2-4, where she did not have the feedback or evaluation move in terms of I-R-F or I-R-E sequence, implying that Arthur broke the classroom norm and interaction pattern, and the teacher Vivian does not try to get “the last word” and merely initiate another question after Arthur’s taboo words. She might have no ready response to his disruptive and uncooperative behaviors, but it is
more likely that she tends to avoid a conflict, so she just ignores him or initiates another question in order to get the floor back to her.

In terms of turn-taking mechanism, it seems that Arthur is cooperative in examples 1-4 since he indeed takes his response turn after the teacher’s initiation turn in the IRF exchange. However, Arthur seems to use the student response turn to create disruptive resistance in the classroom interaction by giving wrong answers or using taboo words instead of giving correct answers. Such language behaviors are uncooperative and violate the Quality maxism of Grice’s cooperative principle, showing that Arthur’s goal of communication is not to succeed but to intentionally miscommunicate.

During my observation, Arthur frequently used taboo words “pee” and “poo” in class. The four examples presented above are typical of his language practice. He explained the reason why he did that in his conversations with me. The following excerpt is from the interview with him.

0069 Arthur (0:10:47-0:11:11)

1  R: 你為什麼會常常講大便啊？這個很有趣，非常有趣耶。沒有好壞，但是姐姐只是很好奇，你不好意思講是因為你不想上課的關係嗎？
2  
3  Arthur: No.

4  R: 還是你想要引人注目？Draw others’ attention?

5  Arthur: No.

6  R: No? 要不然呢？

7  Arthur: Bored.
(Translation)

1 R: Why do you often say poo? This is very interesting. No judgment, but I am just wondering why you are embarrassed to talk about it. Is that because you don’t want to attend class?

2 Arthur: No.

3 R: Or do you want to get someone’s attention? Draw others’ attention?

4 Arthur: No.

5 R: No? Or what else?

6 Arthur: Bored.

7 R: You just feel bored and want to say poo.

8 Arthur: Yes.

In the following interview excerpt, however, Vivian speculated about Arthur’s motivation that he meant to get her attention by saying taboo words so as to disturb the classroom order. In her view, it seemed that Arthur developed the strategies for disruptions, and she thus ignored him most of the time.

0063 Vivian (0:04:27-0:05:07)

1 T: 我是剛好讀一些教育理論它就講說有些小孩就是要 attention 嘛。

2 R: 對。
T: If you scold him, that is what he wants, so I ignore him and then direct him. He will say something like eating poo.

R: Right, I am thinking that in your opinion, why did he have such language behavior? I am also wondering that he says poo all day long, and I think he sometimes means to do that to disturb the classroom order…

T: He means to do that, yes, he wants to disturb, and he wants me to scold him. I don’t want to achieve his purpose, but after class, I will tell him not to say that in class.

According to the above interview quote, the teacher Vivian believed that Arthur desired to draw the attention of her and the other students, but Arthur reported that it was because he felt bored in class. Regardless of what their answers are, as depicted in Chapter 4, Arthur’s ideologies about heritage language and language learning seems to reflect a lack of enthusiasm for learning the Chinese language and attending this Chinese school. Gonzalez and Arnot-Hopffer (2003) have assumed that “language ideologies both constitute and are embedded in social practices, that is, in actual activity” (p. 219). In this
light, Arthur’s ideological resistance seems to be expressed through uncooperative language practices.

5.2.2 Paul (ninth grade)

Compared to Arthur, Paul did not show a feeling that he hated studying the Chinese language. He did not express a view either that he was more like an American when speaking English. He was aware of the importance of studying the Chinese language and perceived it as having value in the future worldwide. He did not develop very negative attitudes toward attending this Chinese heritage language school and did not show his strong resistance to learning the Chinese language. Yet, he expressed his ideological affiliation to English and the English-speaking macro environment. Although he also gave wrong answers as uncooperative behaviors, he disrupted with an orientation toward humor at the same time because he seemed to be trying to be funny and make the class laugh.

In the next case, when the teacher, Lily, was talking about ordering foods in Taiwan, such as “什錦麵” (a kind of noodles) and “什錦火鍋” (a kind of hot pot), Paul said ordering one “漢堡” (hamburger) in Mandarin Chinese in line 4, inserting a comment into an ongoing activity where no talk from students was expected. Also, since “漢堡” (hamburger) is not a traditional food in Taiwan, his comment seemed to give another question directly to his teacher, making her laugh in line 5. He then repeated the same word “漢堡” (hamburger) with laughter, making another student laugh. In line 8,
ordering a “漢堡” (hamburger) was also echoed by Jean with laughter in Mandarin Chinese. Later, Lily changed the conversation topic and explained other words.

5.2.2.1 Giving Wrong Answers

Example 5. Teaching words (0020 Lily: Taiwanese food 0:01:20-0:01:48)

1. T: 那這個呢我會弄在那裏的原因是因為我覺得你們平常的時候會用到，回台灣你要 order 東西的時候，什錦麵、什錦火鍋，這些東西比較平常會用到的東西我讓你。。我會我就把它放進去，OK?

   Ni zhe ge nei wo hui nong zai na li de you bian shi yin wei wo jue de ni men ping chang de shi hou hui yong dao, hui tai wan ni yao ORDER dong xi de shi hou, shi jin mian, shi jin huo guo, zhe xie bi jiao ping chang hui yong dao de dong xi wo rang ni..wo hui wo jiu ba ta fang jin qu, OK?

   ‘About this one, I will show it ((on the power point)) because I think you will use ((these words)) in our daily life. When you go back to Taiwan and order something, like shi jin mian ((a kind of noodles)) and shi jin huo guo ((a kind of hot pot)), because these things are common and you will use these words, I will put them ((on the power point)).

4. Paul: Why don’t we order that, one\漢堡?

   ‘Han bao.

    ‘Hamburger.’

5. T: @@@

6. Paul: That, one\漢堡 [@@@].

   ‘Han bao.

    ‘Hamburger.’

7. Sm: [@@@]

8. Jean: XXX 點一個漢堡 @@@。

   ‘Dian yi ge han bao.

   ‘Order a hamburger.’

9. T: (changing the conversation topic)

10. 衣錦，你的衣服是錦做的，對不對？就是很好的衣服。
In the I-R-F exchange of lines 4-10, Paul not only responded but also initiated a humorous question at the same time in line 4 “Why don’t we order that, one 漢堡 (hamburger)?”, which can be interpreted as made to challenge the teacher. It seemed that the teacher Lily might have no ready response to Paul’s disruptive humor and what she could do was just laugh. Paul received no reprimand, so he again continued with the question in line 6, “That, one 漢堡 (hamburger).” with laughter and gained the floor with an orientation toward humor in that there was no teacher reaction and one student laughed as well. Paul’s initiation moves in lines 4 and 6 can be seen as powerful actions when he challenges the common classroom rules where students are supposed to listen and respond to the question the teacher initiates. However, Lily does not seem too offended by Paul’s initiation moves. Without reprimanding Paul and Jean, Lily just laughed as a response for the first time and tried to get the floor back to her by changing the conversation target to initiate another question in line 10 after Jean’s response turn for the second time. Here, Paul as a student seems to use humor as a strategy to participate in the conversational floor, and Jean also reacts to his humorous act by saying “ordering a ‘漢堡’ (hamburger)”.

Following Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle, the Quality maxim is being flouted in example 5, where Paul intentionally gave an answer that he knows is false. In example 5, Paul said, “Why don’t we order that, one ‘漢堡’ (hamburger)?” while the teacher was talking about ordering foods in Taiwan. Here, Paul must know ‘漢堡’
(hamburger) is not a traditional food in Taiwan, which is not suitable for the situation, meaning that he does not seem to comply with his teacher or even challenge the teacher’s authority because he violates normal classroom interaction patterns and is behaving uncooperatively. Like Arthur, Paul attempts to miscommunicate and show his reluctance to learning Mandarin Chinese; at the same time, nevertheless, he seems to use humor to get away from what could be interpreted as a face-threatening situation. Zajdman (1994) noted that humor can be regarded as “part of a personal communicative strategy” (p. 331), and “humor is closer to the positive politeness techniques which foster friendship and familiarity” (p. 327). In other words, humor used by the students may help maintain the teacher’s face and relieve tensions.

In my interview with Lily, she mentioned that there are two students who deliberately gave incorrect answers in class, and Paul is one of them. It means that Paul does not follow the classroom rules at times and his language behavior is disruptive and uncooperative. In the next excerpt, Lily further interpreted, “He enjoys playing a class clown.”

0095 Lily (0:11:50-0:12:46)

1 R: Paul 是不是很喜歡開玩笑啊，就是…

2 T: Paul 算是..有點..我 (.1) 以前的話，以前來講的話，我們好像有學過一個名詞 叫 clown，那個什麼小丑的那個那個，教室裡有一個小朋友就有每一個小朋友
3 的個性對不對，那以前..我記得有一個那個有一個好像是 clown, 那個小丑的那
4 個個性，我覺得 Paul 以前偏向那個，那現在變慢慢收斂了，蠻多了，他以前
5 就是他就是很愛扮小丑，在班上很愛扮小丑的那種人啦，就是..就是等於是在
6 班上講一些話啊或做一些事情讓班上笑得要命的那種人。
(Translation)

1 R: Does Paul like joking? It is...
2 T: Paul is..kind of..I (.1), in the past, we learned one noun, clown, and every student in
3 the classroom has his/her own personality, right? In the past..I remember a clown’s
4 personality, and I think that Paul has such a personality, but he is getting to restrain
5 himself. He liked playing a clown before and is that kind of person who plays a
6 clown in the class. He says something or does something, which makes the class
7 laugh.

In addition, Lily pointed out that Paul did not purposely disturb the classroom
order by giving wrong answers, and he just felt bored, got distracted easily, and could not
focus in class. The following response reflected this view.

0095 Lily (0:20:26-0:20:34)

他不是故意的，他不是故意要去反駁妳還是什麼，或是故意去搗亂，或者是
什麼，那個不是..那個不是他的個性。

He does not do that on purpose, and he does not mean to answer you back or
disturb anything or do something. That is not..that is not his personality.

It can be suggested that Paul does not desire to show his resistance only, but
rather, to show his humor as a class clown at the same time. After play-back, Lily
expressed the same opinion again about Paul’s language behavior in example 5 in the
next interview excerpt.

0095 Lily (0:23:52-0:24:09)

1 R: 因為我之前好像有問過他漢堡那個例子，結果他就說他不知道，然後我覺得
他…

T: 那個漢堡的例子，我是覺得他真的是神飛掉或是什麼突然回來然後加進去的。

R: @ @@

T: 我真的講，他如果真的離題的時候，常常是因為他自己不專心。

(Translation)

R: Because I seemed to ask him about this example of 漢堡 (hamburger), but he said that he did not know, and then I felt he…

T: About that example of 漢堡 (hamburger), I feel that he was really distracted, then came to himself, and then added it ((to the conversation)).

R: @@@

T: I really mean that if he really digresses from the topic, that is because he often does not concentrate.

To conclude, as already discussed, Arthur and Paul are behaving uncooperatively in the sense that they deliberately fail to do what they are expected to do in the classroom. Their disruptive and uncooperative language behaviors – giving wrong answers or using taboo words, leading to the violations of the normal classroom interactional patterns, would suggest that they are trying their best to avoid linguistic cooperation. In a Gricean framework, there is nonobservance of the Quality maxim. It appears that they purposely miscommunicate. Regardless of what they express, resistance or/and humor, they may not be that concerned with the social recognition of their teachers and adopt a style of non-cooperation as their preferred discourse strategy to challenge their teachers’ authority.
5.3 Student Initiations

In example 5, we found that Paul initiated questions in lines 4 and 6; in the following examples 6-7, the student-initiated IRFs were again found in his other-correction - he corrected the teacher’s English pronunciation or stress in conversation. In other words, Paul reversed his interactional role and changed the classroom power asymmetry. He adopted a pedagogic role and tried to control the discursive interaction since he has more competence in English.

5.3.1 Paul’s Other-correction

In example 6, the teacher, Lily, was explaining what “綠葉成蔭” (lu ye cheng yin) means. It means “Green leaves make a shade.” In lines 1-2, Lily said, “another word (exuberantly) is too difficult to pronounce, and I don’t want to read it,” where she opened the door for her student, Paul, to catch this opportunity to teach her English pronunciation of “exuberantly” in line 3. Later, Lily just said “yes” in response as the feedback without reiterating it. Paul once again syllabled this long word with a slower pace, and this time Lily repeated it in line 6. Lines 5-7 comprise the I-R-F sequence, where Paul initiated the correction, Lily followed his initiation move and repeated the word, and then one boy student (unidentified) gave the feedback “Here you go” to confirm that Lily’s pronunciation was correct. Another I-R-F sequence is in lines 10-12, where Paul corrected Lily’s pronunciation of the word “leafy”. Lily reiterated it, and Paul had the feedback move “There you go”.
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Example 6. Teaching Chinese phrases (0020 Lily 0:07:27-0:08:07)

1 T: 那個蔭是...shade 的意思，所以呢，有什麼， leafy 的意思，另外那個字太難
念，我不要念。@@@
   Na ge yin shi..SHADE de yi si, suo yi ne, you she mo, LEAFY de yi si, ling wai na
g zi tai nan nian, wo bu yao nian.
   ‘That yin means..shade, so it has the meaning of leafy. Another word is too difficult
to pronounce, and I don’t want to read it.’

2 Paul: (reading the word) Exuberantly.

3 T: Yes.\

4 Paul: Yeah./ (.5) E..xu..be..rant..ly.

5 T: E..xu..be..rant..ly.

6 Sm: [Here you go.]

7 Paul: [E..xu..be..rant..ly.]

8 T: @@ See, you guys may follow me. (.2) 簡單一點，leafry @@ leaf, leafy.@@
   Jian dan yi duan.
   ‘Make it simpler.’

9 Paul: You said leafry, [leafy]. @

10 T: [Leafy]. \Yeah.

11 Paul: There you go.

12 T: (changing the conversation topic ) 再來，樹蔭，什麼是樹蔭？
   Zai lai, shu yin, she mo shi shu yin?
   ‘One more, shu yin, what is shu yin?’

The two I-R-F sequences suggest that Paul plays the expert and authoritative role
to correct Lily’s English pronunciation. He and another boy also have the feedback move
to evaluate Lily’s performance - the boy said “Here you go” as the feedback in line 7
after the teacher Lily read “exuberantly”, and Paul said “There you go” in line 12 after Lily read “leafy”. Such student-initiated correction is rarely expected in the educational settings, and Paul’s act of correcting his teacher’s pronunciation is counter to the norm – it is normative that teachers assume the expert and authoritative role to evaluate their students’ performance, which results in the inversion of the normal classroom power dynamics. However, in the later section, Lily expressed acceptance of the correction by her students since English is not her native language, and she has a closer relationship with her students. In Chapter 4, she also mentioned that this Chinese school is informal; it is a place where she teaches the students Mandarin Chinese, and the students teach her English.

When Paul initiated the correction in line 3, the teacher responded with “yes” in line 4 and did not repeat after Paul immediately. In line 5, it is more likely that Paul intended to help the teacher because he did not respond but initiated the correction again. At this time, the teacher reiterated the word after him, and one boy student (unidentified) gave the feedback “Here you go” in line 7.

In the following, Paul’s correction of Lily’s English led her to laugh again. At the beginning of example 7, the teacher, Lily, was asking her students what “阿摩尼亞” (ammonia) is, and Paul responded with “ammonia” in line 2. In line 3, Lily repeated it with laughter as the feedback, and opened the door for Paul to correct her in line 4, causing her to laugh and change another topic.
Example 7. Teaching Chinese words (0067 Lily: Lesson 4 Hospitality 0:00:45-0:00:51)

1 T: 阿摩尼亞是什麼?
   A mo ni ya shi she mo?
   ‘What is a mo ni ya?’

2 Paul: Ammonia.

3 T: <@ Ammonia, yes. @>

4 Paul: Ammonia.

5 T: <@ Ahah @>, ammonia 被味道怎樣？不好聞。
   De wei dao ze mo yang? Bu hao wen.
   ‘How about the smell of ammonia? It’s smelly.’

Like in example 6, Paul also assumes the role of arbiter with respect to her pronunciation and stress of the English word, “ammonia” in this sequence. In the I-R-F exchange of lines 2-4, Paul initiated the first turn by teaching her how to pronounce the word “ammonia”. Lily had feedback (or evaluation) move “Ammonia, yes.” in line 3, and Paul offered a correction from his vantage point by virtue of his English ability in line 4.

After I listened to this conversation a couple of times, it seems to me that Lily’s pronunciation or stress of “ammonia” in line 3 was a little close to how Paul read this word in line 2, but he still intended to offer the correction on her nonnative English again in line 4. As a native English speaker, perhaps Paul felt that a correction should be made and he wanted Lily to read this word better.

In line 5, Lily did not repeat it immediately; she said “Ahah” with laughter and then said ammonia at the beginning of the Chinese sentence “How about the smell of ammonia?”
Subsequently, I queried Paul about his feeling when playing back his conversations in examples 5-7, but unfortunately, I did not get any further explanation from him since his response was “沒有印象” (no impression), and he did not notice what he was saying then.

0065 Paul (0:48:37-0:48:57)

(After playing back)

1 R: 你有印象了嗎？

2 Paul: 哦…I’m not sure that’s really meaning talking; I mean I don’t really remember by saying that at all or…”

3 R: 你不確定這是你講的嗎？你完全都不記得了，可是

4 Paul: 哦…I don’t know I don’t really listen to myself most of the time.

5 這是你的聲音，對吧？

6 R: 阿r’t you sure that this is what you said? You don’t completely remember it, but

7 Paul: Eh…I don’t know I don’t really listen to myself most of the time.

(Translation)

1 R: Do you have any impression ((of the conversations))?

2 Paul: Oh… I’m not sure that’s really meaning talking; I mean I don’t really remember by saying that at all or…”

3 R: Aren’t you sure that this is what you said? You don’t completely remember it, but

4 Paul: Eh…I don’t know I don’t really listen to myself most of the time.
Paul had no answer to this question of why he corrected the teacher’s pronunciation. When I interviewed him, it seemed that he was not willing to answer some of questions or had no ideas, including responding with “漢堡” (hamburger) in example 5.

Like Paul, Jack also made the initiation turns in the IRF pattern where he corrected the teacher Lily’s English, as is shown in examples 8-9 below.

5.3.2 Jack’s Other-correction

In Chapter 4, I examined Jack’s self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning. Jack’s father is American and his mother is Taiwanese. His mother is also the teacher, Lily. He reported that he is mostly American, speaking English in conversation signals that he is American, and he is not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture, showing his strong ideological affiliation to English and the American society. Although he admitted the importance of studying the Chinese language to obtain job opportunities in his future, he did not really have a strong motivation to study the Chinese language.

In the next case, the teacher, Lily, was explaining different types of facial-painting in Beijing Opera. When Lily was asking about what “精靈” (Jing ling) is, Jack provided the answer “fairy” and “elf” in line 3. Lily mispronounced this word “elf” in line 4, and Jack thus initiated the correction in line 5.
Example 8. Beijing Opera (0044 Lily: Lesson 2 Experiencing Culture and the Arts 1:36:42 -1:37:12)

T: 銀色，它這裡說銀色是妖怪，跟我查到的又有點不一樣，所以我也不太清楚
這個到底是怎樣。它說銀色是妖怪，灰色的什麼，是精靈，精靈是什麼？

Yin se, ta zhe li shuo yin se shi yao guai, ge wo cha dao de you you dian bu yi yang,
suo yi wo ye bu tai qing chu zhe ge dao di shi ze yang. Ta shuo yin se shi yao guai,
hui se de shi she mo, shi jing ling, jing ling shi she mo?

‘Silver, here silver means a monster, which is different from the answer I searched for. So I am not clear exactly about what it is. It said silver means a monster, and something gray is jing ling. What is jing ling?’

Jack: Fairy, elf.

T: el..uh, yeah, fa..fairy 或者是 el..elber 之類的東西。OK．
HUO ZHE SHI ZHI LEI DE DONG XI.
‘Or it is el..elber, whatever.’

Jack: Elf.

Ss: @@@

Jack: Elf.

T: Elf, OK. Sorry. [@@@]

Ss: [@@@]

T: (changing the conversation topic) 好，所以那個都在你們那個上面，所以我們
訓練人物裡面..裡面記不記得藍色...

Hao, suo yin a ge dou zai ni men na ge shang mian, suo yi wo men na ge dai biao ren wu li mian.. li men jib u ji de lan se...

‘OK, so that is on ((something)), so the representative figure..do you remember blue color...’
In terms of I-R-F exchange, Lily’s feedback (or evaluation) move in line 4 turned out to be not successful because she did not pronounce the word “elf” properly, allowing Jack to pronounce it again in line 5, but she did not follow it immediately until Jack once again pronounced the word in line 7. In line 8, she said “sorry” with laughter after being corrected by Jack and repeating it and then changed the conversation target in lines 10-11. It should be noted that she said “sorry” and laughed, implying that she admits making a mistake and her lesser competence in English pronunciation. Also, it seems that Jack is constructed as the legitimate authority to correct her pronunciation.

Once again, example 9 illustrates how Jack corrected Lily’s pronunciation of the word “misunderstanding”. Lily was requesting every student to give an example about the difference between Chinese and Western table manners. Eric was chosen to answer this question, but it seemed that he was not sure what Lily meant, so he gave the answer “beer” in line 4. Lily wanted to point out that it was a “misunderstanding” in line 6, but she pronounced it as “misterun…” It seemed that she hesitated to pronounce it, which marks her uncertainty with respect to its correctness. Eric tried to answer this question again after Lily’s request and finally replied with “給中國人喝冰水” (Giving Chinese people iced water) in line 14. For Lily, it was still a misunderstanding, yet she mispronounced it again in her feedback move in line 17. Jack initiated the correction of her pronunciation in line 20, and Lily followed his initiated move and repeated it. Jack then explained why he corrected her pronunciation – because her pronunciation sounded like “misterunderstanding” in line 22.
Example 9. Discussion: Chinese and Western table manners (0084 Ying-Li: Lesson 4 Hospitality 0:41:40-0:42:48)

1 T: 哦=，還有什麼？還有誰？有什麼東西，Eric?
   O Hai you she mo? Hai you shei? You she mo dong xi
   ‘Oh Anything else? Who else? What things, Eric?’

2 Eric: 哦/…
   O.
   ‘Oh.’

3 T: 你有什麼？
   Ni you she mo?
   ‘What do you have?’

4 Eric: Beer? Oh, yeah,

5 R: @@@

6 T: misterun…

7 Jack: XXX right now. (.2)

8 Eric: 就…
   Jiu…
   ‘That is…’

9 T: 還有什麼？(4) 快點。
   Hai you she mo? Kuai dian.
   ‘What else? Come on.’

10 Eric: 哦，不知道別人要喝什麼，because…
    O, bu zhi dao bie ren yao he she mo.BECAUSE...
    ‘Oh, ((someone)) doesn’t know what other people want to drink, BECAUSE…’

11 Jack: What would you be talking about?

12 Eric: 那個哦，別人可能會…
    Na ge o, bie ren ke neng hui...
    ‘That one, oh, other people may…’

13 Jack: @@@@
14 Eric: 給中國人喝冰水。

   Gei zhong guo ren he bing shui.
   ‘Giving Chinese people iced water.’

15 T: Hah? 那個..那個有差嗎？給..給給中國人喝冰水有關係嗎？

   Hah? Na ge..Na ge you cha ma? Gei..gei zhong guo ren he bing shui you guan
   xi ma?

   ‘Hah? That..is that the difference? Give Chinese people iced water?

16 Eric: 我的意思 right, uh, 他們不喜歡喝冰的東西。

   Wo de yi si ta men bu xi huan he bing de dong xi.
   ‘I mean they don’t like drinking iced things.’

17 T: 不喜歡並不是說不可以，那個我現在説的 misterunderstanding.

   Bu bu xi huan bing bu shi shuo bu ke yi, na ge wo xian zai shuo de
   MISTERUNDERSTANDING.

   ‘Don’t like doesn’t mean mustn’t, that is what I am saying now
   MISTERUNDERSTANDING.’

18 Sm: @@@

19 T: It’s 呢，跟那個 make it look bad, make you look bad.

   IT’S Ne gen a ge MAKE IT LOOK BAD, MAKE YOU LOOK BAD.
   ‘IT’S (Paticle), and that one MAKE IT LOOK BAD, MAKE YOU LOOK
   BAD.’

20 Jack: Misunderstanding.

21 T: Misunderstanding.

22 Jack: Sounds same mister..understanding.

23 T: @@@

24 T: (changing the conversation topic) 那個 Eric…

   Na ge.
   ‘That one.’
From line 1 through 19, Lily mispronounced the word “misunderstanding” twice in line 6 and 17 respectively. Jack initiated the correction in line 20, and Lily reiterated it in her response turn. In line 22, Jack evaluated Lily’s pronunciation in line 17 in his follow-up turn and thus gained a powerful position since he got the last word “Sounds same mister..understanding” and played the expert and authoritative role to correct and evaluate Lily’s performance. In line 23, Lily said nothing but just laughed in reply, probably because she did not know how to deal with this and had no ready response to Jack’s correction. She then changed the conversation target, called Eric and avoided embarrassment in line 24.

Subsequently, I queried Jack about his feeling when playing back his conversations. Below is the reason why Jack corrects Lily’s pronunciation – he wants her to have better English.

0094 Jack (0:44:58-0:45:44)

1 R: I just want to ask you why you wanted to correct your teacher’s English pronunciation. Is that because it’s funny or you are used to doing that or other reasons. Can you tell me?

2 Jack: I just want her to have better English.

3 R: @ So you just want to help her have better English.

4 Jack: Yeah.

5 R: OK. What else?

6 Jack: No.
Jack is also Lily’s son. With such a close family relationship, he corrects her pronunciation at home pretty often, which is consistent with what Norrick (1991) argued for. It is assumed in his study that the students and the teacher perceive one another’s asymmetrical abilities in English, and their interactional goals are that the students, as a pedagogical stance, want to provide a friendly help and improve their teacher’s English, and the teacher is willing to learn how to pronounce English words correctly. Jack reported that he just wanted Lily to have better English, reflecting his attitude toward English. Since he identifies himself as American (NS), he seems to initiate the corrections to help Lily (NNS).

In the next section, Lily’s interview quotes also express such attitudes. In addition to Paul and Jack, other students like Jean, etc., also corrected her pronunciation in class.

5.3.3 Lily’s Attitudes toward the Students’ Other-correction

As we have described in Chapter 4, Lily has adopted the view that it should be less formal in this Chinese school than the usual educational settings, and has also embraced the “bilingualism” ideology – she and her students learn from each other without using Mandarin Chinese exclusively. In addition, the interview quotes below also show the reasons why she is used to being corrected by her students without embarrassment: (i) English is not her native language; (ii) Each teacher must make a mistake; (iii) She has a closer relationship with her students.
English Is Not Her Native Language

First of all, Lily emphasized that English is not her native language, and her pronunciation is not so good, so she has gotten used to being corrected by her husband and students.

1. 0094 Lily (0:00:03-0:00:35)

1 R: 平常應該是妳先生糾正妳的發音嘛，對不對？

2 T: 對啊！Hei-ah (Taiwanese, meaning yes.), 所以我已經很習慣了。

3 R: 她已經很習慣了，所以上課的時候同學糾正妳，

4 她也覺得 OK 這樣嗎？

5 T: 無所謂啊，本來就是我本身的發音就不是很..因為她並不是那個什麼 native language 嘛。

6 R: 對對。

7 T: 對，所以被糾正無所謂啊。

8 R: 那…

9 T: 我已經很習慣了啦！

10  <@ 老實說，我已經很習慣了。@>

(Translation)

1 R: Normally, it should be your husband that corrects your English, right?

2 T: Right! Hei (Taiwanese, meaning yes.), so I get used to it.

3 R: You have already got used to it, so when the students correct you in class, you also feel it is fine. Is that right?

5 T: I don’t care, and my pronunciation is originally not very..because it is not
something, native language. ((English is not my native language.))

R: Right.

T: Right, so I don’t care about being corrected.

R: That…

T: I have got very used to it already!

<T: To be honest, I have got very used to it already. @>

Then, Lily pointed out that each teacher must make a mistake, so she does not care and also follows her students when they correct her pronunciation. She thinks that she needs to learn how to pronounce English words too.

_Each Teacher Must Make a Mistake_

In the following quotation, I asked Lily about her authoritative role in the classroom. Interestingly, she still reiterated that she does not care, does not feel embarrassed, and is willing to admit her mistakes.

2. 0094 Lily (0:03:59-0:04:42)

T: 因為我從以前英文的那個糾正就是被糾正過嘛，所以我很習慣被糾正，妳知
道說 @。

R: @ 可是因為今天是課堂上，因為一般不管是在美國或台灣都一樣，就是說在
教室裡面，老師是算比較權威的角色嘛。

T: 對啊。/

R: 那通常是老師去糾正學生，那可能比較不習慣被學生糾正或者..或者是[覺得
有點尷尬。]
Lily noted the difference between American public school and this Chinese school. In general, almost each teacher teaches the same group of students for just one
year in American public school; yet conversely, many teachers in this Chinese school teach the same group of students for more than one year.

3. 0094 Lily (0:09:17-0:09:38)

1 T: 那妳想想看，中文學校的話不一樣，
2 我從一年級帶他們帶到九年級，對不對？
3 我跟他們多熟啊。

4 R: 哦…

5 T: 我說幾乎等於是說，從小看他們長大，而且在這之前我不是他們老師的時候，
6 他們還在幼稚班的時候，Jack 也在那一班呀，我也是那一班的家長啊，我
7 們通常常常有 party, potluck.

(Translation)

1 T: Please think about it. Chinese schools are different ((from other schools)). I have been their teacher since they were in the first grade and now they are in the ninth grade, right? I am so familiar with them.

4 R: Oh…

5 T: I can almost say that I have been watching them growing up. When I was not their teacher and they were in kindergarten, Jack was also in the same class and I was a parent. We usually have a party, potluck.

Lily has a closer relationship with her students since she has already taught her students for nine years. In addition, she is not only a teacher but also a parent to her students in that she knew them before teaching them when they were in kindergarten.

Such different roles influence the students’ attitudes toward her, as is shown again below.
4. 0094 Lily (0:09:56-0:10:48)

1 T: 所以我對他們來講並不是，並不只是老師而已，我還是個家長。

2 R: 哦，所以有不同的角色，不是單純的老師的那個…

3 T: 對，對他們來講，我覺得啦，我不只是一個老師而已啦，所以我還是就是普通
4 通的家長，因為我跟他們太熟了啊，他們從小，從幾歲開始，從四五歲開
5 始，我就知道，認識他們啊。

(…)

6 T: 所以說他們來糾正我的話我無所謂，因為我跟他們太熟，他們跟我太熟了，所以他們會來糾正我。如果今天是不熟的話，我不知道他們會不會這麼做。

(Translation)

1 T: So for them, I am not only a teacher but also a parent.

2 R: Oh, so you have different roles, not only a teacher…

3 T: Right, for them, I feel that I am not only a teacher but also a parent, because I am too familiar with them. Since they were little, four or five years old, I have known them.

(…)

6 T: So I don’t care if they correct me, because I am too familiar with them. They are too familiar with me, so they will correct me. If we are not familiar with one another, I don’t know if they will do so.

As Lily stated, if she and they are not familiar with one another, maybe they will not do so. She stressed again that this Chinese school is not an informal educational setting, so the traditional perspectives on what role a teacher plays in the classroom cannot be taken into account. It is noteworthy that the interview quotes from Lily mostly
echo Cameron’s (2001) argument that we may behave less politely with those people we are socially close to like family and friends (p. 81). In particular, Lily’s closer relationship with her students is a significant factor affecting their interaction and power relations in the classroom. Norrick (1991) also noted that if the first speaker willingly accepts the role of learner, other-correction will not necessarily cause severe face threat. Lily likewise reported that she did not feel embarrassed when corrected by her students. Additionally, based on Norrick (1991), the corrections by the students in examples 6-9 show the exchanges of corrective feedback from the native speaker (NS) to the nonnative speaker (NNS) because of Lily’s nonnative English. In general, “the NS does the correction from the position of the knowledgeable participant, and the NNS accepts the correction from the position of the linguistically inferior. That is, the participants orient to their identities as a native and a non-native speaker during an other-correction sequence” (Kurhila, 2001, p. 1104). In Chapter 4, Paul and Jack identified themselves as American-born Chinese (ABC) and American respectively, and English was their first language. It seems that the correction actions taken by them (NS) are for the teacher Lily (NNS). Paul and Jack other-correct Lily since they have more competence in English and are aware of Lily’s English level, meaning that their American identity is embedded in the correction actions. This also echoes their ideological affiliation with English described in Chapter 4: I prefer English. They were born and raised in the United States, so years of contact and socialization in an English context may contribute to their identification with the dominant societal group. They are fully proficient in English and seem to identify with English, yet they are not so proficient in Mandarin Chinese, probably affecting their
attitude toward the Chinese heritage language and learning it. As discussed in Chapter 4, they reported that they do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language and do not want to learn it.

5.4 Code-switching

In this section, I provide a discussion of how Arthur and Bill employed code-switching as an accommodative strategy to express solidarity and reduce social distance when arguing with their teacher. In examples 10-12, they converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language. Sachdev and Giles (2004) argued that “Bilingual communication is not only a matter of exchanging referential information, but salient social category memberships are often negotiated during an interaction through the processes of accommodation” (p. 354). On this view, Arthur’s and Bill’s attempts at language convergence might be seen as a sign of agreement and ingroup solidarity. Interestingly, Vivian’s choice to switch to Taiwanese may also be construed as an accommodation in order to reduce conflict and tension in the classroom.

5.4.1 Arthur’s Code-switching in Arguing with the Teacher

In this exchange, the teacher requested Arthur to read a paragraph, but Arthur was not willing to do that because it was too long. In the beginning, Arthur responded to the teacher’s instruction in Mandarin Chinese and then switched to English in lines 11, 13, and 15 when he began arguing with the teacher. However, from line 16 through 21, he
did not follow the teacher’s imperative moves and then switched from English into Mandarin Chinese in lines 17, 19, and 21. In this conversation, the teacher spoke Mandarin Chinese all the time.

**Example 10. Reading the text (0018 Vivian 0:07:56-0:08:33)**

1. T: 好了。(.3) 所以因為我們都會了，我們把它唸一唸，從 (.2) 噓 (.3) 從 Arthur
2.  開始。

   *Hao le. Suo yi yin wei wo men dou hui le, wo men ba ta nian yi nian, cong shi cong Andy kais hi.*

   ‘OK. Thus, because we all learned ((the text)), and we read it now. From (.2) shi (.3) Arthur is the first one to read.’

3. Arthur: 嗯？/

   *En?*

   ‘Um?’

4. T: 唸。

   *Nian.*

   ‘Read.’

5. Arthur: 豪？

   *Hao?*

   ‘Lux((urious))?’

6. T: [唸到..句點。]

   *Nian dao..ju dian.*

   ‘Read until the period.’

7. Arthur: [豪華？]

   *Hao hua?*

   ‘Luxurious?’

8. T: 對。

   *Dui.*

   ‘Right.’

9. Arthur: 句點。

   *Ju dian.*
Ju dian.
‘Period.’

10 T: Uh.

11 Arthur: The first comma?

12 T: 句點。Circle.
   Ju dian.
   ‘Period.’

13 Arthur: (with a complaining tone) That much? / That’s the whole paragraph. All that.

14 T: 沒有啊。
   Mei you a.
   ‘Not much.’

15 Arthur: (with an arguing tone) <F Yeah. / F>

16 T: 那有。
   Na you.
   ‘No.’

17 Arthur: (with a arguing tone) <F 有。\ F>
   You.
   ‘Yes.’

18 T: (with a impatient tone) <F 沒，快點唸。\ F>
   Mei, guai dian nian.
   ‘No, read it right now.’

19 Arthur: (with a arguing tone) <F 有。\ F>
   You.
   ‘Yes.’

20 T: (with a impatient tone) <F 趕快唸。\ F>
   Gan kuai nian.
   ‘Read it right now.’

21 Arthur: (with a arguing tone) <F 我太懶。\ F>
   Wo tai lan.
   ‘I am too lazy.’
Gumperz (1982) argued that all the contextual clues in various discourse types should be taken into account, including turn-taking strategies, speech accommodation, and voice alterations. Following Gumperz (1982), Ladegaard (2009) added that the use of these cues may help us understand the intention of speaker accurately in an interaction and whether or not he/she is being cooperative. In his study, Ladegaard (2009) used Speech / Communication Accommodation Theory (SAT/CAT) to explain the teacher’s motivation when she accommodated toward the nonstandard dialect or speech style of her students, possibly in an attempt to make them cooperate. Her over-accommodation might be to appeal to her students for social approval and/or signal agreement and ingroup solidarity (p. 659-660). In example 10, the particular code-switching explicates that Arthur’s first switches to English as a strategy of divergence seem to show his resistance because his goal is to avoid reading this long paragraph but in vain. Then his switches to Mandarin Chinese are employed as an accommodating strategy to achieve his goal again, probably because the use of Mandarin Chinese could help reduce the tension between the teacher and him. In other words, Arthur accommodated toward the teacher’s ingroup language, Mandarin Chinese, which can also be seen as a sign of agreement and ingroup
solidarity. Here we might expect a teacher reprimand; nevertheless, it seems to show acquiescence and acceptance of the teacher’s authority. Then the teacher changed the target – called another student’s name and avoided Arthur’s continuous arguing. We found that Arthur eventually gave up trying to argue with his teacher and began reading this paragraph. Regardless of his strategy of divergence or convergence, Arthur showed his stance of resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese, but unfortunately, both his strategies were unsuccessful and he ended up reading the long paragraph.

Note that in line 21, Arthur responded with a arguing tone, “我太懶” (I am too lazy), which is consistent with his reason - “我太懶” in lines 7 and 9 in the interview excerpt below when asked about why he does not speak Mandarin Chinese in his home.

0069 Arthur (0:01:22-0:01:50)

1 R: 第六題，你在家裡，你們家裡的人都用什麼語言？
2 Your family?
3 Arthur: 我說英文，媽媽和爸爸都說中文。
4 R: 是喔？
5 Arthur: 嗯嗯。
6 R: 那你為什麼不講中文？
7 Arthur: 太懶了。
8 R: @@@ 真的嗎？你覺得你中文太爛了。
9 Arthur: 我太懶。
10 R: 喔，你太懶喔，不想講，不想開口講中文。
R: Question 6, when you are at home, what language do your family members use at home? Your family?

Arthur: I speak English, and my mom and dad speak Mandarin Chinese.

R: Really?

Arthur: Uh-huh.

R: Why don’t you speak Mandarin Chinese?

Arthur: I am too lazy.

R: @@@ Really? You feel that your Mandarin Chinese is too poor.

Arthur: I am too lazy.

R: Oh, you are too lazy, and you don’t want to speak Mandarin Chinese.

Arthur: Uh-huh.

In Mandarin Chinese, “懶” (lazy) and “爛” (poor) have the same pronunciation with different tones, so I was confused with Arthur’s tone and meaning in the beginning in lines 7-10. Here, “我太懶” (I am too lazy) means his lack of motivation to speak Mandarin Chinese, no matter where he is, in his home or in the classroom. This seems to explain Arthur’s resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese in example 10.

The following two examples demonstrated how code-switching was used by Bill to deal with potential tensions and conflicts.
5.4.2 Bill’s Code-switching in Arguing with the Teacher

In example 11, the teacher, Vivian, stressed the importance of speaking Mandarin Chinese and complained that the students did not use it. In line 5, Bill retorted, saying, “I can say things.” Subsequently, Vivian invited him to say something in Mandarin Chinese. Interestingly, instead of giving a Mandarin response to Vivian, he replied in Taiwanese, “我” (I) in line 7 and “我是修理水電的” (I am a plumber.) in line 9, and all the students laughed after hearing this. In Vivian’s view, Bill purposely said this, so she initiated a question with Taiwanese words “阿公阿媽” (a gong a ma, Grandpa and Grandma) inside to elicit the reason from Bill but she failed.

Example 11. Discussion (0002 Vivian: the importance of learning Mandarin part I 0:28:11-0:29:00)

1 T: 你一定要知道怎麼寫中文啊，不然你回去台灣你怎麼你怎麼點菜?
   ‘You must know how to write Chinese, or how do you order food when you go back to Taiwan?’

2 Xf1: My mom will translate.

3 Xf2: I know what they are saying, but I can’t say anything back to them.

4 T: 那就是因為你太少講，我現在叫你講你又不講。
   ‘That is because you rarely speak ((Mandarin)), and now I ask you to speak ((Mandarin)), but you don’t want to.’

5 Bill: <HI I can say things. HI>

6 T: 那你現在可以說啊。
Na ni xian zai ke yi shuo a.
‘You can say (something in Mandarin) now.’

7 Bill: <LO 我 LO>
   Wa
   ‘I.’

8 T: 什麼，你會說什麼 thing?
   She mo, ni hui shuo she mo THING?
   ‘What? What thing can you say?’

9 Bill: 我是修理水電的。
   Wa si siu li ju den ei.
   ‘I am a plumber.’

10 Ss: @@@

11 T: 他說什麼？<HI 他每次都講這句 HI>，他說他是 plumber (.2) 是不是？他是修水電的，他是故意的啦。那是因為你回阿公阿媽家，碰到修水電的人來按電鈴嗎？那為什麼學這句?
   Ta shuo she mo? Ta mei ci dou jiang zhe ju, ta shuo ta shi PLUMBER shi bus hi? Ta shi xiu shui dian de. Ta shi gu yi de la, ni shi yi wei ni hui A GONG A MA jia, peng dao xiu shui dian de ren lai an dian ling ma? Na wei she mo xue zhe ju?
   ‘(To the class) What did he say? He says this every time. He said he is a plumber, didn’t he? He is a plumber. He meant to say so. (To Bill) That is because you went back to your grandparents’ home and a plumber rang the doorbell? Why did you learn this sentence?’

14 Bill: No.

15 T: No reason?

Note that in lines 2 and 3, two girl students (unidentified) first responded to the teacher Vivian in English, arguing that they did not have to know how to write Mandarin Chinese. After that, Vivian continued talking her students into speaking more Mandarin
Chinese, yet in line 5, Bill also responded to Vivian in English with “I can say things.” Their use of English all reflects their resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese.

Here, the switch to Taiwanese in line 9 seems to fulfill Bill’s intention of avoiding potential conflicts, which was later confirmed by Bill in his interview below.

0054 Bill (0:31:34-0:33:35)

1 R: 你每次都講這一句, 那為什麼？有什麼特別原因嗎？
2 好玩還是？
3 Bill: 我喜歡說。

(Then the researcher checked the digital voice recorder.)

4 R: 可是你好像只會這一句耶?

5 Bill: (partially in Taiwanese) 我, 廚飯、吃 XX、泡茶、洗澡 (.4) 我已經說吃飽了 嗎？

6 R: (in Taiwanese) 是。

7 R: (in Taiwanese) 是。

8 R: 其實姐姐這裡有一個問題就是說，
9 因為你們老師一直要讓你們講中文，
10 她一直講說：「現在叫你講你又不講。」你就是不回答，
11 不用中文回答，你卻回答台語，可是你也沒有回答英文。
12 可是我很好奇，你為什麼突然會想要講台語？
13 你就是死不想講中文，那時候是不是這樣？

14 Bill: 對啊/。

15 R: 可是那你，你也不想要用英文回答？

16 Bill: 如果她已經講中文了，我不喜歡用英文回答。

17 R: 這樣子喔，為什麼？
Bill: 因為她問，用中文問的。

R: 你的感覺是，她用中文問你，你覺得你不應該用英文回答，是這樣嗎？

Bill: 對啊。

R: 可是你又不想要用中文，用中文回答她，你抗拒講中文，所以你就用台語，是不是這樣？

Bill: (點頭)。

R: 所以那個時候只是很單純抗拒講中文，就非常單純是這樣的關係嗎？

Bill: 對啊。

Translation

1 R: You always say this sentence, and why is that? Do you have a special reason? For fun or (something else)?

Bill: I like to say it.

(Then the researcher checked the digital voice recorder.)

4 R: But it seems that you can only say this sentence?

Bill: (partially in Taiwanese) I, eat, eat XX, make tea, take a bath (.) Have I already said full?

7 R: (in Taiwanese) Yes.

8 R: Here, I actually have a question for you because your teacher keeps urging you all to speak mandarin Chinese. She always said, “now I ask you to speak ((Mandarin)), but you don’t want to.” You didn’t reply, but rely in Taiwanese rather than Mandarin Chinese. However, you didn’t reply in English either. I am curious, and why did you suddenly want to speak Taiwanese? You really resist speaking Mandarin Chinese. Is that true at that time?

Bill: Right.
R: But you, you don’t want to reply in English either?

Bill: Because she already spoke Mandarin Chinese, I didn’t like to reply in English.

R: That’s it? Why?

Bill: Because she asked in Mandarin Chinese.

R: Your feeling is that she asked you in Mandarin Chinese, and you think that you shouldn’t reply in English. That’s it?

Bill: Right.

R: But you didn’t want to use Mandarin Chinese in response to her. You resisted speaking Mandarin Chinese, so you used Taiwanese. That’s it?

Bill: (nodding).

R: So you just resisted speaking Mandarin Chinese at that time? Is that your simple reason?

Bill: Right.

In this excerpt, Bill stated that he resisted speaking Mandarin Chinese at that time and did not desire to reply in Mandarin Chinese, yet he did not like to reply in English either when the teacher spoke Mandarin Chinese. It seems that Bill switches to Taiwanese in order not to speak Mandarin Chinese and not to offend his teacher, showing his resistance to speaking Mandarin Chinese.

As discussed in Chapter 4, I asked him why he did not like speaking Mandarin Chinese then. Bill reported that it was because he felt uncomfortable when speaking Mandarin Chinese in front of many classmates. It seems that he is not confident of speaking it since he pressures himself into speaking it well, which may be the reason why
he resists speaking Mandarin Chinese during class. However, Bill’s mother also told me that her husband (Bill’s father) cannot speak English well, so Bill speaks Mandarin Chinese with his father.

After playing back their conversations, I asked the teacher Vivian about Bill’s use of Taiwanese.

0062 (0:32:07-0:32:14)

T: Why can Bill speak Taiwanese? Because his father and mother speak it. His father speaks a lot of Taiwanese, and he speaks more Taiwanese with Bill’s grandmother.

(Translation)

T: Why can Bill speak Taiwanese? Because his father and mother speak it. His father speaks a lot of Taiwanese, and he speaks more Taiwanese with Bill’s grandmother.

Additionally, Vivian reported herself as a Mandarin speaker, yet she told me that she grew up in the bilingual environment – Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese, so she can understand Taiwanese. When she was little, her grandmother did not understand Mandarin Chinese and could only speak Taiwanese, so her family members needed to communicate with her grandmother in Taiwanese. However, she admitted that she could not speak Taiwanese fluently.

In example 11, it might be assumed that Bill uses Taiwanese as the strategy of resistance as well as of accommodation. First, in order not to speak Mandarin Chinese, Bill switched to Taiwanese, thereby showing his resistance to speaking Mandarin Chinese. Second, in order not to offend his teacher, he switched to Taiwanese to signify a
closer relationship between him and Vivian, signaling ingroup membership, and express his partial solidarity. In lines 11-13, it should be noted that Vivian used code-mixing - she used not only the English word “plumber” but also the Taiwanese words “阿公阿媽” (Grandpa and Grandma) in her response. As noted by Sachdev and Giles (2004), “Mutual language convergence could be used as a strategy to promote ethnic harmony, even at the potential cost of communicative effectiveness” (p. 355). In general, students are in subordinate positions would converge to teachers in superordinate positions (upward convergence), but here, we found that the language convergence they displayed means more negotiation and cooperation between them since English is Bill’s preferred language and Taiwanese is Vivian’s ingroup language.

There were occasions in which Taiwanese seemed to be used by the teachers and the students in the two classrooms. In Taiwan, Taiwanese is a dialect used at home and viewed as a language with lower status than Mandarin Chinese, which is a formal language. As Vivian stated in Chapter 4, the Taiwanese language is part of Taiwanese culture and she does not exclude using Taiwanese in class. Example 12 provides another example.

In the beginning, Vivian went on with “剉冰” (cua bing, shaved ice, a kind of ice dessert) in Taiwanese to discuss further about using Mandarin Chinese in Taiwan. After Vivian mentioned “夜市” (night market), Bill suddenly said “吃飽三粒” (jia ba sa lia, take three pills after you are full) in Taiwanese in line 9. It is significant to note that from line 10 through line 20, Vivian also joined in and guessed what “吃飽三粒” means in
Taiwanese, Mandarin Chinese, and English, and other students were also guessing too, yet Bill still used English only without Mandarin Chinese in lines 11 and 13.

**Example 12. Discussion (0002 Vivian: the importance of learning Mandarin part II 0:29:29-0:30:23)**

1. **T:** 去吃过剉冰吧?  
   *Hui qu chi guo cua bing ba?*  
   ‘Did you ever eat “CUA BING” (shaved ice, one kind of ice dessert in Taiwan) when you went back ((to Taiwan))?’

2. **Ss:** 有。/  
   *You.*  
   ‘Yes.’

3. **T:** 那那上面全部都有一大堆什麼什麼剉冰什麼什麼剉冰你怎麼點?  
   *Na na shang mian quan bu dou you yi da dui she mo she mo cua bing she mo she mo cua bing ni ze mo dian?*  
   ‘If there are many different kinds of CUA BING on the ((menu on the wall)), how can you order it?’

4. **Xf1:** Because it is normally hanging this thing right out there.

5. **Xf2:** I want that mango…

6. **T:** 那等你高中自己回去呢? 媽不帶你去呢? 為什麼不自己 explore?  
   *Na deng ni gao zhong zi ji hui qu ne? ma bu dai ni qu ne? wei she mo bu zi ji explore?*  
   ‘What if you go back ((to Taiwan)) alone when you are a high school student? What if your mother won’t take you ((there))? Why not explore by yourselves?’

7. **Xf:** I know. /

8. **T:** 那夜市就沒有了呀。夜市ㄟ。  
   *Na ye shi jiu mei you le a. ye shi ei.*  
   ‘There are not any ((menus on the wall)) in the night market. Night market.’

9. **Bill:** 吃飽三粒..三粒，whatever.

206
Jia ba sa lia..sa, WHATEVER.
‘Take three pills after you are full..three, whatever.’

10 T: 啊？/
   A.
   ‘Ah?’

11 Bill: I don’t know.

12 T: 吃飽三粒?
   Jia ba sa lia?
   ‘Take three pills after you are full?’

13 Bill: I don’t know what that means.

14 T: 吃太飽？ㄟ?
   Jia su ba? ei?
   ‘Too full? Eh?’

15 Xf: 吃飽 is full.
   Jia ba IS FULL.
   ‘Jia ba means full.’

16 Arthur: No, I am finished eating something. I don’t know.

17 T: 吃飽 mean full。
   Jia ba MEAN FULL.
   ‘Jia ba means full.’

18 Xf: Yeah.

19 T: 這個 mean full, it could be I finish my meal. It could be 有的人可能還沒吃飽 hor。
   Zhe ge MEANS FULL, IT COULD BE I FINISH MEAL. IT COULD BE You de ren ken eng hai mei chi bao hor.
   ‘This mean full,’ It could be ‘some people haven’t been full yet.’

In this exchange, Vivian continued convincing her students to use Mandarin Chinese more. In lines 4 and 5, two girl students (unidentified) still responded to the
teacher Vivian in English, arguing that they did not have to use Mandarin Chinese. In line 9, Bill first used Taiwanese and then English in response to Vivian. In lines 11 and 13, Bill still used English. In my interview with Bill, I asked him what “吃飽三粒” means (jia ba sa lia, take three pills after you are full). He was not sure of its meaning and said that his father did not explain it to him. Arthur also used English in discussing its meaning. Vivian mentioned that Arthur could understand more or less Taiwanese but not much. Like example 11, their use of English or Taiwanese reflects their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. Additionally, it seems that Taiwanese is used by Bill to suggest solidarity with Vivian without offending her instead of using English. Vivian also responded in Taiwanese in lines 12 and 14, showing that Bill’s accommodation (convergence) is favorably received by her.

In sum, in example 10, Arthur argued with Vivian switching to Mandarin Chinese from English, where he violated normal classroom interaction patterns and was behaving uncooperatively. One thing worth noting is that Arthur used both strategies of divergence and convergence to avoid reading the long paragraph and to show his resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese. In examples 11-12, Bill switched between Taiwanese and English when Vivian kept urging the students to use Mandarin Chinese. Both English and Taiwanese seem to be used by Bill to display his resistance to speaking Mandarin Chinese. More importantly, the Taiwanese language might be used by Bill to signify his compliance and solidarity and avoid offending Vivian, and Vivian also used code-mixing of Taiwanese words or switched to the Taiwanese language as a response. Such mutual convergence is expected to be able to facilitate interpersonal and intergroup interaction.
between Vivian and Bill. Examples 10-12 support this argument that code-switching is the way in which Arthur and Bill use to express resistance or compliance.

In Chapter 4, I discussed the social-cultural context of the Chinese heritage language schooling and two teachers’ language ideologies. In this Chinese heritage language school, there seems to be no Chinese-only policy, and the two teachers appear to adopt perspectives of multilingualism and accommodation - English as a pedagogic tool and Taiwanese as part of the culture. The teacher, Lily, also regards this Chinese school as an informal educational setting. It indicates that this Chinese heritage language school is like “a miniature social cosmos of trilingualism” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 66) and may provide a safe space for multilingual children to practice their multiple languages (Creese and Martin, 2006; Martin et al., 2004). Myers-Scotton (1993) supported that speakers make code choices to “negotiate interpersonal relationships” and “signal their perceptions or desires about group memberships” (p. 478). In other words, languages can be used by speakers to show their personal and group identities. In the interviews with them, Arthur identified himself as Chinese American and Bill as American-born Taiwanese, and through code-switching, their group identities are embodied in the code choices they make in the conversations.

5.5 Discussion and Conclusion

With respect to their uncooperative language behaviors, in examples 1-4, Arthur’s practice of giving wrong answers and using taboo words, leading to the violations of the normal classroom interactional patterns, would suggest that he is trying his best to avoid
linguistic cooperation and shows resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese in his response turns. In example 5, Paul not only responded by giving the wrong answer but also initiated a humorous question in his response turn, which can be interpreted as an attempt to get away from the face-threatening situation and help maintain the teacher’s face and relieve tensions. In a Gricean framework, there is nonobservance of the Quality maxim in examples 1-5, indicating that Arthur and Paul are behaving uncooperatively in the sense that they deliberately fail to do what they are expected to do in the classroom. They purposely miscommunicate in that they may in fact be not that concerned with the social recognition of their teachers and adopt a style of non-cooperation as their preferred discourse strategy to challenge their teachers’ authority. So why are Arthur and Paul being non-cooperative? What are the meanings Arthur and Paul convey by their uncooperative language behaviors?

The simplest inference is that Arthur and Paul attempt to draw the teacher’s or other students’ attention. Another logically possible interpretation is that they may want to convey one message: “this class is boring”. In the interview with the two teachers, Vivian and Lily, Vivian reasoned that Arthur intentionally did such uncooperative language behaviors so as to disturb the classroom order, so her strategy was to ignore his disruptive and uncooperative language behaviors. However, as Arthur mentioned “bored” after I played back his conversations to him, it seems that, by performing those uncooperative language behaviors, he may show his resistance to signal that “I don’t want to be in this class”. As discussed in Chapter 4, Arthur also expressed his ideological resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese in the interview. Being at Stage 2 may lead to
Arthur’s lack of motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese, affect his attitudes toward classroom activities, and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom.

Paul may also be at Stage 2, but unlike Arthur, he did not express a strong ideological resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese because he recognized the importance of learning Mandarin Chinese. Lily noted that Paul enjoys playing a class clown and attempts to make the whole class laugh, so she responded with laughter most of the time without reprimanding him, suggesting that Paul’s uncooperative language behaviors may be acceptable to her and even contribute to a jocular classroom atmosphere since not only Paul himself but also other students laughed, along with challenging Lily’s authority and showing his reluctance to learning Mandarin Chinese. According to Paul’s mother and the teacher Lily, Paul is more proficient in Mandarin Chinese than Arthur and Jack, which may explain why he does not express a strong ideological resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese. With respect to flouting a maxim, Mey (2001) claimed that “we must consider the effects people want to obtain by their linguistic behavior” (p. 77). Ladegaard (2009) further explained that “one of these effects of flouting a maxim could be seen as non-cooperative and signal resistance” (p. 664). Here, I suggest that another effect a speaker may want to obtain is to signal his/her attempt at humor based on the findings of this study. On this view, Paul may express his humor to contribute to playful interaction and a better classroom atmosphere.

Examples 6-9 show student-initiated IRFs, where Paul and Jack corrected the teacher’s English. The teacher, Lily, followed and reiterated the corrections by Paul and
Jack, where their initiation of correction seems to reflect the agency they could invoke and the linguistic power they could assume. However, Lily noted that English is not her native language, and she is willing to be corrected by her students. In Chapter 4, she viewed this Chinese school as an informal educational setting, where a teacher has less authority and the students can teach her English in class. This also indicates her “bilingualism” ideology - in this Chinese school as a bilingual place, Mandarin Chinese is not the dominant language, and English is still influential in the classroom. This appears to contribute to the students’ preference for English rather than Mandarin Chinese and they thus have less motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese.

Additionally, Norrick (1991) argued for the organization of corrective sequences based on how the participants perceive asymmetrical abilities to accomplish the action successfully instead of preference for self-correction. When the second speaker feels more competent in the area about the first speaker’s error, he/she may initiate the correction in the ongoing interaction for successful communication as the goal. In one example involving two well-acquainted professors, he pointed out that a direct other-correction was understood as “a friendly offer of information” (p. 62). The first speaker picked up the corrected pronunciation later in the conversation and the second speaker feels responsible for correctness and assumes “a pedagogical stance” (p. 6). In the bilingual classroom, the teacher and the students interact with significantly different abilities in the language used. In examples 6-9, the teacher Lily is assumed to be incapable of self-correction in English, and Paul and Jack naturally produce a correction immediately to help improve Lily’s English and the corrections by them can be viewed as
a friendly help. As Jack reported in the interview, “I just want her to have better English.” Cameron (2001) also explicated that people perform FTAs (face threatening acts) differently with those who they are socially close to or more distant from. People may use less elaborate politeness strategies with family and friends (p. 81). It seems potential that Paul is more socially close to Lily since Lily also reported in the interview that she has a closer relationship with her students. In particular, Jack is Lily’s son and they have a family relationship.

As discussed previously, Paul identified himself as American-born Chinese (ABC) and Jack as American, and English was their first language. According to Norrick (1991), the corrective actions taken by them (NS) are for the teacher Lily (NNS) because of Lily’s nonnative English. Their American identity is thus embedded in the corrective actions, which echoes their ideological affiliation with English described in Chapter 4: I prefer English. This probably affects their attitude toward the Chinese heritage language and learning it. As discussed in Chapter 4, they reported that they do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language and do not want to learn it.

Examples 10-12 reveal that Arthur and Bill use both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. In example 10, Arthur argued with Vivian switching to Mandarin Chinese from English to avoid reading a long paragraph. In examples 11-12, Bill switched between Taiwanese and English to avoid speaking Mandarin Chinese when Vivian kept urging the students to use Mandarin Chinese. In particular, the Taiwanese language might be used by Bill to signify his compliance and solidarity and avoid offending Vivian, and Vivian also used code-
mixing of Taiwanese words or switched to the Taiwanese language as a response. As Ladegaard (2009) argued, the contextual clues like speech accommodation can help us to interpret the speaker’s intentions. We are thus interested in code changes Arthur and Bill made and what functions these code switches served. Their use of English or Taiwanese seems to be motivated by the need of communicative efficiency in part because Arthur may be not proficient in Mandarin Chinese and Bill may be uncomfortable with it.

Furthermore, in examples 11-12, Bill’s use of Taiwanese seemed to avoid potential conflicts, and the teacher, Vivian, also switched to Taiwanese, showing that the Taiwanese language is a marker of ingroup membership, through which Bill expresses his partial solidarity and a closer relationship with Vivian. Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) argued that “what ultimately sets linguistic choices in motion is speaker intentions and calculations to optimize rewards” (p. 2). Similarly, Accommodation theory encompasses four social psychological theories, one of which is social exchange theory and it assumes that “if speakers choose to converge their speech styles to their interlocutors, they do so because of anticipated higher rewards than costs” (Beebe and Zuengler, 1983, p. 202). In this sense, it can be suggested that the switches made by Arthur and Bill are internally consistent and motivated by the goal to optimize their returns – Arthur does not need to read a long paragraph, and Bill avoids offending the teacher. Additionally, Milroy and Muysken (1995) argued that speakers make language choices in conversations to express “aspects of a fluid social identity as they move through a multidimensional sociolinguistic space” (p. 7). Sachdev and Giles (2004) outlined four major assumptions of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) and
one of them is that “salient social category memberships are often negotiated during an interaction through the processes of accommodation”. In this vein, Arthur switched strategically to Mandarin Chinese from English and Bill code-switched between Taiwanese and English, showing that their group identities are fluid by the use of code-switching. Nevertheless, “convergence is not always rewarding” and “it may well entail some costs, such as the possible loss of personal or social identity” (Sachdev and Giles, 2004, 357). In this light, the strategy of convergence used by Arthur and Bill seem to cause the loss of their American identity because they use Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese instead of English.

If we apply the notion of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) / Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), Arthur and Bill are expected to accommodate toward their teacher since they are the less powerful party and should have the desire for their teacher’s social approval in the classroom. Yet, in examples 10-12, it appears that they do not completely comply with their teacher. They use the strategies of convergence and divergence in language choice to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. As Giles et al. (1991) pointed out, “We should not conceive of convergence and divergence as necessarily mutually exclusive phenomena” (p. 11). I suggest that their convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors seem like a kind of partial accommodation, indicating that their language divergence may be seen as a lack of cooperation.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Discussion of the Results

6.1.1 Student Ethnic Identity

In Chapter 4, I investigate what stage of ethnic identity development the four focal students may be at, including their self-identification and ideologies about heritage language and language learning, employing two approaches - Tse’s (1998a) four stage model of ethnic identity development and Bakhtin’s concepts of ideological becoming, and of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. It is concluded that Arthur, Paul, and Jack seem to be at Stage 2 - Ethnic Ambivalence / Evasion (EAE); Bill appears to be between Stage 2 and Stage 3 - Ethnic Emergence. With respect to self-identification, Arthur and Paul are aware that they are of Chinese descent and speak Chinese, but Jack does not identify himself as Taiwanese or Asian. Our findings confirm Tse’s (2000) conclusion - language is viewed as a sign of group membership and related to the EM group. In the present study, the Taiwanese language appears to be viewed as an ethnic group symbol, and the Taiwanese language ability may affect how Arthur and Paul identify themselves with the EM group. They do not speak Taiwanese, so they do not identify themselves as Taiwanese. On the contrary, Bill identifies himself as American-born Taiwanese because he can speak a little Taiwanese. In other words, not only
Mandarin Chinese but also Taiwanese can be regarded as the basis of their ethnic identity. Arthur, Paul, and Jack are not at Stage 3, called Ethnic Emergence, in that they are aware that they are members of the Chinese ethnic group, but they do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language because Arthur does not quite understand what “heritage” means; Paul reported that his Mandarin Chinese is not good enough; Jack stated that he is not part of the ethnic culture. Based on Tse’s modal, at Stage 3, EMs explore their cultural heritage and lead some of them to embrace their ethnic heritage. They also become more interested in learning their heritage language. Nevertheless, the students prefer the use of the majority language, English, and have no ideological inheritance with Mandarin Chinese. They show their ideological resistance - I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese, and even Arthur prefers being American and assimilation into the mainstream group.

Jack explained that he identified himself as American in that he was not really that culturally affected by Taiwanese culture, which may affect his association with the EM group. However, he must be aware of his mother’s ethnicity and just seems to prefer to identify with his father’s, so he is mostly American and prefers identification with the dominant societal group. As Phinney (1990) noted, culture or cultural traditions, as the common indicators of ethnic involvement, are shared by ethnic groups (p. 505). Taiwanese culture thus seems to be seen as a marker of group membership. In Chapter 5, it is found that the Taiwanese language, as a sign of community/ingroup membership, is used by Bill for solidarity and reducing conflicts when he is arguing with their teacher.
Bill may be between Stage 2 and Stage 3 since he is going through a process where at first he identifies himself as American, prefers English, and does not like speaking Mandarin Chinese, and then he gradually becomes more aware of his ethnicity because he identifies himself as American-born Taiwanese and also expresses ideological inheritance and no ideological resistance - he views Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language and likes attending this Chinese school. Additionally, the focal students have three patterns of ideological becoming – (i) ideological affiliations: I prefer English; (ii) no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language; (iii) ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese. The three patterns provide more detailed descriptions of the students’ response to other voices in different ideological environments and how they negotiate or struggle between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. As Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007) noted, “the children construe their language ideologies by appropriating from the language and cultural communities in which they participate or aspire to belong” (p. 52). The students may assert their own ideological stances toward prevailing authoritative discourses in the dominant society– English is viewed as a sign of prestige, but against the authoritative discourses in this Chinese school – Mandarin Chinese is viewed as their heritage language and important for their future. In other words, it seems that they appropriate the authoritative discourses from others in the wider American society, not in the Chinese school community.
6.1.2 Student Language behaviors

As already presented in Chapter 5, examples 1-12 have shown that the students use their language skills to follow or flout the rules and norms of behavior. Arthur and Paul behave uncooperatively in examples 1-5 and adopt a style of non-cooperation as their preferred discourse strategy to challenge their teachers’ authority. Their uncooperative language behaviors include giving wrong answers and using taboo words, leading to the violations of the normal classroom interactional patterns. In a Gricean framework, there is nonobservance of the Quality maxim. It appears that they purposely miscommunicate and they are trying their best to avoid linguistic cooperation.

In examples 6-9, Paul and Jack corrected the teacher’s English, and the teacher reiterated the corrections and accommodated toward them. In the classroom, the teacher is the corrective role, IRF is the standard pattern for classroom interaction, and “straightforward other-correction is a standard form of evaluative feedback used by teachers” (Norrick, 1991, p. 72). In this current study, the other-corrections by Paul and Jack seem to show that they are able to make the initiation and follow-up moves in the IRF pattern and gain a more powerful position. Nevertheless, Jack reported in the interview that he corrected the teacher’s English because he wanted to provide a friendly help and improve her English. The interview quotes from the teacher Lily are line with Cameron’s (2001) argument that we may behave less politely with those people we are socially close to like family and friends (p. 81) since she has a closer relationship with her students. In particular, Jack is Lily’s son and they have a family relationship. The close relationship between teacher and student affects their interaction and power
relations in the classroom. These results lend some credence to Norrick’s conclusion that instead of preference for self-correction, the participants negotiate corrective sequences based on their perceptions of who can correct errors due to asymmetrical abilities. The corrections appear a favor because “parents, teachers, and NSs other-correct children, students, and NNSs, in order to help them achieve equal status” (p. 78). In other words, the relationship between interlocutors should be viewed as primary in conversation.

Additionally, our data suggest that code-switching plays a role as a convergent (accommodative) or divergent act for the students. In examples 10-12, Arthur argued with Vivian, switching to Mandarin Chinese from English to avoid reading a long paragraph, and Bill switched to Taiwanese from English to avoid speaking Mandarin Chinese when Vivian kept urging the students to use Mandarin Chinese. They use both strategies of convergence and divergence to show their resistance to learning and speaking Mandarin Chinese. In particular, they converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodate toward her ingroup language – Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese to express solidarity or reduce potential conflicts. The teacher Vivian also used code-mixing of Taiwanese words or switched to the Taiwanese language as a response to Bill. Such mutual convergence seems to be able to facilitate interpersonal and intergroup interaction between Vivian and Bill. It is worth noting that their use of English or Taiwanese seems to be motivated by the need of communicative efficiency in part because Arthur may be not proficient in Mandarin Chinese and Bill may be uncomfortable with it.
As Sachdev and Giles (2004) concluded, “partial accommodation” refers to a strategy that is “neither full convergence nor divergence”, involving code-switching - “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation” (p. 359). This finding reported on here seems to be indicative of the fact that Arthur and Bill seem to express a kind of partial accommodation, indicating their language divergence may be seen as a lack of cooperation. This also supports what Giles et al. (1991) argued for - “We should not conceive of convergence and divergence as necessarily mutually exclusive phenomena” (p. 11).

6.2 Theoretical Implications

6.2.1 The Relationship between Language Ideology and Ethnic Identity

In Tse’s (1998a) study, she proposed a four stage model of ethnic identity development to describe the identity-related experiences of the ethnic minorities (EMs). She pointed out that language is an ethnic identity marker and language attitude toward the majority and heritage languages shifts as individuals’ sense of their ethnic identity changes over time.

The present findings enhance Tse’s (2000) findings by providing a more detailed examination of the focal students’ language ideologies. Like the role of language attitude Tse argued for, language ideology also appears to be connected to ethnic identity since “Ideological becoming occurs in environments that either offer children opportunities or constrain them in their own positioning” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 74). Like Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen (2007), I also use Wollard’s (1998) definition of
language ideology: “representations whether explicit or implicit that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (p. xxii). From a theoretical perspective, Bakhtin’s dialogic theory of discourse can offer us an opportunity to better understand how the students are conscious of language and social worlds. For example, the focal students in the current study express no ideological inheritance to the Chinese language as well as ideological resistance to learning the Chinese language, both reflecting their perceptions of heritage language and ethnic group.

Another issue worth noting is that the focal students express no ideological inheritance: Mandarin Chinese is not my heritage language, which does not fall anywhere along this “continuum” ranging from “a lack of interest in the ethnic culture (ambivalence)” to “active rejection of the ethnic group” (evasion)” (Tse, 1998b, p. 29). In terms of Bakhtin’s theory, the students’ language ideologies can reflect how they are aware of their heritage language and ethnic group. Additionally, their ideological resistance to learning the Chinese language also indicates their negative attitudes toward ethnic group because learning Mandarin Chinese may be viewed as “an important part of their ethnic identity” (Maguire and Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 74). However, the participants’ attitudes toward learning Mandarin Chinese were not examined in Tse’s study.

6.2.2 The Link between Student Ethnic Identity and Language Behaviors

In Chapter 4, I suggest that this Chinese heritage language school may provide a unique and safe space for the students to practice their multilingual languages and
identities. I also assume that their self-identification and language ideologies may affect their language behaviors. In Chapter 5, Arthur and Paul displayed uncooperative language behaviors in Mandarin Chinese to challenge their teacher’s authority (e.g., giving wrong answers or using taboo words). In Chapter 4, Arthur expressed his ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese. He expressed that he was struggling to learn Mandarin Chinese as his heritage language. This may affect his attitudes toward classroom activities and cause him to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. Paul did not express a strong ideological resistance: I neither hate nor like learning Mandarin, and the teacher Lily noted that Paul enjoys playing a class clown and attempts to make the whole class laugh. Paul’s uncooperative language behaviors may be acceptable to her since he shows not only reluctance to learning Mandarin Chinese but also humor to lighten the classroom atmosphere. Additionally, both Paul’s mother and the teacher Lily considered that Paul is more proficient in Mandarin Chinese than Arthur and Jack, which may be the reason for his attitude toward learning Mandarin Chinese – he did not express a strong ideological resistance.

In examples 6-9, Paul and Jack other-corrected the teacher’s English to offer a friendly help since they have more competence in English and are aware of Lily’s English level. In Chapter 4, Paul and Jack identified themselves as American-born Chinese (ABC) and American respectively, and English was their first language. Based on Norrick (1991), the corrections by them show the exchanges of corrective feedback from the native speaker (NS) to the nonnative speaker (NNS) because of Lily’s nonnative English. Their American identity is thus embodied in the corrective actions, echoing their
ideological affiliation with English described in Chapter 4: I prefer English. In Lily’s view, this Chinese school is not only an informal educational setting but also a bilingual place, where the students can teach her English. In this light, Mandarin Chinese is not the dominant language and English is still influential in the classroom. This may be responsible for the students’ preference for English rather than Mandarin Chinese, and they thus have less motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese. As discussed in Chapter 4, they reported that they do not view Mandarin Chinese as their heritage language and do not want to learn it.

In examples 10-12, when arguing with the teacher, Arthur switched to Mandarin Chinese from English, and Bill switched to Taiwanese from English, indicating that they use the strategies of convergence and divergence in language choice to show their resistance to learning Mandarin Chinese, which is consonant with their ideological resistance: I don’t want to learn Mandarin Chinese. They converged toward the language preference of their teacher and accommodated toward her ingroup language – Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese. The teacher, Vivian, also switched to Taiwanese as a response to Bill, showing that the Taiwanese language is a marker of ingroup membership, through which Bill expresses his partial solidarity and a closer relationship with Vivian. As argued by Milroy and Muysken (1995), speakers make language choices in conversations to express “aspects of a fluid social identity as they move through a multidimensional sociolinguistic space” (p. 7). In Chapter 4, Arthur identified himself as Chinese American and Bill as American-born Taiwanese. Through code-switching, their group identities, Chinese, Taiwanese, and American, are fluid and group memberships are negotiated.
during an interaction through the processes of language convergence and divergence. Nevertheless, as noted by Sachdev and Giles (2004), “convergence is not always rewarding” and “it may well entail some costs, such as the possible loss of personal or social identity” (p. 357). They seem to lose their American identity at the same time because they use Mandarin Chinese or Taiwanese instead of English.

6.3 Limitations and Further Research

Even though the present study has yielded findings that have theoretical implications, its design is not without limitations. First, since this study involved only four focal students and two Chinese heritage language classrooms, whether the results will also be generalized to the students in other (Chinese) heritage language classrooms cannot be determined based on this study. Further research should be undertaken in other (Chinese) heritage language classrooms. Additionally, my four focal participants are all male students, so additional research focusing on female students would be of interest in understanding their ethnic identity and language behaviors as well as the similarities and differences between male and female students.

Second, this study has touched the issues of students’ ideologies about heritage language and language learning, thereby examining their ethnic identity development. Nevertheless, our data collected was only from the students at one stage or between two stages. Future research should investigate how language ideology toward the majority and heritage languages shifts as ethnic identity changes from one stage to the next, just like Tse’s (1998a) four stage model of ethnic identity development. We are hopeful that
future research will provide more detailed results to prove that language ideology, like language attitude (Tse, 1997, 2000), can also be an ethnic identity marker.

The third limitation concerns the small number of examples about student language behaviors due to the fact that the current study was carried out in a short time, six months. In order to obtain more reliable and objective data, we anticipate that a longitudinal study will generate more important findings in this field. Since classroom interaction in Chinese heritage language classrooms has not been widely examined, much more also needs to be known about the way students talk and act, and how their uncooperative language behaviors, other-corrections, and convergent (accommodative) and divergent language behaviors occur in the classroom interaction.

Moreover, as noted earlier, that the students are at Stage 2 may lead to their lack of motivation to learn Mandarin Chinese, influence their attitudes toward classroom activities, and cause them to display uncooperative language behaviors in the classroom. However, accounting for why students’ language ideologies affect their classroom language behaviors and how their ethnic identities are embedded in their language behaviors at different stages remains for future research.

Finally, as discussed in Chapter 4, the finding shows that the Taiwanese language seems to be seen as a marker of community/ingroup membership. That is, Taiwanese can be regarded as the basis of the students’ ethnic identity in addition to Mandarin Chinese. Perhaps future research could explore the students’ ideologies about Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese. For instance, how proficient are they in Taiwanese? Is Taiwanese their heritage language? How is their attitude toward Taiwanese different from theirs toward
Mandarin Chinese? Are Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese both part of their ethnic identity?

In spite of all the limitations of our conclusions, it is hoped that this study will throw some light on the above issues or at least can serve as a basis for future study on student ethnic identity and language behaviors in (Chinese) heritage language classrooms.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. Interview questions with students

Profile

1. What is your name?
2. How old are you?
3. Where were you born?
4. If you were not born here in the U. S., how long have you lived here in the U. S.?
5. What language did you speak first as a child? What languages or Chinese dialects do you speak? When and where did you first learn each language (English, Mandarin Chinese, etc.)?

Language use

6. What language(s) do your family use at home? What language(s) do you speak most frequently at home? Do you use different languages when talking with different family members, such as your parents, your siblings and grandparents? If yes, under what situations and with whom will you make a change in the use of languages? Do they use the same language as yours when they respond?
7. What languages do you use in class? Will you use different languages when talking to your teachers and classmates? Will you mix the languages together?
8. What language(s) will you use when communicating with your friends? Will you change the use of languages when talking to different friends?
9. When did you start to learn Mandarin Chinese at the Chinese heritage language school? Did you learn Mandarin Chinese in Taiwan before you came here in the U.S.? How long?

Language learning and teaching

10. Do you like attending the Chinese class? Why or Why not? What is the most difficult part of learning Chinese?
11. Please rate your language ability in Mandarin Chinese. Why do you think so?
   1 (not good)  2  3  4  5 (very good)
Ideology

12. Which language do you prefer to speak? Why? Do you think it’s better to speak English or Mandarin Chinese?
13. How would you describe yourself? Do you think you are Taiwanese, Chinese-American, ABC (American-born Chinese), American-born Taiwanese, American, or others? Do you feel speaking English in conversation signals that you are American?
14. What do you think of the concepts of Chinese culture you have learned in the classroom?

2. Interview questions with parents

Profile

1. What is your nationality?
2. What is your mother tongue? What other languages do you speak?
3. What is your education level? Did you have formal schooling here in the U. S.?
4. How long has your child been in the U. S.?

Language use

5. What language is used the most at home? What are the languages you use when talking with different members of your family, such as the elderly, your spouse, and your child? In what language does your child reply?
6. What is the Chinese dialect you speak at home with your family members? Do you speak different Chinese dialects? Do you speak different Chinese dialects to different people? Please give examples to explain.

Language learning

7. Why do you register your child in a Chinese class? How old was he/she when you decided to enroll him/her? Why do you think it is important for your child to learn Mandarin Chinese?
8. Do you supplement your child’s Chinese learning at home? If so, how is this done?
9. Does your child express his/her feelings or ideas in relation to speaking or learning Mandarin Chinese? If yes, what did he/she say about them?
10. What parts of Chinese heritage language school does your child like/dislike? What kinds of things did your child tell you about his/her difficulties at this Chinese heritage language school?
11. What did your child feel about Chinese heritage language school when he/she first began and what does he/she feel about attending Chinese heritage language school now?
12. For how many years would you like your child to study at Chinese heritage language school?
13. Do you have to persuade your child to go to Chinese heritage language school? If so, what arguments do you use and how effective are they?
14. Do you ever try to influence which language your child speak? How do you do this and what are the results?

Ideology

15. What advantages or disadvantages do you think of being bilingual? How will it benefit (or not) your child?
16. What do you think of your identity at home, at your workplace and in society? What do you think of your child’s identity at home and in society?
17. Is the maintenance of Mandarin Chinese supported in this community? How (not)?
18. What do you think of Chinese heritage language maintenance?

3. Interview questions with teachers

Profile

1. Please describe the language backgrounds of your students.
2. Teaching experience in the Chinese heritage language school.
   (1) Would you briefly describe your educational background and your experience of Chinese teaching?
   (2) How long do you teach at that Chinese heritage language school?
   (3) What did teaching at the Chinese heritage language school mean to you?
   (4) What was the best part of teaching and the most difficult time/thing of teaching at the Chinese heritage language school?

Language use and teaching

3. What languages do you use when teaching in class? Do you find it necessary to use more than one language in your instructional practice?
4. Will you change the languages you use from time to time in class? If yes, under what situations will you change the languages you use? What are the languages used in class usually and what are their proportions? Will you mix the languages together?
5. What is the language your students usually use when communicating with you in class? Outside of instructional time, what language do the students most often speak to you?
6. Will your students change their use of languages in class? Under what situations will they change their use of languages and how often are the changes?
7. In which situations were there difficulties communicating with each child due to his/her lack of Mandarin Chinese competence? If students didn’t understand your instructions, how did you try to help them?
8. Can you describe the greatest challenges and satisfactions of teaching at the Chinese heritage language school?
9. What do you think of the textbooks and other teaching materials?

**Ideology**

10. Even though teachers told their students, “Please speak in Chinese,” some students still spoke in English. Why do you think they did so?
11. How do you feel about forcing students to speak in Chinese only?
12. How would you value the use of languages in class? What do you think of your students’ use of other languages (e.g., English and Taiwanese) in addition to Mandarin Chinese in the classroom?
13. What culturally valued concepts would you like your students to learn in class (in terms of language/culture/values…)? How do you do this?
14. Do you think knowledge of Chinese language, culture, etc., is important for your students? Why?
15. Does the school have any policies regarding teaching standards or goals in place? If so, what do you think of them?
16. How would you value your and your students’ identities in class and in society?
Appendix B: Transcription Conventions

Zhe Italics indicates the pinyin system of Romanization.

‘these’ Single quotes indicate English translation of Chinese speech.

我 Underlining words are Chinese words in Taiwanese pronunciation.

YOU Capitalization indicates code-switching.

Bold Indicates increased loudness and emphasis.

(…) Indicates the omission of irrelevant parts in one conversation.

( ( )) Encloses author’s addition.

( ) Encloses transcription comments on the interaction.

[ ] Represents an overlap in speakers’ utterances.

/ Indicates pitch direction is rising.

\ Indicates pitch direction is falling.

@ Indicates laughter.

.. Indicates a slight break in timing.

(.x) Indicates pause in tenths of a second.

X Indicates an indecipherable word.

<HI HI> Indicates a higher pitch level over a stretch of words.

<LO LO> Indicates a lower pitch level over a stretch of words.
R: the researcher
M: the mother
T: teacher
Ss: students
Sf: female students
Sm: male students
Xf: the female student that can’t be identified
Xm: the male student that can’t be identified