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ABSTRACT

This study explored the extent to which the L2 speech of 4 Chinese ESL university-level students was influenced by their native language discourse patterns in the context of face-to-face interactions in English with 3 adult native speakers of American English. Data collection involved interviews, non-participant observations, and a total of 30 hours of audiotaped recordings of face-to-face interactions between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of American English. Data analysis involved applying the methods of transfer analysis and discourse analysis to analyze the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants by relating it to their first language discourse patterns.

Data analysis of the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech yielded a total of 38 categories of transferred Chinese discourse that were grouped under the 4 modules: organizing propositional information, overusing metadiscourse strategies, manifesting social identity, and performing rituals of face. The study found that discourse transfer influenced and was influenced by the interactional context in which linguistic, cognitive, and social processes were at work during the production of discourse transfer by the 4 Chinese learners. The measures of frequency of use, percentages, and rankings indicated that the 4 Chinese participants varied among themselves as individuals in terms of the quantity and quality of discourse transfer categories produced by each Chinese participant.
The study generated three hypotheses to account for the discourse transfer phenomena in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. First, the modularity hypothesis accounted for the information-processing that took place between, on the one hand, the dynamic interplay between the L1 and the L2 in the learner’s performance, and on the other, the interactive processing of the L2 input that was provided in the interactional context by the English native-speaking interlocutors. Second, the complexity hypothesis accounted for the bidirectional relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context which involved linguistic, social, and cognitive processes in the production of discourse transfer in an L2 context. Third, the idiosyncracy hypothesis provided theoretical support for the finding that the 4 Chinese participants varied as individuals in terms of the production of discourse transfer.

Implications for pedagogy were a series of interventions embedded within a set of communicative activities designed to contribute to language learning in the classroom. The suggested pedagogical framework consisted of providing authentic L2 input, establishing L1-L2 relations, developing strategies for communication and social interaction, and attending to learner idiosyncracy. Recommendations for further research were a classroom-based observational study of an EFL classroom in which the pedagogical framework was implemented, and an experimental study on the effects of "task type," and "interlocutor familiarity" on the production of discourse transfer among Chinese ESL learners. A list of references and appendices relating to matters of access and entry to the research site are included at the end of the dissertation.
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- Topic-Comment Word Order (TC)
- Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP)
- Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP)

Different Organizing Principles of Discourse
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(II) Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies

Connectors

- Conjunction with "And"
- Disjunction with "But"
- Rhetorical Questions (RQ)
- Free Association (FA)
- Revisiting (REV)

Qualifiers

- Overusing "Maybe" (OM)
- Answering with "Maybe" to a Question
- Answering with "Maybe" to Yes/No Questions (MYN)
- Answering with "Maybe" to Either/Or Questions (MEO)
- Answering with "Maybe" to WH Questions (MWH)

Miscues: Saying "Yes" When Meaning "No"
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Discourse Transfer of Social Interaction

(III) Manifesting Social Identity

- Sense of Community

  - Group Conformity (GC)
  - Uncritical Acceptance of Authority (UAA)
  - Dependence (DEP)
  - Referencing (REF)

Cultural Beliefs

- Predestination ("Ming")
- Fortune & Opportunity ("Yun")
- Spiritual Masters (SM)

A Summary of the Beliefs and How They are Related
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Discourse transfer happens when the language learner transfers L1-based discourse patterns to the L2 context that may have different interactional consequences from those usually intended in the L1. One of the general assumptions in discourse transfer studies is that intercultural miscommunication is often caused by learners’ falling back on their first language (L1) discourse patterns during their interactions with native speakers (NSs) of the target language (TL) (e.g., Scarcella, 1992; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). Hence, a number of studies have investigated the causes that lead second language (L2) learners to transfer at the discourse level. Focusing primarily on the innate processing of the learner, some studies viewed discourse transfer as a cognitive activity in that it reflects active selection of some discourse patterns in the learner’s L2 to be used in the same way in which they are employed in the learner’s L1 (e.g., Bartelt, 1992; Selinker, 1992; Trevise, 1986). Other studies have attributed more influence to the sociocultural setting in determining the causes behind discourse transfer (e.g., McKay & Wong, 1996; Odlin, 1989; Sridhar & Sridhar, 1992).
Investigations of the causes behind discourse transfer seem to reflect either the cognitive or the sociocultural perspectives. Some studies, for instance, investigated discourse transfer by focusing on the learner's cognitive contribution in actively selecting and producing L1-based discourse patterns in L2 contexts (e.g., Bartelt, 1992; Gass, 1996; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Selinker, 1992; Trevise, 1986). These studies focused on how learners perceived L1 discourse patterns as equivalent to L2 norms, and therefore, transferable. Bartelt (1992), for example, stated, "Discourse transfer [is] a rule-governed cognitive process" (p. 113). To investigate the learner's cognitive role, researchers focused primarily on identifying a variety of discourse patterns produced by L2 learners that are deviant from those followed by native speakers of the target language (e.g., Bartelt, 1992; Scarcella, 1992; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). These studies have found that discourse patterns that may seem to the learner to be appropriate for transfer to L2 contexts may turn out to have different interactional consequences from those available in the L1. For example, Scollon and Scollon (1995) analyzed the discourse of crosscultural business meetings and discovered that the different discourse patterns of the Chinese and American businessmen who participated in their study resulted in the stereotypes of "the inscrutable Asian or the frank and rude westerner" (p. 2).

Studies that investigated discourse transfer from a sociocultural perspective assumed that the causes behind discourse transfer were largely external to the learner and were thus mainly related to the sociocultural context of language use (e.g., Odlin, 1989; Sridhar & Sridhar, 1992). Sridhar and Sridhar (1992), for example, stated, "Given that transfer features are not idiosyncratic to learners but shared by speakers of the same native
language, they serve as effective simplification strategies, modes of acculturation, and as markers of membership in the community of speakers of a given indigenized variety” (p. 101). Odlin (1989) expressed similar views about the reasons behind discourse transfer in Irish English. He noted that some Irish English idioms and expressions that could only have come from Gaelic constitute a sociocultural phenomenon and may be an indicator of membership in the Irish speech community. Thus, these researchers (e.g., Odlin, 1989; Sridhar & Sridhar, 1992) viewed the sociocultural setting as having a paramount effect on the transfer of discourse patterns from L1 to L2. They attributed the causes behind discourse transfer to the speaker’s sense of identity and as a way to signal membership in the speech community.

Although the phenomenon of discourse transfer has been considered from both its cognitive and sociocultural perspectives, and much progress has been made in its investigation, comprehensive explanations of discourse transfer are still unavailable. Moreover, the research findings are inconsistent as to whether intercultural miscommunication takes place as a result of discourse transfer. Socioculturally-oriented discourse transfer studies presented instances of positive transfer; that is, cases where discourse transfer contributed to a smooth information exchange (e.g., Odlin, 1989). Cognitively-oriented discourse transfer studies, however, focused on cases where interactions involving native and nonnative speakers were sometimes based on misunderstandings caused by the non-native speakers’ falling back on their L1 discourse patterns (e.g., Scarcella, 1992; Scollon & Scollon, 1995).
Part of the problem lies in the fact that the available literature on discourse transfer is of the “theory-then-research” variety (Long, 1985). This strategy in conducting research has, so far, prevented the generation of substantive findings on this important area of research. From these investigations, a complex and somewhat confusing picture has emerged. For example, due to the negative assumption about the role of the L1 that is held by cognitively-oriented researchers, one of their consistent findings on discourse transfer is that miscommunication is often caused by L2 learners’ falling back on their L1 during their interactions with native speakers of the target language (e.g., Scollon & Scollon, 1995). In contrast, studies that approached discourse transfer from a sociocultural perspective have routinely found that, far from impeding smooth communication in the L2, discourse transfer “acts as the grease to make the wheels of communication turn smoothly” (Sridhar & Sridhar, 1992, p. 101).

In addition to studies of the “theory-then-research” variety, there is a need for studies on discourse transfer phenomena that adopt a “research-then-theory” strategy. The present study is an effort in this direction. Without taking sides on the cognitive/sociocultural dichotomy, the present study took as its priority the need for basic research on the phenomenon of discourse transfer: What are the categories involved? How does the occurrence of discourse transfer categories impact real communication situations between 4 Chinese ESL participants and 3 native speakers of English? What are the possible relationships between individual variation and the production of discourse transfer? Being Chinese herself, and due to the controversial role played by the L1 in the production of discourse transfer, the researcher conducted an ethnographic study on a
group of 4 Chinese participants who were university-level ESL students in an American university. The 4 Chinese participants were each asked to participate in a series of 90-minute interactional sessions with a native speaker of American English. There was no manipulation by the researcher beyond facilitating the meetings between the 4 Chinese participants and their 3 native-speaking interlocutors.

**Statement of the Problem**

Despite the growing second language acquisition (SLA) research interest in the processes that lie beneath learners’ performance in the L2, discourse transfer research has mainly focused on instances of learners’ deviations from the L2 discourse patterns that may lead to miscommunication between L2 learners and native speakers of the target language. Little recognition has been given to the processes involved in discourse transfer, the interactional contexts in which discourse transfer was produced, or individual variation among L2 learners in producing discourse transfer.

The available research on discourse transfer has been preoccupied with the issue of crosscultural miscommunication between L2 learners and native speakers of the target language. The research focus on the possible relationship between discourse transfer and miscommunication has deterred the emergence of detailed in-depth insights that can contribute to our understanding of discourse transfer as one of the processes that accompany the phenomenon of second language acquisition. There is a common lack of evidence among discourse transfer studies of a full account of the categories of discourse transfer that characterize the L2 speech of a group of learners from a specific language background. From a second language learning perspective, this lack of evidence poses
problems for language pedagogy in designing materials, courses, and syllabi that cater to
the specific needs of students in the area of discourse transfer. A number of papers (e.g.,
Harder, 1980; Thomas, 1983) already exist on the potential for language teaching to
address discourse transfer problems but these efforts were too general in their
recommendations. More research is needed that is focused on a group of learners from
one language background who encounter second language use problems that stem from
the transfer of their L1 discourse knowledge to the L2 interactional context. The present
study addressed the common discourse transfer problems faced by a group of 4 Chinese
speakers during their interactions with native speakers of English.

Another problem that has emerged from a number of discourse transfer studies is
that they adopt a generic view to the language learner. For example, speakers from
language X fail to communicate appropriately in language Y. This tendency in discourse
transfer research was probably caused by Kaplan's (1966) early effort on contrastive
discourse analysis. Kaplan (1966) found, for example, that due to the linear nature of
English discourse, Chinese learners failed to appropriately express themselves in English,
because Chinese discourse is characterized by a "cyclical" pattern of rhetorical
organization. There is, however, a need for empirical evidence on the possible relation
between individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants, and their production of
discourse transfer from Chinese to English. The purpose of the focus on the role of
individual variation was to compile individual profiles of the 4 Chinese learners organized
around the transfer of specific categories and patterns of L1 discourse by each individual
learner. Evidence already exists to document individual variation in other areas of
language transfer. Giacobbe and Carmmarato (1986), for example, have demonstrated that there was a qualitative difference between speakers of the same language background in the extent to which L1 syntax influenced the L2.

Furthermore, because of the vitality of context in furthering our understanding of language learning processes, many SLA researchers have investigated the relationship between context and learner performance. SLA research on variability (Ellis, 1989; Tarone, 1988; Gass et al, 1989), for example, has shown that the language performance of L2 learners at various stages of development is highly sensitive to the contexts in which the L2 is learned and used. The present study investigated whether the variability in learner performance especially in terms of the production of discourse transfer had an impact on the interactional context itself in terms of the smoothness of the exchange of information between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of American English. The interactions between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of American English were treated in the study as providing variable interactional contexts that can both influence and be influenced by learner performance. The focus on the interactional context was motivated by the need to know how discourse transfer phenomena from Chinese to English impacted real communication situations with native speakers of English.

In conclusion, existing studies on discourse transfer have overemphasized the issue of crosscultural communication with little recognition of the discourse problems faced by specific language groups, the nature of the relationships between discourse transfer and the interactional context, and the possible relationships between discourse transfer and
individual variation. The present study focused on these issues by investigating discourse transfer among a group of 4 adult Chinese ESL learners during face-to-face interactions with 3 adult native speakers of American English.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth analysis of the manifestations of discourse transfer which 4 Chinese ESL learners produced during their interactions with 3 English-speaking interlocutors. The present study sought answers for the following research questions:

1. What are the categories of discourse transfer that the 4 Chinese ESL learners used during their interactions with the 3 native speakers of American English?
2. What is the nature of the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context during the conversations between the 4 Chinese ESL learners and their 3 English native-speaking interlocutors?
3. What are the possible relationships between individual variation among the 4 Chinese ESL learners and their production of discourse transfer?

In-depth analysis of these questions can increase our understanding of discourse transfer in the English of the 4 Chinese participants in the study. By exploring the ways in which the 4 Chinese participants rely on their native language to interact with the 3 native-speaking interlocutors, the study generated new findings on the phenomenon of discourse transfer among Chinese speakers learning English as a second language.
Definition of Terms

**Cognitive**: Cognitive theories of language learning emphasize the learner’s innate mental capacities for acquiring a language, and minimize the contribution of external factors both social and cultural.

**Discourse Analysis**: An approach to analyzing language that focuses on how the linguistic regularities found in language use are governed not only by the rules and principles inherent in the language, but also by the social and pragmatic patterns which frame the production and understanding of messages.

**Discourse Transfer**: The use of some of the discourse patterns of the learner’s L2 in the same way in which they are employed in the learner’s first language (L1).

**Ethnography**: The descriptive study of patterns of behavior in a certain culture and the shared knowledge one has to have to be a member. Robinson (1988) defined ethnography as “a method of describing a culture or situation within a culture from the ‘emic’ or native’s point of view” (p. 73).

**Individual Variation**: Variation between the 4 Chinese participants’ patterns of producing different discourse transfer categories in their L2 speech. For example, the 2 female participants used the category of “dependence” in their L2 much more frequently than the 2 male participants.

**Interactional Context**: The context of the conversation between a Chinese ESL student and a native speaker of English. The study investigated how the conversations were influenced by the production of a number of discourse transfer categories,
and the 7 participants’ perceptions of each other that were based on their patterns of language use.

**Interlocutor**: A person to whom one is speaking or listening to in a natural conversation.

**L1**: The language first learned. The L1 that the 4 Chinese participants have is Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese, a dialect of Mandarin Chinese that students use at home. Mandarin Chinese is the medium of instruction at school, and it is preferred as a means of communication in the workplace.

**L2**: The term second language (L2) is used to mean a language acquired by a person in addition to the first language (L1); in other words, no distinction is made in this study between a “second” and “foreign” language learning. L2 learning is viewed as the same phenomenon whether it takes place in an EFL context or in an ESL context.

**Language Transfer**: (a) The use of the first language in a second language context (Gass & Selinker, 1994, p. 333); (b) The process of using knowledge of the first language in learning a second language (Ellis, 1985, p.305). For example, language learners who come from first language backgrounds (e.g., Chinese) that do not have an article system like that found in English (e.g., a, an, the) have more difficulty controlling these articles than learners who came from first language backgrounds that have an article system (e.g., Arabic, French, German). In this case, language transfer constrains acquisition for the first group and has a neutral, or positive effect on the second group.
**NS Norms:** A linguist uses his/her intuition to generate rules that describe a certain language. These rules are not taken from everyday language use. For example, one rule that describes NS norms is the linguists’ distinction between the specialization of adverbs to describe verbs and adjectives to describe nouns. However, in everyday situations we find “I feel good” as opposed to the correct form “I feel well,” which is used less often by NSs of American English.

**Second Language Acquisition (SLA):** Means the study of the processes underlying the learning of a second language after the first language has been acquired (Cook, 1993; Gass, 1996; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Lalleman, 1996; Ritchie & Bhatia, 1996). Second language acquisition (SLA) is not distinguished from second language learning (L2 learning).

**Target Language (TL):** The Chinese learners’ second language (i.e., English) was sometimes referred to as the target language (TL).

**World English:** Language settings in which English has become a lingua franca (e.g., Philippines, India, Ireland, Singapore, South Africa).

### Assumptions and Research Procedures

The need to distinguish between issues of crosscultural communication and second language acquisition was proposed by Gass and Selinker (1994). They stated,

Many stereotypes of people from other cultures (e.g., rudeness, unassertiveness, etc.) are based on patterns of nonnative speech. These judgments in many instances are not justified, because many of the speech patterns nonnative speakers use reflect their nonnativeness rather than characteristics of their personality. It is our view that understanding second language acquisition and how nonnatives speak allows us to separate issues of crosscultural communication involving nonnative speech from stereotyped behavior. (p. 3)
Data analysis in the present study benefitted from a group of assumptions gained from studies on second language acquisition. The first assumption concerns the dual influence from the L1 and the L2 on the language produced by the L2 learner. Ellis (1992) considered the learner’s emergent language “amenable to penetration by new linguistic forms and rules, which may be derived internally (i.e., by means of transfer from the L1) or externally (i.e., through exposure to target language input)” (p. 51). The second assumption concerns the importance of context in analyzing learner performance (Kramsch & McConnell-Ginet, 1992). While the present study focused on analyzing L1 influence on learner speech, analysis of learner speech alone could result in a partial picture of learner performance. Certain parts of a learner’s performance can only be understood in context. For example, the analysis of L1 influence on how learners respond to questions might benefit from considering the types of questions that were being asked by the native speakers. The third assumption concerns the variability of learner performance according to different contexts (Tarone, 1989; Ellis, 1989). Tarone (1989) accounted for style-shifting among second language learners by showing that a learner’s language is a variable one, changing when the linguistic environment changes.

These assumptions from SLA research collectively emphasize the need for caution so as not to make hasty conclusions about a learner’s L2 speech. Each assumption implies using a specific research procedure for the investigation of discourse transfer in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants. First, the researcher needs to make sure that cases of discourse transfer have actually and unambiguously occurred in learner speech. James (1998) introduced a data analysis method that he called “transfer analysis.” According to
James (1998), transfer analysis is a method that was derived from error analysis. By using transfer analysis, the research is focused on isolating those cases of learner language use that are thought by the analyst to be the results of first language transfer. Being Chinese herself, the researcher had the added advantage of reflecting back on her own native language and asking herself: Is this the way that the expression under review is usually said in Chinese? A further step in transfer analysis was to design the research so that categories of discourse transfer were confirmed by their use by more than one participant in the study. This precaution was made to ensure that findings gained in this study were not the result of a single learner’s idiosyncratic use of the second language.

Second, in order to analyze the discourse of the interactions between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of American English, discourse analysis was employed because it allows the researcher to capture the contextual nature of the interactions. Rather than just analyzing learner utterances to assess L1 influence on discourse transfer, this study also attended to the relations between native speaker input and learner performance. Discourse analysis offers the benefit of taking into account not only the learners’ performance, but also what was said before and after by the native-speaking interlocutor. The use of discourse analysis was also beneficial for the purpose of exploring the inferential process by which speakers interpreted the context of the interaction. The researcher was able to formulate a balanced approach in the study that reflects not only the Chinese but also the American perspectives on the different categories of discourse transfer in Chinese speakers’ L2 speech.
Third, the assumption from Tarone about the sensitivity of learner performance to
the interactional context was accommodated by putting each participant in a series of 90-
minute interactional sessions with 3 different native speakers of American English.
In addition, because different contexts constrain language use in different ways, the
researcher collected these interactional sessions from a variety of contexts such as the
researcher’s home, the university in which she worked, and sometimes in selected Chinese
restaurants.

**Significance of the Study**

This study was significant because it sought to employ knowledge gained through
educational research for the benefit of language students and their teachers. The main
concern of language teachers is to serve their students well so that they do not have to
face problems that can be avoided through teaching that is based on findings from
research. In the meantime, the research on discourse transfer has been preoccupied with
theoretical concerns. While the cognitivists see the L1 as playing a basically negative role
in L2 learning and use, the sociocultural researchers believe that the L1 can play a positive
role in L2 learning and use. Without taking sides on this issue, the basic question that this
study attempted to answer was: How does the learner’s discourse transfer occur in real
communication situations with native speakers of the target language? Related questions
focused on the individual variation among learners in terms of the production of discourse
transfer, and the interrelation between discourse transfer and the interactional context in
which it was produced. In order to increase our understanding of discourse transfer
phenomena, it was essential to explore the processes involved in discourse transfer, and
the role of discourse transfer in crosscultural communication between language learners and native speakers of the target language. Thus, the primary focus of the study was on the ways the 4 Chinese learners used English as a second language in situations of actual communication with native speakers of the target language.

**Limitations of the Study**

The major limitation of this study was the lack of generalizability of the findings due to the small sample of subjects. The issue of generalizability in qualitative educational research has been approached by a multiplicity of perspectives. Lazaraton (1995), for example, stated that "the results obtained from qualitative studies are not generalizable to other contexts" (p. 464). Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted that qualitative researchers strive for transferability of findings as opposed to generalizability because it is up to the readers or "consumers" of the research to apply the findings to their specific contexts. According to Davis (1992), "The degree to which working hypotheses can transfer to other times and contexts is an empirical matter, depending on the degree of similarity between the two contexts" (p. 606). Donmoyer (1990) took a different perspective on the issue of generalization. He argued that single case studies still have lessons to offer even though the situation studied is non-random and the population is an N of one. Both the generalizations that occur in experiential learning and those from “vicarious experiences” found in case studies can enlighten practitioners in the field of education by adding new concepts and ideas to their cognitive structures. Moreover, for discourse transfer research to make generalizations related to speakers of the same language background is to treat
learners generically as representatives of a much larger group of L2 learners who share the same L1 background (e.g., speakers of language X cannot control features of language Y).

A more immediate concern related to the issue of generalizability in the present study was that qualitative findings are often geared toward generating hypotheses rather than testing them. Given the research questions and our lack of knowledge about the actual processes underlying discourse transfer, a research design that is exploratory and descriptive may be most beneficial at this stage of inquiry.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is organized into 7 chapters. Chapters 1, 2, and 3 describe the problem statement, review the related literature, and introduce the research methods that were employed in the study. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 report the findings according to the order of the 3 research questions of the study. Each of these chapters concludes with a hypothesis that was generated by the researcher as a result of the analysis. Finally, chapter 7 begins with a summary of the findings and concludes by drawing implications for pedagogy and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Language learning studies can be usefully divided into two distinct orientations: cognitive or sociocultural. This division is often made due to the different assumptions, analyses, and findings on the phenomenon of language learning that each orientation holds. Their assumptions about the nature of language and language learning run parallel to Sassure's famous distinction between "language" and "speech." On the one hand, linguists, psycholinguists, and SLA researchers view language as an encapsulated system or "mental organ" to be analyzed in isolation from the social contexts in which it is learned and used. Sociolinguists, language-oriented ethnographers, and discourse analysts, on the other hand, believe that language cannot be studied in isolation from the variable social institutions that impose different criteria of appropriateness on how people use language to fulfill their communication goals.

Because research on discourse transfer was mainly conducted within the SLA paradigm, the majority of discourse transfer studies held mainly cognitive theoretical assumptions on the phenomenon. They believed, for example, that discourse transfer is a
rule-governed cognitive process in which the L2 learner negatively transfers the L1 patterns of language use thereby violating the native norms of the second language. Hence, a number of studies were interested in analyzing what is negatively transferred to the learner's L2 discourse patterns. These analyses served as evidence of the negative effects of transfer in two ways: (a) the L1 constrained the process of successful second language acquisition, and (b) the L1 interfered with the use of the L2 in communication with native speakers of the target language. Discourse transfer studies typically focused on an L1 discourse strategy that is negatively transferred to L2 contexts in order to inform language teachers on how to mitigate its effect on the learner's erroneous use of the L2.

The sociocultural perspective views language not as an abstract system of rules for producing and understanding messages, but as a constitutive feature of the indigenous social settings in which it is deployed to accomplish a variety of social functions. The interpersonal and cultural displays of language, not the rules of grammar, nor the user's internal cognitive processing, lie at the heart of the proper study of language. The sociocultural perspective on language development views the L1 as playing a constructive role in learning the second language. Language-oriented ethnographic studies set out to explore how the patterns of language L2 learners use are closely tied to their sense of personal and social identity, culturally-determined patterns of interaction, and complex patterns of socialization. Rather than judging learners' performance according to NS norms of proficiency, L2 speech was examined from the emic perspective of L2 learners, and situated critically within the larger sociocultural contexts in which the second language is learned and used. For ethnographers interested in language learning, analyzing
discourse meant analyzing how the linguistic regularities found in second language use are constrained not only by the structures and patterns that are transferred from the L1, but also by the social, pragmatic, and cultural contexts which frame the production and comprehension of L2 messages.

The purpose of this review was twofold: (a) to establish that the theoretical frameworks governing research in both orientations influence to a great extent not only their different approaches to discourse transfer but also the scope of their research questions as well as the ways in which they analyze discourse, and (b) to draw implications for the present study on how best to explore the phenomenon of discourse transfer in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants during their face-to-face interactions with native speakers of the target language. The review was organized into three sections. The first two sections discuss the theoretical and methodological frameworks governing discourse transfer studies from both the cognitive and sociocultural perspectives. The third section attempts to draw implications for the present study that are based on a synthesis of the two perspectives.

I. The Cognitive Perspective on Discourse Transfer

Until the late 1960s, most people regarded second language learners’ speech as an incorrect version of the target language. Language teachers and researchers have considered this incorrect speech to be largely a result of the tendency of L2 learners to transfer the patterns of their native language to the newly learned second language. Language transfer was characterized as an unavoidable learning problem, a source of difficulty for learners, and frustration for teachers. Contrastive analysis was the basis for
identifying differences between the first and second language and for predicting areas of potential error. Although the notion of transfer as a language learning variable has been introduced in the 50s and 60s in behaviorist terms as habit formation, it was reconceptualized as a cognitive strategy in the 1970s and early 1980s. Language transfer theory has evolved from its behavioristic basis with its strong version of "contrastive analysis" to a more cognitively-oriented diagnostic method called "error analysis."

Despite this shift in theoretical perspective, the learner's LI is still seen by SLA researchers as a negative force that undermines the successful learning and use of the L2.

**Contrastive Analysis**

In the 50s and 60s, language researchers linked all the errors a second language learner makes to the nature of the learner's first language. So, for example, one might predict that a speaker of French would be likely to express the idea of having seen someone as "*I him saw" in English because this would be a direct translation of the way this meaning is expressed in French "*J'ai il vois." The prevailing theoretical standpoints about errors in language learning were psychologically behaviorist and linguistically structural. The application of linguistic and psychological theory to the study of language learning added a principled means for accounting for learners' errors, namely that they were the result of interference in the learning of a second language from the habits of the first language. Behavioristic learning theory (Skinner, 1957) influenced research on second language learning because it was based on a stimulus-response paradigm in which the habits learned in the process of acquiring the native language exert a major influence on the process of second language learning. Second language learning researchers (e.g.,
Lado, 1957), influenced by behaviorism, considered transfer a direct cause of erroneous performance or "interference." The set of habits that made up the first language was seen as interfering with the acquisition of the second language.

The major contribution of structural linguistics to language teaching was seen as an intensive contrastive study of the systems of the second language and the native language of the learner. Contrastive analysis was the method used to predict learning errors that were thought to be the results of first language interference. Out of this contrastive analysis would come an inventory of the areas of difficulty which the learner would encounter in learning the second language. The value of this contrastive analysis was to direct the teacher's attention to these areas so that he/she might devote enough time in class to enable the language learner to overcome, or even avoid, these predicted difficulties. Second language learning was assumed to involve the building up of new language habits, and since there is already a language known to the learner, the old habits of the first language were presumed to interfere with the new habits of the L2.

In the field of methodology, the Audiolingual Method was thought to be the perfect teaching method for dealing with learning errors. Good teaching techniques emphasized memorization, repetition, and reinforcement of correct performance so that the errors would never be committed at all. The prevailing belief then was that if materials and lessons could be prepared which would help learners overcome the conditioned habits of their L1 while they were imitating the new patterns of the L2, successful language learning would be the outcome. The language lab was introduced during this period to reinforce the learning of the pronunciation and structures of the L2 by using audiotaped
materials directed at potential areas of difficulty that the L2 learner might confront in using the second language.

**Contrastive Rhetoric**

A parallel research movement to contrastive analysis was evident in the development of contrastive studies of writing. Contrastive rhetoric is an area of research in language pedagogy that was initiated by Kaplan (1966) who argued that different languages have different patterns of thought organization that are transferred across languages. Influenced by Whorf’s (1956) “linguistic relativity” principle, contrastive rhetoric holds that each language has rhetorical conventions unique to it. Furthermore, Kaplan asserted, the linguistic and rhetorical conventions of the first language interfere with writing in the second language. It used contrastive analysis for locating “errors” in L2 learners’ writing. Kaplan (1966) contrastively analyzed the organization of paragraphs in ESL students’ essays. He identified five distinct rhetorical types of paragraph development for five groups of second language learners. In what has come to be known as Kaplan’s (1966) “doodles” paper, he claimed that L1 rhetorical patterns were transferred to the L2 writing patterns of ESL students. He supported his ideas with examples drawn from a large sample of English compositions written by native speakers of languages representing these groups.

Kaplan suggested that Anglo-European expository essays follow a linear development. The English paragraph development pattern is dominantly linear in its organization. In contrast, paragraph development in Semitic languages is based on a series of parallel co-ordinate clauses. Semitic languages such as Arabic and Hebrew make
use of "parallel constructions," such as "Because he inclined his ear to me, therefore, I will call on him as long as I live" (p. 7). Essays written in Oriental languages use an indirect approach and come to the point only at the end. Oriental languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean employ "a variety of tangential views" that Kaplan claimed are "turning and turning in a widening gyre" (p. 10). In Romance languages and in Russian, essays are permitted to digress and bring extraneous materials that would seem excessive to a writer of English. While Kaplan characterized Romance languages as having greater freedom to introduce extraneous materials, he saw Russian as demonstrating "parenthetical amplifications of structurally related subordinate elements" (p. 14). These culture-specific patterns of organization were considered by Kaplan negative influences on the ESL writing of the large sample of native speakers of these languages that he employed in his study.

Contrastive rhetoric, like contrastive analysis, started as an effort to improve pedagogy. Its proponents believed that interference from the first language was the biggest problem in language learning. To combat "interference," Kaplan recommended that ESL students learning to write essays in an Anglo-American style should study model compositions constructed according to the linear pattern of development typical of that style. Unfortunately, the predictions of contrastive analysis and contrastive rhetoric were not significantly new to teachers whose practical experience has already shown them where these difficulties lie. Many of the errors with which they were familiar were not predicted by contrastive analysis. In addition, Wardhaugh (1970) empirically showed that structural and rhetorical comparisons of two language were uncertain predictors of learner
success in learning the second language. He also found that not all errors made by second language learners could be explained in terms of first language transfer alone. The process of building up competence in a second language was clearly more intricate than simply substituting structures and rhetorical patterns from one language to another. A number of studies showed that many second language learners’ errors could be explained better in terms of learners’ attempts to discover the structure of the language being learned rather than an attempt to transfer the patterns of their first language. Here, contrastive analysis and contrastive rhetoric have had little to suggest for teachers.

**Error Analysis**

In addition to the lack of empirical support for contrastive analysis, a paradigm shift in linguistic theory ushered by Chomsky (1959) upset the prevailing behaviorist belief about the nature of language acquisition. In place of the behaviorist notion that language is learned by children through imitation, memorization, and habit-formation, Chomsky hypothesized that any human language can be learned by any normal child quite naturally, which is to say without help from others. According to this view of language learning, the only environmental help children need to learn their first language is exposure to, or interaction with, natural language data (Chomsky, 1965). These data are speech produced by adult native speakers, in the context of everyday activities, in ways that give learners access to the meaning intended by the speaker. The linguistic data must also allow learners to segment utterances into constituents or component parts, and to match form with grammatical function (Slobin, 1991). It is argued that the evidence from input data (i.e., the speech samples available to learners) is not sufficient to account alone for the
language acquisition process because such evidence about language does not adequately represent the linguistic knowledge ultimately acquired by adults.

Chomsky (1966) concluded that children do not learn language simply through imitation because a large number of utterances produced by children are not like the utterances they have heard, but seem to be based on some internal processes and knowledge which permit them to gradually discover the complexities of adult language. Children's early speech seems best characterized in terms of a developing system with its own interim rules, not simply as imitations of adults. Instead, languages are learnable because humans are predisposed to acquire knowledge system that have precisely the form of natural languages (Culicover, 1997). Chomsky (1959) claimed that the central guiding force in language acquisition is a "language acquisition device (LAD)" (pp. 47-59). Chomsky hypothesized that learners posses the special linguistic faculty that enables them to process the input data in order to discover the rules of the language and relate them to a language-specific "mental structure."

These theoretical developments in linguistics were instrumental in changing the way in which language researchers viewed the process of second language acquisition. A crucial change in perspective has been the shift from viewing second language acquisition as habit-formation to viewing it as rule-formation. Applied linguists like Corder (1967), Nemser (1971), and Selinker (1972) have virtually abandoned the contrastive analysis hypothesis, which depends on comparisons between the structures of the first and second languages in order to predict potential areas of "interference" that are mechanically transferred by learners to the second language. They began to focus instead
on the cognitive contribution by the L2 learner in learning a second language. SLA researchers who upheld this cognitive orientation to language acquisition believed that L2 learners must be endowed with a special linguistic faculty that enables them to operate on the input data in order to discover the L2 rules and relate them to their cognitive structures. Following linguistic theory, Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) viewed SLA as the gradual process of acquiring an abstract system of linguistic principles and rules which produce the grammatical sentences of the second language. Research on second language acquisition has shown that second language learners pass through sequences of development and that many of these sequences are similar to those of children learning the same language as a first language. In addition, the features of the first language will also influence the learner's developing language system.

An important research question about developmental sequences was how they may interact with transfer from a learner's first language. This interaction between developmental sequences which are common to learners from many language backgrounds, and language features which are transferred from the learner's first language, illustrates how the learner uses a variety of sources of knowledge in the effort to learn the second language. The cognitive contribution of the learner, or the natural activity of the human mind in learning a second language became the focus of research in the 1970s. The cognitive view emphasized the relationship between L2 input, learner internal processing, and learner output in order to discover how the existing knowledge of the L1 influences the acquisition of the L2. For example, Anderson (1983) considered that the L1 acts "as a filter that governs the learner's perception and retention of specific
features of the second language” (p. 177). In this cognitive perspective, developing competence in a second language is guided by the properties of the second language input as well as those of the native language. The resulting “interlanguage” (IL) is a unique language system in which features of both languages interact to produce the level of linguistic development in the L2. The term “interlanguage” (Selinker, 1972) has been used in the SLA literature to refer to the intermediate system between the native language and the second language. Analysis of a learner’s interlanguage showed that it has some characteristics of the learner’s native language, some characteristics of the second language, and some characteristics which seem to be very general and tend to commonly occur in the interlanguages of all or most language learners. According to Selinker (1972), “interlanguage is a product of a number of major processes, such as language transfer, transfer of training, second language leaning strategy, second language communication strategy, overgeneralization of second and native language structures” (p. 216-217). Interlanguages are systematic, but they are dynamic and continually developing as learners receive more L2 input and test and revise their hypotheses about the second language.

Sharwood Smith (1979) captured the theoretical shift in transfer research from behaviorism to cognitivism:

The cognitivist approach is extended to transfer phenomena; this is much more consistent with the post-behavioristic way of thinking. In other words, transfer can be “creative”: it needs not be a mechanical and rather superficial process to be contrasted with the more creative processes by which a learner reconstructs the second language in the same, similar or indeed different ways as is evidenced by children learning their first language. (p. 347)
L2 learners came to be viewed as traversing a continuum that begins within the boundaries of the L1 and ends with ultimate attainment of the L2. In this process of language development, learners move from one stage to the next stage in their interlanguage development, and so on, until they reach proficiency in the L2. As a result, a number of researchers began to take a different approach to analyzing learners' errors. There was a need for a new method of analysis in order to plot the learner's progress through the different stages of interlanguage development. This approach, which was developed during the 1970s, became known as "error analysis" and involved a detailed description and analysis of the typical kinds of errors second learners make in the successive stages of second language acquisition. Contrastive analysis gave way to error analysis in which the concern was not so much with predicting errors on the basis of interference from the first to the second language, but with discovering and describing the common kinds of errors learners make in every stage in an effort to understand how learners process the second language input. The goal of error analysis was to provide enough evidence from learners' errors in order to understand the processes of second language acquisition.

The view of L2 learners from an error analysis perspective differs greatly from the view of L2 learners from the contrastive analysis perspective. In contrastive analysis, errors were the result of the interference of L1 habits over which the learner had no control. From an error analysis perspective, the learner is no longer seen to be a passive recipient of L2 input, but rather plays an active role, processing input, generating hypotheses, testing them, and refining them, all the while determining the level of ultimate attainment of the L2 he/she will reach. Error analysis was based on the assumption that
the speech of second language learners is a system in its own right. This developing system is rule-governed and predictable and very much like the interim system of young first language learners. Learners’ errors were believed by Corder (1967) to be significant indicators that can tell the analyst the features of a learner’s “transitional competence,” and the sorts of input needed to enable learners to progress further in learning the L2.

One effect has been to shift the emphasis away from a preoccupation with “teaching” towards the study of “learning.” This has led to a consideration of the question of whether there were any parallels between the processes of acquiring the native language and the learning of a second language. According to Larson-Freeman (1985), “SLA research in the seventies was motivated by the question of whether L1=L2; i.e., are the two acquisition processes identical, or at least similar, not necessarily in their product, but in the way they occur?” (p. 434). The L1=L2 hypothesis meant that L2 learners were perceived by SLA researchers in the same way as children trying to learn their first language. Seliger (1988), for example, focused on “overgeneralization” errors in the oral performance of L2 learners. These errors are typical of children learning their first language (*I buyed it.* *I holded the baby rabbit.*). Errors in learning the L2 were viewed by Seliger as a type of “overgeneralization” in which the L2 learner transfers knowledge from the L1 to the L2 context. According to Seliger (1988) “language transfer is a generic type of overgeneralization” (p. 22).

The Role of Transfer in Interlanguage Development

What most impressed Seliger (1988) and other early practitioners of error analysis (e.g., Dulay & Burt, 1974; Corder, 1967) were similarities to the results from research on
children learning their first language. With the accumulation of data on the types of errors being made by second language learners, support for the L1=L2 hypothesis grew stronger. Second language learning came to be seen as a cognitive processing on the part of the learner of L2 input that is guided by hypothesis formation and testing. The learner's linguistic development in the L2, technically known as linguistic competence, was assumed by SLA researchers to be represented in the form of an interlanguage, an abstract system of principles and rules which produce the grammatical sentences of the second language. Principles and rules account for the formal properties of the second language as syntax, phonology, morphology, and semantics. The learner's attempt to master the L2 was seen by Krashen (1981) as a "creative construction process."

As a result, the attempt to fit the role of the L1 into the cognitive theoretical constructs of SLA has been constrained by the strong association between transfer and behaviorists learning theory. It seems that even though SLA researchers have started to focus their studies on the types of cognitive decisions made by the learner, they were, nonetheless, unable or unwilling to completely ignore the behavioristic origins of the contrastive analysis hypothesis. By classifying and counting errors made by groups of second language learners, SLA researchers in the 1970s have dismissed the role of the native language in L2 acquisition as marginal if not irrelevant. Dulay and Burt (1974) went so far as to propose that about only 4 percent of the total errors made by L2 learners could be unambiguously attributed to the native language. Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) stated, "In this climate of opinion, it became fashionable to reinterpret putative cases of transfer as outcomes of such other "respectable" acquisition strategies as
overgeneralization” (p. 9). Sridhar and Sridhar were implying that even though the process of transfer was the same, its association with the old behavioristic paradigm made the use of new cognitively-oriented terms such as “overgeneralization” to describe transfer more acceptable by SLA researchers.

The first factor to reinstate transfer as a language learning variable came from Selinker (1972) who hypothesized that “interlingual identifications” are perhaps the basic learning strategy in SLA” (p. 211). Researchers working on transfer realized that it would make good cognitivist sense to talk in terms of a strategy of transfer. Larsen-Freeman (1991) observed that “what was noteworthy was the extent to which the idea of transfer as a deliberate cognitive strategy had taken hold” (p. 319). The second factor in the reinstatement of transfer as a cognitive strategy was the continued interest in identifying just where and when L1 influence can be expected to take place. In the early 1980s, new attempts were made by transfer researchers to find areas where transfer action might be going on. One such area was “linguistic similarity” between the first and second language. Transfer studies have supported the notion that similarity between the L1 and the L2 is a good predictor of second language acquisition. Transfer researchers argued that if these similarities reflect in some way a “natural” tendency for human language to be organized in certain ways, then some implications might follow. One has to do with the efficiency of learning. If a learner expects a collection of second language features to go together with the features of the native language - this expectation needs not be explicitly a part of the person’s awareness - then exposure to just a few members of that collection would be enough to facilitate the learning of the remaining groups of features. By learning one or
two rules, a learner is able to "project" other related patterns to the partial L2 knowledge he/she already has. Another implication of "similarity" has to do with transfer. It is possible that linguistic features that tend to cluster into typological characteristics, such as word order and relative clauses, are most likely to transfer from one language to another because these features are marked and might result in "positive" transfer to the learner's interlanguage development.

Along the same lines, features that tend to vary greatly from one language to another might not readily transfer from the L1 to the L2. Rutherford (1983) claimed that if the native language of the learner is typologically close or similar to the target language, the learner will have an easier task of using his/her knowledge of the L1 in learning the second language. If, however, the native language background is typologically distant from the second language, the learner, regardless of cognitive effort, will be unable to use knowledge gained in L1 acquisition for the efficient learning of the L2. Thus, differences constrain acquisition, and transfer research has demonstrated that the result can be "negative" transfer. Of course, negative, positive, or neutral transfer are relative terms attached to the transfer process after an error analysis has been conducted according to native speaker norms of proficiency. In other words, these terms can be considered artifacts of the research methodology of error analysis. Gass and Selinker (1994) explained how these terms came to be used to describe transfer as a language learning process:

In the learning situation, learners use previous linguistic knowledge in interacting with the target language. Based on present information, we feel that there is one process of transfer.... Hence, we now believe that there is no need to attribute separate processes (for example, positive, negative, or neutral) to the learner.
Our view is that the learner is transferring prior linguistic knowledge resulting in IL forms which, when compared by the researcher to the target language norms, can be termed "positive," "negative," or "neutral" (p. 6)

Nonetheless, as we shall see, the role of the L1 has increasingly been viewed as a negative influence on the learning and use of the L2. As Verhoeven and Durgunoglu (1998) stated, “Within the majority language context, the first language (L1) of a people is considered as a potential source of (un)successful transfer in L2 acquisition” (p. ix.). Thus, even though SLA researchers have gradually shifted their view of how languages are learned from a mechanical behavioristic theory to a more cognitively-oriented perspective, the consensus about the contribution of the L1 in L2 learning was still negative.

In spite of the possible success of this approach in finding new areas where transfer action may contribute positively to L2 learning and use, transfer studies have not made any serious attempts to rehabilitate the notion of transfer in the new theoretical constructs of SLA. Regardless of the potential success of research on transfer, transfer studies have not made any serious attempts at linking the transfer of relevant structural features of language to the process of second language acquisition. That is to say, no study has simultaneously looked at whether the transfer of word order, relative clauses, and other correlated features are good predictors of second language acquisition. The recognition of learners of negative or even neutral transfer, by whatever means, can be part of an internal learner process in which awareness of transfer errors, similar to hypothesis-testing, becomes a strategy for learners to promote their acquisition of the second language. On the contrary, learners were shown by SLA researchers as not really utilizing their awareness of negative, positive, or even neutral transfer as a mechanism that can further
their acquisition of the second language. McKay and Wong (1996) stated, for example, "A common image of the immigrant learner paints native language and target language as mutually antagonistic; in anti-immigrant discourse, someone using the native language is accused of not being committed to learning English" (p. 601). For example, the negative influence of the L1 can result in either “fossilization” of L1 features in IL performance (Selinker, 1972), avoidance of unfamiliar L2 structures (Schacter, 1974), or “transfer to nowhere” (Kellerman, 1995). Even when languages were similar, Kellerman has shown that L2 learners may not necessarily have the awareness to make such similarity work for them. Indeed, some case studies have revealed that “perceived transferability” was a cause of negative transfer.

**Fossilization**

According to Selinker (1972), the most crucial threat facing “successful” second language learning is fossilization, “the regular reappearance or re-emergence in IL productive performance of linguistic structures which were thought to be eradicated” (p. 215). Fossilizable phenomena are “linguistic items, rules, and subsystems which speakers of a particular (native language) will tend to keep in their interlanguage relative to a particular (target language)” (p. 215). As an example, Selinker cites “Indian English as an IL with regard to English which seems to fossilize the ‘that’ complement or ‘V that’ construction for all verbs that take sentential complements” (p. 216). Selinker further emphasized that “not only can entire competences be fossilized in individual learners performing in their own interlingual situation, but also in whole groups of individuals, resulting in the emergence of a new dialect (here Indian English) where fossilized
competence may be the normal situation” (p. 217). Selinker’s notion of Indian English as a fossilized language variety meant that transfer can play a definitely negative role in L2 learning.

Several SLA researchers concurred with Selinker’s assertions about the negative influence of the L1 in interlanguage fossilization. Discourse transfer studies held a deterministic view on the role of L1 in learning the second language. Bartelt (1992), for instance, intended to “pursue Kaplan’s (1966) suggestion that L1 thought patterns in rhetoric may play a crucial transfer role in L2 discourse production” (p. 101). Bartelt investigated whether redundancy “a culture-specific pattern in Apachean oral rhetoric was transferred to English compositions” (p. 101). Redundancy was defined as the repetition of key lexical items and phrases for the expression of emphasis. Data analysis revealed that redundancy in the use of phrases and sentences, when transferred to English, has the same function in Apachean writers’ interlanguage as in their native language: that of emphasis. Bartelt stated that “discourse transfer [is] a rule-governed cognitive process” (p. 113) in which the known rules of the native language are used as hypotheses in mastering the second language. Taking an information-processing perspective, Bartelt stated that “this transfer could be regarded as the need for L1 proceduralised knowledge to fill gaps in L2 declarative knowledge” (p. 104). Following Selinker (1972), Bartelt concluded that this rhetorical transfer may fossilize and become part of an ethnically marked norm.

Scarcella (1992) offered a similar explanation of “discourse accent” in the English of Spanish speakers who were highly proficient in English. Data analysis found evidence
of the transfer of L1 conversational features such as topic sequence, back channel cues, and pause fillers to the English spoken by the Spanish subjects. By comparing the performance of her Spanish subjects with a baseline of similar conversations between native-speaking participants, Scarcella concluded that there may be reason to assume that fossilization has occurred. Scarcella then proposed that the Spanish learners’ English may have evolved into a fully developed dialect learned from childhood. Although consistent with Selinker’s notion of fossilization, and Bartelt’s findings on Apachean English, Scarcella’s study went a further step in showing that the L1 can still negatively influence highly proficient Spanish speakers who have either been in the United States all their lives or at least the major part of it while still leaning English as a second language.

**Avoidance**

Rather than hold a deterministic view of the role of L1 on the learner’s interlanguage development, Schacter (1974) proposed a “constraint” view. In this view, L2 learners cognitively “avoid” the use of the English relative clause formation as a result of being constrained by the fact that their L1s do not have a similarly-equivalent formation. Avoidance as a cognitive decision taken by the learner at least gives the learner more autonomy over his/her use of the L2 than fossilization. However, this tendency to avoid or not to avoid relative clauses is not linked by Schacter to the process of acquiring the second language.

Schacter arrived at her constraint view of the role of the L1 after conducting an error analysis study on the use of the English relative clause by learners from four language backgrounds: Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Persian. The linguistic item in
question was relative clauses and the direction of branching (the position of relative clauses with respect to the noun). Schacter reported that the native speakers of Arabic and Persian, which share a right-branching sentence structure with English, were far more likely to produce English sentences with relative clauses than were native speakers of Japanese and Chinese, which are left-branching, even though the four groups were comparable in overall proficiency in English. Schacter’s analysis revealed that the Chinese and Japanese speakers did not commit as many errors in supplying relative clauses as did the Arabic and Persian speakers. Further analysis revealed that the Arabic and Persian speakers used relative clauses much more than the Chinese and Japanese speakers.

Schacter conducted a contrastive analysis of the four languages in relation to the existence of right-branching relative clauses comparable to English. She found that the Arabic and Persian languages had right-branching relative clause systems while Japanese and Chinese had left-branching relative clauses that are not found in the English language. Schacter hypothesized that the existence of right-branching relative clause systems in Persian and Arabic was the main reason behind these students’ not avoiding them in English. In fact, linguistic similarity led them to commit more relative clause errors than their Chinese and Japanese colleagues. Schacter’s (1974) study was significant because it provided evidence that ran counter to Dulay and Burt’s (1974) finding that only 4 percent of learners’ errors were due to transfer from L1 to L2. Schacter’s finding confirmed the view that language transfer played an undeniable role in language learning and use. Finally, it showed that a researcher’s functional familiarity with the native language backgrounds of her subjects can improve the quality of her findings. If Schacter only conducted an error analysis of
the English used by the four groups, she would have reached the conclusion that the Japanese and Chinese speakers were more successful than their Arabic and Persian colleagues in controlling the relative clause system of English.

In support of Schacter's constraint view of the L1, Ringbom (1986) showed an advantage for Swedish speakers over Finnish speakers in learning ESL in many areas. The data provided strong evidence that the Swedish speakers capitalized on the proximity of their language to English, an advantage not available to the Finns. Another study by Laufer and Elizsson (1993) showed that Swedish speakers have fewer problems utilizing English phrasal verbs than their Hebrew-speaking counterparts. According to Laufer and Elizsson (1993), "the relative ease shown by the Swedish learners is determined more by a systematic congruence between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2) than by the inherent difficulty of L2 forms" (p. 36). Finally, Jagtman and Bongaerts (1994) were committed to a constraint view of transfer in the early stages of acquisition. Their analysis of their Moroccan subjects' early acquisition of Dutch showed that the Arabic word order pattern of (verb, subject, object) was transferred to Dutch which is dominated by a (subject, verb, object) word order. Their Turkish subject, on the other hand, transferred the (subject, object, verb) word order found in Turkish to Dutch as a second language. The constraint view meant that if the first language does not provide a similar structure that is available in the second language, the learner will either negatively transfer or take the cognitive decision to "avoid" using that structure at least at the initial stages of second language learning.
Transfer to Nowhere

Kellerman (1995) proposed a principle to complement Schacter’s notion of avoidance which he called the “transfer to nowhere principle” (p. 137). This principle does not refer to differences in grammatical forms as to differences in the way languages predispose their speakers to conceptualize experience. A major influence on Kellerman’s proposal was Slobin’s crosslinguistic study of how different languages offer different ways of predisposing their speakers to conceptualize experience. Slobin’s (1991) notion of “thinking for speaking” hypothesized that our experiences are filtered (a) through our choice of perspective, and (b) through the set of options provided by our particular language to report experience into verbalizable events. According to Berman and Slobin (1994), “the child has to construct the necessary filters for organizing any experience into a verbal account of that experience in accordance with both the communicative goals and the set of formal options available in the language” (p. 12). Kellerman (1995) proposed that second language learners unconsciously assume “that the way we talk or write about experience is not something subject to between-language variation” (p. 141). Kellerman hypothesized that most of what falls under “thinking for speaking” is usually inaccessible to the learner’s awareness. The knowledge that is represented in this way is unconscious knowledge. Most people are not aware of the systematic nature of their language and cannot articulate the rules and principles that constrain the linguistic options that they in fact follow. Counter to Schacter’s claims about learners avoiding certain L2 structures, Kellerman (1995) stated, “we probably have no awareness of the language-specific nature of our own options” (p. 141). In the absence of such awareness, the L2 does not provide
stimuli for generalization of L1 material. Kellerman’s proposal differs from Schacter’s constraint view of transfer, which assumes some sort of awareness on the part of the learner. “Transfer to nowhere” meant that L2 learners do not have the ability to map the L1 and apply similar categories to the L2.

Evidence on learners’ lack of awareness of the language-specific nature of discourse patterns was found by Trevise (1986) who investigated how French L2 learners of English transfer discourse patterns from their L1 to the L2. English lends itself to the thematic structuring of utterances, and more generally to regular discourse patterns in terms of new information coming after old or known information. This so-called "linearization problem (Levelt, 1981) must be solved by second language learners whose language does not organize the same patterns as English in the domain of linear ordering of information. Because spoken French can be considered a topic-prominent language, Trevise’s (1986) French subjects followed the same pattern in their English which led them to an overproduction of particular constructions that are not typically found in standard English. Kellerman (1995) explained that “when it comes to verbalizing events in a second language, learners may not look for the perspective, peculiar to that language; instead they may seek the linguistic tools which will permit them to maintain their L1 perspectives” (p. 141).

Perceived Transferability

The learner’s lack of awareness of transferable linguistic items also undergirds Kellerman’s ideas on “perceived transferability.” Kellerman (1984) related fossilization among speakers who come from typologically close language backgrounds to the concept
of "perceived transferability." Even when the languages are similar there is a strong basis for fossilization. Zobl (1983) showed that L2 learners who come from a Spanish language background may fossilize at a developmental stage in English short of the standard native speaker norm (e.g., *I no like). Therefore, fossilization can occur in areas where there is congruence of a feature of the native language with a developmental feature of the L2. It appears that such congruence may prolong the restructuring of the negation rule in English, leading to a fossilized form. The concept of "perceived transferability" involves the learner's perception of L1/L2 distance on what can be transferred from L1 to L2. This process was viewed by Kellerman as a selection process in which the learner is perceptually engaged in decisions on what to transfer and what not to transfer. Because learners have no real awareness of the distance between the L1 and the L2, those who come from typologically-close language backgrounds may experience temporary or permanent fossilization.

Although it seems logical to expect that there should be opportunities for positive transfer if languages are typologically similar, some case studies suggest that the L1 may still play a negative role in second language acquisition. These case studies suggest that a learner's idiosyncracy and personal choice influence the transfer process even though the languages are typologically similar. Giacobbe (1992), for example, documented how Berta, a female Spanish-speaking refugee in France, chose not to transfer what she knew from Spanish to French as a second language. French is a typologically similar language to Spanish. Another study by Giacobbe and Cammarota (1986) focused on the acquisition of French as a second language by Brenda and Cocho, two Spanish-speaking refugees.
This study demonstrated that the extent to which the L1 influences L2 development can vary strongly from individual to individual. While Cocho uses new French words quite frequently on the basis of her knowledge of Spanish, Brenda "does not establish a mechanism for the systematic construction of vocabulary. There is no evidence to support the existence of a hypothesis on the proximity of the L1 and L2" (p. 341). Brenda seems to be less inclined to make use of the crosslinguistic similarity between Spanish and French. Kellerman (1995) recommended that a researcher needs to take the learner's history of transfer-caused success and failure into account to explain why some congruent forms in L1/L2 do not show up as positive transfers. A possible explanation is that as a result of having had negative feedback in the past when an L1 feature has been transferred and this led to an error, the learner maintains a strategy of not utilizing this L1 feature in using the L2.

**Linking Transfer to Acquisition**

A group of SLA researchers have attempted to establish a bidirectional relationship between word order transfer and second language development. According to Meisel (1981), second language learners "are using the underlying canonical word order of their L1s as a starting point in L2 acquisition and speech processing in the second language" (p. 47). Evidence on the existence of word order transfer at the earliest stages of acquisition was cited by Odlin (1990) who suggested that it does look as if basic L2 word order is quickly acquired after the initial stages of L2 acquisition because "word order is a structural characteristic rather than accessible to consciousness" (p. 110). Research on the transfer of L1 word order in second language acquisition focused on the transfer of
typological features of the L1 to the interlanguage performance of the L2 learner (e.g., Jordens, 1995; Rutherford, 1983, 1992; Yip and Matthews, 1995). These studies have provided evidence that the typological categories of the L1 may be transferred to the learner's interlanguage system.

Rutherford (1983) conducted a study of word order transfer that attempted to establish a meaningful role for the L1 in the relationship between language transfer and proficiency in the second language. Rutherford (1983) focused on the way different languages are constrained by typological universals. He conducted a study on the transfer of "topic prominence" as a typological parameter of Mandarin Chinese to the English produced by native speakers of Mandarin. He speculated that L1 topic prominence would serve to shape the L2 output of Mandarin-speaking learners who are in the levels of lower proficiency. The word order "errors" Chinese students made were shown to be the results of the distinction between the subject-prominent English and the topic-prominent Chinese languages.

Rutherford's (1983) study on the acquisition of English by Mandarin speakers focused on the influence of underlying native language (NL) typology on interlanguage structure. The writing samples of the Mandarin students at the level of "lower proficiency" reflected the topic-prominence of their native language. Rutherford argued that the frequent occurrence of "heavy subjects" (p. 360) in the written compositions of Mandarin speakers is a direct influence from their mother tongue, whose topic-prominent typology is "strong enough to override more general acquisitional strategies that limit the early production of such constructions" (p. 361). The research showed a developmental
path taken by Chinese learners as they increased their proficiency in English as a second language. Rutherford observed that there exists an acquisitional route in Mandarin learners' English who start out erroneously assuming that in L2-English, as in Mandarin, "topic prominence" is a major typological property of English. He identified several stages of development that learners go through before they reach the relevant stage at which they have discovered that English, unlike Mandarin, is a subject-prominent language. The examples from the six stages that Rutherford found were as follows:

1. Take good physical care of themselves is very important.
2. A lot of people, they know how to take care by themselves.
3. There are a small amount of people get married in their teenage.
4. There are many elements to maintain a successful marriage.
5. There are many people that make marriage unsuccessful.
6. More people do physical exercises now than before. (p. 363)

Rutherford carefully added that one should realize that there is "heavy overlap" between these stages. This does not preclude, however, that each of these six construction types corresponds "very roughly to a different proficiency level" (p. 363).

Looking at these six types of sentences in terms of developmental stages, Jordens (1995) concurred with Rutherford that these types of sentences are part of a developmental process starting out with a topic-prominent structure underlying sentence (1) and ending with a subject prominent structure in (6), while (2) is uncertain with respect to both topic- and subject- prominence. Jordens (1995) also observed that in these data two general types of constructions are involved. He argued that there is a curious gap in the types of constructions. Jordens attempted to explain the curious gap in the data by proposing a way in which the two parallel constructions may interact in second language development. Jordens (1995) argued that the developmental sequences observed among
Chinese learners may involve not just the problem of subject vs. topic prominence, but also an interaction with the English "presentative" construction, a form of rhetorical organization.

Working on the same data set, Yip and Matthews (1995) reexamined and reinterpreted the problems that Chinese-speaking learners of English apparently encounter when attempting to sort out the topic-prominence of their native language from the subject-prominence of English. Yip and Matthews proposed an explanation of these problems that is based in Universal Grammar (UG). Their explanation is based on the notion that much of our linguistic competence stems from innate knowledge which takes the form of a universal grammar and guides our acquisition of language. It is hypothesized by SLA researchers holding a UG perspective that L2 learners, in order to acquire the L2, may have to “reset” certain parameters in their cognitive structure if the L1 and the L2 follow different principles and parameters of UG. Yip and Matthews argued that Chinese learners were attempting to “reset” their interlanguages from the topic-prominent parameter of Chinese to the subject-prominent parameter of English. Other studies have demonstrated that there may be an interaction between the L1 and UG principles. Perdue (1993), for example, stated that for acquisition as a whole “initial steps in development are dominantly guided by universal principles, and factors attributable to specifics of (L1) and (L2) are more characteristic of later stages” (p. 27). The general picture with regard to UG principles is that they are not available to L2 learners in a totally open manner. Rather, the L1 continues to exert a major influence on the learning of the L2, at times interacting with UG principles.
The empirical evidence on the role of the word order transfer in L2 acquisition is mixed. Odlin (1989) noted that there are studies that claim that cases of the negative transfer of word order are extremely rare or do not occur. Rutherford (1983), for example, found that Japanese learners of English do not write sentences that follow the word order of their native language, in which the verb appears at the end. On the other hand, Meisel et al (1981) have found that Italian and Spanish immigrant workers in Germany seem to make use of their native language (subject, verb, object) order in speaking German, a (subject, object, verb) language.

Odlin (1989) noted that evidence on word order transfer was found among native speakers of languages with a flexible word order such as Finnish and French. Trevise (1986) demonstrated that French speakers transfer this property to English “I think it’s very good the analysis between the behavior of animals and the person” (p. 193). Likewise, native speakers of English were found to have difficulty in comprehending languages with a flexible word order such as Spanish. Converging evidence can be found in a study by Sasaki (1994) who showed that English and Japanese speakers use different cues for deciding on the subject of a sentence: word order for English, and other cues for Japanese. These strategies were transferred to the opposite language where they no longer applied, even by highly proficient adult learners of a second language. The status of word order seems to be an important abstract organizing principle of language that is transferred in acquiring a second language.
The Role of Transfer in Second Language Use

The same pattern of negative transfer that characterized research on the role of the L1 in interlanguage development seems to dominate studies that considered the influence of the L1 on the use of the L2 in spoken interactions with native speakers of the target language. These discourse transfer studies have typically examined situations in which interpersonal conflict emerges between native and nonnative speakers as a result of miscommunication caused by the NNSs' falling back on their L1 discourse norms and conventions. Motivated by a patronizing outlook to the role of learner speech in crosscultural settings, they attempted to show how negative affect derives from misunderstanding of intent (e.g., Harder, 1980; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Thomas, 1983). Their emphasis has thus been on the need to avoid interactional failure by highlighting the ways in which L2 use can put L2 learners at a disadvantage, or worse, lead to miscommunication.

Discourse transfer studies hold that miscommunication is caused by NNSs falling back on their L1 sociocultural norms and conventions when they use the L2 in face-to-face interaction. This assumption undergirds Scollon and Scollon's (1995) study of the different discourse strategies utilized by a group of North American and Mandarin Chinese businessmen. Scollon and Scollon (1995) described the differences in discourse systems both parties employ and argued that "the potential for miscommunication is always present in meetings between international businessmen because each side employs a different discourse system to organize its presentation" (p. 2). In their explanation, Scollon and Scollon (1995) established a parallel between the Chinese principles of discourse
organization with the Chinese language parameter of “topic-comment.” They stated, “the Asian speaker uses a ‘topic-comment’ order of presentation in which the main point (or comment) is deferred until sufficient backgrounding of the topic has been done” (p.1). They argued that, as a result of these different discourse systems, "there is a feeling that it is not clear what the speakers' main point is" (p. 1). They concluded that this confusion of goals in interpreting the main point of another's speech may lead to "the unfair and prejudicial stereotypes of the "inscrutable" Asian or of the frank and rude westerner" (p. 2).

The structure of explaining, justifying, and persuading has been studied by Young (1982) in business conversations between Chinese and English-speaking businessmen. The study showed that the patterns of argument in English business conversations by native speakers of Chinese was transferred from their native language patterns. Young noted that a basic Chinese line of argument is to initiate the discussion, present the argument, and draw a definitive summary statement. In contrast, the basic English line of argument is to state the conclusion and provide supporting arguments. The Chinese subjects in her study frequently used the English “because” to mark the arguments, and then used "so" to indicate transition to their final conclusions.

Graham (1990) claimed that part of the debt which the U.S. owes Japan each year can be explained by miscommunications which arise between U.S. and Japanese businessmen. In investigating sales negotiations between American and Japanese businessmen, Graham found that the Japanese businessmen's use of silence in expressing agreement was mistakenly interpreted by the Americans as a refusal of the offer they just
made. The Americans offered what they believed to be a generous price. When the Japanese did not react favorably to their offer, but instead paused, the Americans offered the Japanese even more money for their goods. From the Americans' perspective, the Japanese paused because they were dissatisfied with the Americans' first offer. When Graham interviewed the Japanese businessmen, he found that they only paused after the Americans' first offer to reflect upon the interaction. Graham pointed out that in conversation, silence is more frequent and positively valued in Japanese society than it is in America. The outcome is an unintentional conflict of communication strategies that may have a negative influence on U.S.-Japanese trade relations.

Discourse transfer studies have found that dramatic differences in discourse style among different language groups may lead to miscommunication and stereotypical behavior. Scollon and Scollon (1981), for example, focused on differences between English and Athabaskan speakers in turn-taking behavior. They hypothesized that these differences may result in problems that arise from L1 transfer in interethnic communication. They showed that discourse features of turn-taking may affect the image one presents of self. Transferred patterns can lead to unfortunate misunderstandings. For example, English speakers reported that Athabaskan Canadians kept silent, avoided direct questions, never started a conversation, did not talk about themselves, left without saying anything, were inexplicit, and were slow to take a conversational turn. The English participants held a negative impression of Athabaskan Canadians who transferred these native language norms into English. Athabaskan Canadians, in turn, perceived the English
speakers as talking too much, always talking: first, bragging, asking too many questions, interrupting and dominating the conversation; in English.

In crosscultural conversations, differences in conversation management can lead to conversational difficulties between native speakers and members of ethnic minorities. Scarcella (1992) investigated "discourse-acc*ent" among Spanish immigrants in the United States. She investigated conversations between 15 pairs of informants in southern California (5 Spanish-Spanish, 5 English-English, and 5 ESL-English). Scarcella found differences in topic selection, ordering of topics sequence, back-channel cues, abrupt topic-shifts, and pause fillers (i.e., words to hold one's conversational turn). Spanish-speaking subjects ranged in age from 19 to 24 and had come to the U.S. from Mexico before the age of 7. Thus, despite their high levels of proficiency in English, the Spanish-English interactions were characterized by what Scarcella called "conversational difficulties." Scarcella noted that "for many adult L2 learners, discourse accent persists, perhaps permanently" (p. 109).

Discourse transfer studies demonstrated how the L1 can exert a negative influence on using the L2 in that learners transferred the L1 criteria of appropriateness of various speech acts and interactional patterns to their L2 spoken performance. In ESL classrooms, Sato (1990) investigated the effect of learners' cultural backgrounds on their "participation patterns." She compared how "Asian" students participated in the classroom to their "non-Asian" classmates. Sato reported a strong correlation between cultural background and turn-taking patterns: in her study. Sato conducted a frequency analysis of turn-taking by Asian and non-Asian students and found that "Asian learners
contributed far less to class discussion than did non-Asians" (p. 114). She quantified turn-taking patterns in terms of the speaker's binary ethnic affiliation: "Asian or non-Asian."

She commented that "the Asian- non-Asian dichotomy can now be refined into a set of categories accounting for each ethnic group represented in a class of learners" (p. 117).

**World English**

A counter movement within SLA discourse transfer studies came from within contexts where English has become the lingua franca of the local language setting. Proponents of World English forwarded as their claim to validity the fact that in places like India, South Africa, Nigeria, the Philippines, and Singapore, English has become the common language for casual communication and upward social mobility of a far larger population than in contexts where English is a native language such as the U.S.A., Britain, New Zealand, Canada, and Australia. In these local contexts, the English which was the language of a colonizing power has assumed a distinctly local character. In Singapore, for example, the incorporation of loan words and usage characteristics of the local Malay, Tamil, and Chinese languages has created Singlish. World English researchers believed that they have a valuable source of naturalistic data that can increase the mainstream knowledge base on the processes and phenomena of language transfer. They claimed that SLA theory needs to revise its basic assumptions about language learning phenomenon by not restricting its sources of data to contexts where English is a native language.

According to these researchers (e.g., Kachru, 1992; Kachru & Nelson, 1996), viewing the English varieties spoken in many parts of the world as legitimate sources of data on
language transfer can not only increase understanding of language learning phenomenon but also advance the goal of theory development in SLA.

Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) theoretically challenged Selinker’s (1974) view to the English variety spoken in India as a fossilized dialect of English. They stated, “For the majority of Indian speakers, the so-called fossilized structures are the normal structures and they have no others in their competence” (p. 8). As a whole, research on World English does not analyze learners’ errors according to English native speakers’ norms of proficiency, but focuses instead on the social setting that may have an impact on the features of the English variety spoken there. Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) stated, for example, “the acquisitional target for these speakers is not a native norm but an indigenized one” (p. 8). Because these assumptions are different from those held by mainstream SLA researchers, research on World English attributes a definitely more positive sociolinguistic role for the native language. Sridhar and Sridhar (1992) have demonstrated that the transfer of lexical items and pragmatic characteristics of the native Indian language to English serves as a marker of social identity, and “far from impeding intelligibility, transfer acts as the grease to make the wheels of bilingual communication turn smoothly” (p. 101). They argued that it is precisely these areas of language use which reflect the distinctive cultural experiences and conventions of the community that bilingual speakers in these contexts have come to expect from their interlocutors. According to Sridhar (1996), “Communication in multilingual societies often presupposes this multilingual competence” (p. 62).
SLA researchers conduct their studies to uncover the cognitive aspects of transfer without paying attention to the social settings that lead to the phenomenon in the first place. Because they employ "error analysis" of learner performance according to NS norms, SLA researchers are not concerned with the degree to which L1 sociocultural knowledge influences patterns of second language use, or the manner in which these influences are exerted on the learner’s use of the L2. World English researchers, however, focus more on the sociolinguistic aspects of language use than on the cognitive decision making by the individual learner. They, thus, attribute more influence on language transfer to the social contexts in which English is used than to the cognitive processes of language learning. Kasper and Schmidt (1996) noted that "while transfer may sometimes be a cognitive overgeneralization from the native language to the second language, it is often a sociolinguistic act and frequently an assertion of cultural identity" (p. 165). Thus, the role of the native language in second language use is not viewed in the same negative outlook in World English research as in mainstream SLA research.

The transfer processes employed in discourse transfer in both contexts are not different in principle, but the SLA side attributes a negative role to the native language while the World English side attributes a positive one. It seems that both sides are confusing product with process; that both negative and positive transfer are only, in this case, artifacts of the assumptions and methodologies followed by each side. With each side bound by a separate technical rationality, neither is able to tell us how the learner’s language background influences the learning and use of the L2. World English studies reveal, however, that the social setting of language use can be as important as the
cognitive processing of the learner in the production of discourse transfer phenomena. In so doing, they have demonstrated that in bilingual settings, discourse transfer can play an important social function in that it signals membership in the speech community. Thus, the role of the L1 in language learning and use is seen by these researchers as a positive sociolinguistic role that promotes social relations between members of the same bilingual community.

Limitations of Discourse Transfer Studies

In addition to the objections raised by World English researchers, discourse transfer studies have been criticized by other researchers for a number of reasons: for being too ethnocentric and privileging native speaker norms of language use (Matalene, 1985; McKay & Wong, 1996); for examining only surface-level L2 products and ignoring the processes involved in discourse transfer (Mohan & Lo, 1985; Takahashi, 1996); for dismissing linguistic and cultural differences among “typologically-related” language groups (Hinds, 1983), for example, Chinese, Thai, Korean and Japanese speakers in one “Asian” group as in Rutherford (1983) and Sato (1990); and for considering transfer from a first language a negative influence on second language learning (Raimes, 1991; Cummins, 1991; Verhoeven & Durgunoglu, 1998).

A more serious methodological limitation of discourse transfer studies is that they adopt a static view of the essentially dynamic nature of human interaction. In discourse transfer studies, learners’ “errors” are examined and reasons for them are hypothesized based on the sociocultural background from which the learners came. Analyzing errors means analyzing the regular L1 patterns that appear in the L2 learner’s speech. In most
cases, error analysis is conducted without considering the interactional contexts from which the data were collected. This procedure involves collecting isolated learner utterances, identifying the errors, and classifying them according to NS norms of proficiency. The errors are then placed in a taxonomy according to their hypothesized causes, and ordered according to their seriousness in violating NS standards of proficiency. This methodology was criticized by Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) as adopting a static view of the dynamic nature of human interaction. Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) stated that this view makes conversation seem like "the contiguous joining of two separate monologues" (p. 166). The neglect of the dynamic nature of interaction presupposes a speech-act based model of learner speech (e.g., Searle, 1969). Speech act theory places the emphasis on the isolated learner utterance rather than on the jointly-performed communicative event as a whole. Such an assumption holds that interactional goals are limited to single-turn speech acts. Even when error analyses have ventured beyond the single turn, they have considered how L2 learners negotiate meaning by clarifying and confirming comprehension of the information that an individual speaker intends to convey by a particular speech act.

In conclusion, SLA studies that have focused on the negative transfer of the L1's discourse patterns in second language use have consistently reported that miscommunication between L2 learners and native speakers of the target language is the expected outcome of discourse transfer in L2 use. These findings served to reinforce the negative outlook SLA researchers hold about the role of the L1 in interlanguage development. In these studies, the theoretically-imposed constraint of fossilization was
always presented as an outcome of employing the L1 as part of the learner’s attempt to use a variety of knowledge sources to learn the second language. On the whole, SLA studies of discourse transfer maintain a negative outlook to the role of the L1 that may have been a carry-over from the behaviorist notion of L1 “interference” which was reintroduced by cognitively-oriented researchers as “negative transfer.”

II. The Sociocultural Perspective on Discourse Transfer

The cognitive and the sociocultural perspectives hold different assumptions about language acquisition, language transfer, and what it means to engage in face-to-face interaction. The sociocultural view on the role of the native language in the learning of a second language is in stark contrast with the cognitive perspective on discourse transfer that views the native language as playing a problematic role in the learning of a second language. In the cognitive view, transfer is assumed to be based on overt linguistic data without attention to the cultural frames of reference that index words and phrases in the L2. Error analysis of learner linguistic products is a surface-level analysis according to NS norms and may thus be insufficient to explore the learner’s acquisition of the cultural content that frames the linguistic input. The “sociocultural” perspective on language learning views language not as a formal code but as a constitutive feature of society and culture. It argues that a second language learner, in order to be successful, must gradually gain access to the implicit information and cultural knowledge possessed by native speakers of the target language. Throughout this process, the learner’s fully developed linguistic competence in his/her native language, as well as the concepts and skills learned in developing the native language, create a foundation of strength from which students
can develop proficiency in the L2. To many theorists ranging from Vygotsky to Hymes, the interpersonal and cultural displays of language, not the rules of grammar, nor the patterns of cognitive activities, lie at the heart of language. They consider the proper study of the phenomenon of language acquisition by placing it right in the social contexts where it is used in a variety of ways: interpersonal negotiation, socialization, signaling one’s identity, and reflecting membership of a group.

Vygotsky

The process of language acquisition was investigated by Vygotsky (1962) who addressed the relationship of language, thought, and society in the process of child development. Although language, thought, and action are distinct psychological functions that might be innate, Vygotsky concluded that the role of society was to bring about their integration and thus make possible the creation of new levels of thinking. Vygotsky used the example of “inner speech” as a manifestation of the role of social institutions in bringing about a child’s cognitive development. Vygotsky hypothesized that an individual’s psychological processes are internalized versions of activity that occur at the interpersonal and social levels. Thus, the child first uses language for the purpose of socialization with other individuals, but reaches higher psychological and mental stages by internalizing the speech experiences. For Vygotsky, individual consciousness is determined by the activity of the group because it is just this activity that in the process of internalization leads to individual consciousness. As Vygotsky (1987) wrote, “The child’s higher functions of thought first appear in the collective life of children in the form of argument and only later lead to the development of reasoning in the child’s own behavior”
Only when immersed in all the variety of social forms of activity can the individual acquire the ability to consciously regulate his/her own activity.

The determination of individual consciousness by social activity leads to a consideration of the role of culture as a determinant of individual consciousness. Vygotsky considered signs and symbols, which possess stable meanings formed in the course of cultural development, to be the real carriers of culture. The sign as a transmitter of cultural activity has a dual meaning. Vygotsky (1987) stated, “The sign is located outside of the organism just as a tool is, separate from the personality, and is in reality a social organ or a social medium” (p. 146). The sign also exists in the consciousness of the individual subject. Vygotsky explained that an individual’s development process reflects the social process of using tools and sign systems including social language. Wertsch (1991) discussed the concept of social language as a way of speaking characteristic of a particular group in a particular sociocultural setting. Wertsch (1991) characterized the association between language and thought by stating that “certain patterns of speaking and thinking are easier, or come to be viewed as appropriate in a specific setting than others” (p. 38).

On language transfer, Vygotsky described the relationship of the development of the native language on the learning of a foreign/second language. In a native language, spontaneous speech develops prior to any awareness of grammar, whereas in a second language awareness of language forms develops before any ability to use the language spontaneously. Vygotsky (1962) stated,
Success in learning a foreign language is contingent on a certain degree of maturity in the native language. The child can transfer to the new language the system of meanings he already possesses in his own. The reverse is also true - a foreign language facilitates mastering the higher forms of the native language. The child learns to see his language as one particular system among many, to view its phenomena under more general categories, and this leads to awareness of his linguistic operations. Goethe said with truth that "he who knows no foreign language does not truly know his own. (p. 110)

In this view, the native language provides a foundation from which the second language develops. The major contribution of Vygotsky's theory lies in its ability to move us beyond the view to the native language as a static backdrop, enabling researchers instead to focus on its constructive role in learning the second language.

A number of researchers (e.g., Ellis, 1991; Fotos, 1993; Schmidt & Frota, 1986) have adopted a perspective on the role of awareness in second language acquisition in which awareness of negative transfer can be seen as part of a mechanism for further learning of the L2. Schmidt and Frota (1986) have demonstrated that when a learner "notices the gap" between her current level of L2 performance and that of a native speaker, she tends to establish a comparison between the native speaker model and her interlanguage. The position that Jackson (1987) advanced was that the role of negative transfer is primarily to facilitate the processes of noticing and comparison. Jackson (1987) stated that negative transfer happens "when an item or structure in the second language manifests some degree of difference from, and some degree of similarity with the equivalent item or structure in the learner's first language (p. 101). It is precisely the learner's awareness of negative transfer that prompts the learner to further his/her learning of the L2. According to Schmidt (1990), the process of noticing is necessarily a conscious one. Schmidt argued that learners who notice the most, will learn the most. The leaner's
awareness of negative transfer as a result of “noticing the gap” between his/her own IL performance and the L2's authentic input or what Vygotsky termed “awareness of linguistic operations” (p. 110), has the potential of pushing the learner's IL beyond its current level of development. In light of these findings, it is not surprising that Van Lier (1996) promoted the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom. He stated that “there is an enormous potential for cross-fertilization between native language and foreign language(s) which is insufficiently exploited in schools, and which could be an important vehicle in the development of higher cognitive skills and critical thinking” (p. 19).

If one agrees with Vygotsky that language development starts as part of a socialization process and that the child's inner speech is in fact internalized social speech, one should question the adequacy of first and second language acquisition models that are based on the acquisition of syntactic structures as an independent level of language, not affected by the conditions of language use. According to Vygotsky's theory, any kind of language acquisition device would have to be able to filter some aspects of the social context that gives meaning and form to speech signals. A device only aimed at acquiring context-free forms may not be able to acquire the relevant input. In its natural use, language is deeply embedded in the situational context. Coppieters (1987) observed that native speakers do not acquire such subtle semantic distinctions as those between “the preterite and the present perfect of English (I lived, I have lived in England) in terms of context-free formal distinctions but by means of a set of richly contextualized exemplars that become associated with specific forms that guide later context-embedded use” (p. 569).
Hymes

In its natural communicative use, any language shows many different types of variation. Within a society, different discourses exist, not only among members of the same social group, for example, in terms of class, gender, and age, but also among different social groups. Interactants from different regional areas or different social groups make use of variant features, and individual speakers will vary their linguistic behavior depending on numerous aspects of the situation in which the interaction takes place. The inseparable link that exists between linguistic variation and specific social contexts of use indicates that language has a vital role in constructing social meaning and in symbolizing membership in social groups. Hymes (1972) stated,

Communities differ significantly in ways of speaking, in patterns of repertoire and switching, in the roles and meanings of speech. Differences among communities reveal differences with regard to beliefs, values, reference groups, norms, and the like, as these enter into the ongoing system of language use and its acquisition by speakers. (p. 33)

Sociolinguistics entailed a rejection of Chomsky's abstraction of the linguistic competence of the "ideal native speaker/hearer," and stressed instead the primacy of the social dimension of language use. Hymes (1974) stated, "In recent years the dominant interest has linked linguistic inquiry with cognitive psychology, and has tended to reinforce, rather than transcend, a purely formal interest" (p. viii). Hymes (1974) encouraged linguists to "move outward into the exploration of speech behavior and use" (p. 193). He promoted extending linguistic inquiry to units of analysis such as the speech act, the speech event, the speech situation, and the speech community. In order to transcend Chomsky's (1965) idealization of "linguistic competence," Hymes argued that the aim of linguistic theory
should be the description of "communicative competence" governing the appropriate use of language in a given speech community. In effect, he redrew the boundaries of what constitutes knowledge of language to include communicative competence as well as linguistic competence.

Communicative competence includes the tacit knowledge of social, psychological, cultural, and linguistic information needed to engage in social interaction. Included in communicative competence is knowledge of discourse which encompasses not just everyday conversation but other culturally-constructed speech events (e.g., prayer, classroom). However, L2 discourse is not a single, generic, homogeneous code throughout society. Since an L2 learner cannot fully interpret the L2 by referring to dictionary word meanings and grammar alone, the L2 learner must be encouraged to observe the variable sociocultural context which is likely to influence the ways the language is used for communication. Discourse as language use can also be learned from social interaction with members of the speech community. One way to ensure language awareness is to engage in social interaction with native speakers of the target language. Lennon (1989) has documented how the advanced learners he studied appeared to switch their attention from trying to communicate to trying to learn by consciously attending to the linguistic features of L2 input even within the course of a single interaction. Gass (1995) made the case that universals that are visible in social relations (i.e., discourse and pragmatics) have a strong impact on the acquisition of linguistic items. In effect, universals based on the way people interact have a greater chance of being noticed than the formal aspects of the L2 input because they have the potential of giving learners a
chance to match linguistic forms to the social functions in which they are frequently employed. In the absence of opportunities to produce speech acts in authentic situational contexts, students should be given the opportunity to observe such speech acts. Hymes (1974) suggested using an ethnographic method of observation that takes into account the diversity of discourses that take place within a speech community. Hymes (1974) stated,

A general theory of the interaction of language and social life must encompass the relations between linguistic means and social meaning. The relations within a particular community or personal repertoire are an empirical problem, calling for a mode of description that is jointly ethnographic and linguistic, conceiving ways of speaking as one among the community’s set of symbolic forms. (p. 31)

The mode of description that Hymes (1974) introduced was the “ethnography of speaking” which shares with ethnography not only its methodology for collecting and analyzing naturalistic data through participant observation, but also a concern for emic explanations of meaning and behavior. An ethnographer must carefully observe as many aspects of language and its use as possible before drawing conclusions about “the ways of speaking” of a particular speech community. In sum, the sociolinguistic methodological reliance on ethnography and participant observation helps linguists interested in understanding how language is deployed in a speech community to uncover the components of communicative competence that members of a speech community need in order to participate in their everyday interactions, and to interpret those competencies in relation to the cultural frames in which they emerge.

The sociocultural perspective aimed to use the ethnographic method of “participant observation” to capture the “emic” perspective of social actors as they move through different social events and jointly construct meaning with other participants. This
phenomenological focus appears, for example, in interactional accounts of crosscultural miscommunication (Gumperz, 1982), language socialization (Schiefelin & Ochs, 1986), and classroom talk (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1982). These sociocultural accounts articulate how in the course of social interactions participants coordinate their utterances to co-produce understandings, misunderstandings and modes of learning. An interaction-centered ethnography of communication means relating strategies for engaging in verbal interaction to socialization patterns, and maintenance of social institutions such as the family, the school, or the classroom. Ochs and Taylor (1992), for example, examined the social, linguistic, and cognitive dimensions of dinnertime interactions in white-middle-class American families. They hypothesized that there is a strong link between a child’s repeated opportunity to participate in collaborative exchanges over dinnertime with family members and the acquisition of the types of cognitive skills that are crucial for posing and exploring problems, and offering explanations. The “problems” posed and explored at dinnertime were mainly the experiences of the family members. But the collaborative thinking that these families engaged in manifested many of the features of scientific inquiry. Ochs and Taylor’s study demonstrated that socialization within these discourses depends on collaboration by novices and experts in solving mundane everyday problems.

As linguistic competence lost its centrality among sociolinguists, the social context of language use assumed a more important analytic role in the field. This shift paralleled a sea change across disciplines away from an analytic focus on describing linguistic competence and cognitive functioning toward a focus on socially coordinated, and culturally situated “interactional patterns” (Givon, 1985; Snow, 1994), “activities”
(Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978), "interactional rituals" (Goffman, 1974), "practices" (Garfinkel, 1967), and "talk-in-interaction" (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). In these approaches, people are not visualized as passive bearers of unconscious patterns of language and culture, but rather as active agents whose participation in communicative events can influence the organization, meaning, and outcomes of those events. As strategic actors, individual participants actively attempt to shape the interactional context in ways that further their own interests. Thus, instead of passive participants who are following unconscious patterns of language and culture, the new sociocultural perspective finds actors who are reflexively aware of the social events they are producing and who are possessed of a rich, immensely varied, and socially-organized cognitive life.

**Discourse Analysis**

Discourse analysis has expanded our understanding of what can constitute valid data. Through focus on analytical units such as speech events or turns at talk, a considerable number of previously unexamined topics have emerged as appropriate and significant discourse phenomena. In addition, discourse analysis has extended notions of what counts as context, operating on the assumption that the relationship between language and its context is of paramount interest (Hymes, 1974). While the traditional SLA method of error analysis refers to the immediately surrounding utterances, discourse analysis focuses on a search for recurring patterns across extended records of naturally occurring conversations. This perspective indicates the relevance of a broader view of socially surrounding context to the interpretation of language use. Moreover, discourse analysis focuses on the interactional consequences of the choice between alternative
utterances. There is little appeal to the intuitive judgement of the researcher of what constitutes adult NS norms of proficiency and an emphasis on language uttered by people actually using the language. There is also a tendency to avoid analyses based on a single text. Instead, as many instances as possible of a particular category are examined across interactions to discover how the coherence and sequential organization of discourse are produced and understood, and how utterances are organized to manage such sequences.

The analysis of discourse behavior in interactive events attempts to analyze how people manage their use of language with respect to their cultural backgrounds and their interactive goals at the time of talk. Analyzing discourse as an interactive event adheres to two basic principles: (a) specification of the interactional context, and (b) the emic perspectives of the participants in interactive events. The contextual description of language use was a critical component of the stance emerging from a sociocultural orientation on language, as opposed to the linguists' preoccupation with linguistic competence and ideal native speakers/hearers. The social situation as a unit of analysis was introduced by Hymes as the most meaningful context for language use. The ethnography of speaking focused on the bearings of "the situation" and the characteristic patterns of the language deployed in it. The discourse analysis of interactive events attempted to capture not only "the situation" but also the "the situated," including situated language use. Researchers like Gumperz (1982) were not only interested in describing the interactional patterns of communicative events but also the analytic reasoning done by the participants that have shaped the features and character of the communicative event.
Researchers interested in conducting discourse analysis of interactive events unanimously hold themselves accountable to recorded data of naturally occurring episodes of interaction of various sorts. This common point of departure in collecting ethnographic data is by no means incidental. It is deeply consequential for how the analysis gets done, and for how their theoretical contributions are to be assessed. But there is another sense in which collecting and recording live data is not incidental. Early on, Fries (1952) proposed an “entirely different kind of evidence” (p. 37) for research on foreign language learning. Regarding this evidence, he stated,

With the recent development of mechanical devices for the easy recording of the speech of persons in all types of situations there seems to be little excuse for the use of linguistic material not taken from actual communicative practice when one attempts to deal with a living language... He [The investigator] has a much more satisfactory base from which to proceed with linguistic analysis if he has a large body of mechanically recorded language which he can hear repeated over and over, and which he can approach with more objectivity than he can that which he furnishes from himself as informant. (pp. 3-4)

There are, however, important difference between Fries’ notion of the function of recorded data and the ones that inform language-oriented ethnographic researchers. For example, Fries was not concerned with how the language he was describing was a constitutive feature of the interaction in which it was used, either socially or personally.

The naturalistic commitment to address the observable, situated ways in which people actually use the language for mundane interaction, as preserved for repeated and detailed examination, is one of the distinctive features of the approach to discourse analysis typical of language-oriented ethnographic studies. A common feature of these studies is their intense focus on the data of interactive events which includes information about the unfolding experiences of the participants in the social worlds and settings they

67
populate. These studies are concerned with giving an account of how coherence and sequential organization in discourse are produced and understood by participants to the talk. Despite their different interests in language and how it operates in social context, Schiffrin (1990) suggested some general principles that are common to language-related ethnographic studies. These principles can be summarized as follows:

1. The analysis of discourse is empirical.
   (a) Data come from intact settings. These settings are the speech communities of native and nonnative speakers: Data are about people using language, not researchers manipulating speech events to elicit data.
   (b) Analyses are accountable to the data: They try to explain the data in terms of both the regularities and patterns that occur together.

2. Discourse is not just a sequence of linguistic units; its coherence cannot be understood if attention is limited to linguistic form and organization.

3. Discourse patterns and participants' meanings contextualize each other, and work together with social meanings and interpretive schemata to produce speech events.

4. The goal of the research is to describe and explain the competencies that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in socially-organized interaction. (p. 9)

**Ethnographic Studies of L2 Discourse**

The ideas and theoretical perspectives of Vygotsky and Hymes remain very much alive today and are currently having new influence, not only on language teachers but also on language researchers. Of relevance to language teachers was a rethinking of their educational goals. Most L2 learners learn a second language to gain access through verbal and written interaction to cultural dealings with people who speak that language.
As Robinson (1988) argued, to learn a second language is to equip the L2 learner with a powerful tool to enter a new culture. Teachers wanted to increase the overall proficiency of their students which meant a focus on the development of communicative competence rather than the narrower focus on linguistic skills. They soon found that there are considerable difficulties facing them in the confines of the classroom that prevent them from promoting a communicative competence for their students that matches that of adult native speakers. In addition to the cognitive and psychological constraints that stem from the very nature of second language acquisition, they found that there are external factors imposed by the social context itself on their students’ successful acquisition of the target language. Rather than merely the transmission of knowledge in the form of either fixed linguistic rules or the socially conventionalized patterns of language use, educational efforts consequently sought to empower the learner with the autonomy and independence to develop his/her own voice in the second language. Rather than viewing the learner as a receptacle for new knowledge, educators sought to reinstate the power of the individual speaker to shape his/her environment in dialogue with other speakers. For example, Van Lier’s (1996) book on interaction in the classroom promotes learners’ awareness and autonomy over authentic language data.

Researchers also rethought the purpose of their research. This shift from a teacher-centered classroom to a student-centered classroom prompted the emergence of language-related ethnographies that reexamined the role of language education not only as a reflection of social order but as an instrument of social change. New ethnographic studies focused on the constraints imposed by the classroom context itself on the learner’s
efforts to master the L2. This new outlook to the purpose of research paralleled a
growing trend among SLA researchers away from an analytic focus on the cognitive
processing employed by the learner in creating interlanguage and error analysis toward a
focus on constantly changing, and socially coordinated "social identity" (Peirce, 1995),
"multiple discourses" (McKay & Wong, 1996), "interactional routines" (Heath, 1989),
and "socialization" in the second language classroom (Poole, 1992).

Social Identity

Sociolinguistic researchers have focused on how L2 learners maintain their social
and cultural identities while using the L2 in face-to-face interaction. Insights from
research on sociolinguistics suggest that there is a close link between the language forms
an L2 learner uses and his/her own sense of identity (Gumperz, 1982). Giles, Coupland,
and Coupland (1991), for example, noted that when people learn a second language, they
do not "converge" totally to NS norms of speech. This measure of divergence was seen
by Preston (1989) as a disclaimer to full membership. According to Preston (1989), in
ESL classrooms, nonnative-like features are maintained to exhibit "learner status."
Preston (1981) argued that "efficient nonnative speakers are not necessarily those whose
performance is a copy of the native speaker's" (p. 107). Scarcella (1992) has also shown
that highly proficient nonnative users of English, many of whom have resided in the
U.S.A. for more than ten years and most of whom could not be distinguished from native
speakers of the same social level (university-level students in southern California) on the
basis of their linguistic performance, diverged markedly from their native-speaker peers in
their acquisition of communicative skills, such as the organization of discourse and rules of
conversational interaction. Scarcella concluded that the lack of correspondence between advanced Hispanic learners’ demonstrated proficiency and their imperfect control of the rules that underlie English discourse organization reflects differences in the way discourse knowledge about English and Spanish is represented in the brain. That is, differences in discourse competence between native speakers and highly proficient nonnative speakers can result in fossilization or “discourse accent.”

Peirce (1995) aimed to contribute to abandoning the “artificial distinctions between the language learner and the language learning context” (p. 10) and the “arbitrary mapping of particular factors on either the individual or the social” (p. 11). The main thrust of Peirce’s (1995) argument was that “SLA theorists have not developed a comprehensive theory of social identity that integrates the language learner and the language learning context. Furthermore, they have not questioned how relations of power in the social world affect social interaction between second language learners and target language speakers” (p. 12). Peirce attempted to advance the reader’s understanding of the way in which power relations have a direct effect on language use and learning.

Using the ethnographic method of participant observation, Peirce (1995) showed that power is embedded in the social relations in which her subjects were engaged. Peirce developed five case studies that were focused on five immigrant women trying to learn English in Canada. Martina, one of the subjects, coped with her position as an “immigrant” by refusing to be silent: a strategy she used in her dealings with her Canadian employers. Because Martina’s “investment” in English was largely structured by her identity as a primary care-giver in the family, she claimed the right to speak “by setting up
a counterdisourse in her work place and resisting the position of “immigrant woman” in favor of the position of “mother” (p. 23).

In her interpretation of Martina’s strategy, Peirce stated that “despite feelings of inferiority and shame... Martina refused to be silent” (p. 21). This was because “her social identity as a mother and primary caregiver in the home led her to challenge” (p. 21) the prevailing expectations of the discursive contexts in which she found herself. Regarding Martina’s phenomenological stance, Peirce asserted that “language is the place... where our sense of selves, our subjectivity is constructed” (p. 15). Martina found the resources to maintain her identity as a mother despite the “multiple sites of Martina’s formation as an immigrant, a mother, a language learner, a worker, a wife” (p. 21). Martina somehow insisted on one identity (mother) over others, despite the way discourse might construct her (immigrant) at any given moment. The multiplicity and site of struggle that Peirce argued for in her notion of learner identity exist among the options which present themselves to Martina, as she struggled to hold on to her identity as a mother. She kept on resisting the frames imposed on her by others’ discursive practices through an act of will, an act of courage, of determination, thus setting up a counterdisourse. The identity Martina took up and her resistance to alternative positions are portrayed by Peirce as maintained through the social identity given to her by her sociocultural background.

Peirce (1995) argued that the notion of the L2 learner as having a social identity forces us to view learners when they speak as not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but as individuals who are “constantly organizing and re-organizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (p. 17). In this way,
learner identity and investment in L2 learning interact with opportunities and contexts of language use and may influence the development of communicative competence in the L2. Peirce's treatment of Martina enabled her to depict the L2 learner in face-to-face interaction, not as a source of linguistic data upon which to perform an error analysis, but as a person with a distinct social and cultural identity.

**The L2 Learner As A Complex Social Being**

McKay and Wong (1996) conducted an ethnography on four adolescent Chinese-speaking ESL students whose families have recently immigrated to the United States. The purpose of their study was to "examine interconnections of discourse and power in the language learning setting" and to focus on these four students "who lack proficiency in the dominant language and thus must simultaneously acquire it and negotiate their identities in light of new social complexities" (p. 578). Employing Peirce's concept of investment, their study represents a response to Peirce's (1995) call that SLA theory develop "a concept of the language learner as having a complex social identity that must be understood with reference to large and frequently inequitable social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day social interactions" (p. 13).

McKay and Wong's (1996) study can be characterized as falling within the educational tradition of critical ethnography of schooling that aims to highlight how mainstream schooling practices, discourses, and structures conspire to subdue the natural learning tendencies of minority students. They showed how the various discourses of power surrounding the students at school prompt them to follow a variety of coping strategies (e.g., resistance, accommodation, transfer of prior literacy experience, code
switching) that have a direct influence on their subsequent success or failure in learning English as a second language. They stated,

We attempt to identify some of the multiple discourses in which the focal students were socially situated and to track the way they negotiated multiple, dynamic, and often contradictory identities. We also relate their development of various English skills to the coping strategies they adopted while positioned by relations of power (p. 580).

McKay and Wong showed how mainstream discourse helped shape the investment each student had toward learning English. Following Peirce (1995), McKay and Wong (1996) established a link between investment in learning the target language and the students’ changing identities in response to mainstream discourses of power. But in addition to the constraints imposed by the discourses of power, they focused on the limits imposed by the ESL school context on the degree of linguistic achievement attainable by the 4 Chinese adolescent learners.

Another theme running through the article is that mainstream ESL educators view the students’ knowledge of the native language as essentially a negative influence. As McKay and Wong (1996) put it, “A common image of the immigrant learner paints native language and target language as mutually antagonistic; in anti-immigrant discourse, someone using the native language is accused of not being committed to learning English” (p. 601). Yet the common identity these learners cling to is “being Chinese” (p. 589). A shared Chinese identity became the basis for classroom solidarity when the students felt vulnerable. Collectively, the four Chinese students relied on their L1 literacy skills in trying to learn how to write in the L2. For example, “Brad Wong attempted a range of strategies, including guessing, transfer from native language literacy, and accommodation”
Jessica Ho switched to Chinese now and then as a coping strategy. Contrary to the teacher's expectations, Jeremy Tang, who maintained his written Chinese, also progressed well in English.

The notion of the L2 learner as a “complex social being” whose language performance is closely linked to his/her sense of social identity requires that the analysis of the linguistic development of L2 learners be fully integrated with descriptions of their actual performance in everyday activities as well as their perspectives on these activities. Both the Peirce (1995) and McKay and Wong (1996) studies were guided by the fundamental ethnographic principles of “participant observation” and “emic” descriptions of the learners and their activities; that is, they attempted to capture the perspectives of the participants being studied. McKay and Wong (1996) have documented in impressive detail the notion that L2 learners are extremely complex social beings with a multitude of fluctuating, at times conflicting, needs and desires. According to McKay and Wong (1996), these needs and desires are not to be taken as simply distractions from the proper task of language learning. Rather, they must be regarded as “constituting the very fabric of students’ lives and as determining their investment in learning the target language” (p. 603). In both studies, the researchers demonstrated how the language use patterns followed by their subjects were changing according to context. It is through their “autonomy” that L2 learners produce and manage a sense of identity that is actively adapted to the everyday settings in which they find themselves. Peirce (1995) stated that when learners speak, “they are constantly organizing and re-organizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (p. 17).
Both studies assign a far more significant role to culture and its interrelatedness with language than is typically found in cognitively-oriented discourse transfer studies. This is achieved at an expense, however. Although ethnographic research continues to expand the SLA researcher's view of discourse, ethnographic studies of second language learners can benefit by attending more to the analysis of learner language. That is probably the reason behind Peirce's (1995) advice for language-oriented ethnographers to develop both the linguistic skills necessary to analyze learner language and the ethnographic skills to show how the learner's performance is influenced by the sociocultural contexts in which it is produced. The analysis conducted by McKay and Wong (1996), for example, attempted to focus on both linguistic and cultural categories. However, they assigned a far more significant role to the culture of schooling and its interrelatedness with second language development than to the close analysis of learner language. They reached the same position held by Breen (1996) that the place of the social context of language learning as a guiding force in second language learning is rarely considered by mainstream SLA research. McKay and Wong's ethnography provided new and detailed evidence on the role of social context in shaping the identities of the Chinese learners that impacted their learning experiences. In their interpretation of the data, the social context was responsible for creating multiple discourses that led the Chinese learners to cope by adopting multiple identities for each situation. McKay and Wong (1996) managed through their study to employ the ethnographic concern with cultural and social context in an extremely relevant way to the concerns of second language teachers.
Emic Interpretations of Language Socialization

In the sociocultural perspective, discourse transfer is viewed as the process through which the L2 learner or the non-mainstream native-speaking child, uses the tacit social, linguistic, and cultural knowledge of the home language in trying to achieve communicative goals in the L2. Since language use cannot be isolated from its social context, discourse transfer is a natural outcome of the learner’s use of the L2. This process takes place despite the L2 learner’s partial knowledge of the “appropriate” rules of using the L2 in social context. Discourse transfer is thus considered to be a social as well as a cognitive process in which the learner’s knowledge of the L1 is a foundation from which he/she proceeds to increase his/her knowledge of the L2.

The topic of the transfer of the discourse practices of the home community has been the subject of research of a number of ethnographic studies. Heath’s (1983) study of three communities in the southern U.S. has been one of the most influential in demonstrating how the discourse practices of the home community can affect children’s success in school. These home-based discourse patterns are often incongruent with the mainstream sequences of discourse patterns required by the school, such as the test question format so typical of classroom interaction. Socioculturally-oriented proposals for improving the teaching of bilingual and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students focus on a variety of teaching efforts which build on the learner’s L1-based discourse practices and L1 literacy skills. Heath’s findings have been so influential in the introduction of teacher training courses that convey the culturally distinct discourse patterns of non-mainstream communities with respect to classroom expectations. Courses that provide
such information attempt to elicit from prospective teachers responses with innovative and culturally responsive methodological solutions.

The purpose of Poole’s (1992) study was to increase understanding of the teacher role as culturally constrained and motivated, as well as demonstrate the role of cultural factors in second language classroom interaction. Poole (1992) conducted an ethnography on language socialization in the L2 classroom. She adopted Heath’s framework on the incongruity between the discourse practices of non-mainstream students and the patterns of interaction found in mainstream classrooms. Poole (1992) argued that since the preferred patterns of interaction found in any language are culturally motivated, then every culture develops its own distinctive criteria and expectations of these patterns. She conducted her study, consequently, to examine “the kinds of cultural messages a second language teacher displays through classroom interaction” (p. 593).

The language socialization perspective of Poole’s (1992) study viewed teacher talk as part of the context of cultural motivations and constraints. Among the findings of the study, the analysis of classroom interaction revealed that the teacher opens the class by saying:

Well-we (..)-I have some pictures here.(..) This is a story. (..) But (..) As you see they’re not in the right order. Ok? (We have) six students and six pictures. (..) (p. 605)

Starting with the pronoun “I, “ the teacher initiated a self-repair addressing the class as a cohort. However, she closed the class by complimenting the students on their achievement as if they have done the task all by themselves. She addressed the students by saying:
GOOD WORK, YOU GUYS! That’s hard!
You - You did a good job. I’m impressed. (p. 605)

In her interpretation of the cultural information embedded in the above utterances, Poole suggested that this activity represents a typically white middle-class accommodation context, in that, on the one hand, students are asked to participate in the activity by using the first person plural markers we, let’s, and our. In the closing sequence, however, these markers are absent, as the teacher has seemingly shifted her point of view. Here students were individually recognized and the pronouns were consistently in the second person.

Poole argued that the pattern used by the teacher constitutes a linguistic and cultural means of “scaffolding” which represents the teacher’s interactional effort to render the students capable of completing a task beyond their levels of competence (Brunner, 1975; Cazden, 1988). That is the “we” in the opening sequence seems to announce that teacher and students will accomplish the task together. Similarly, its absence in the closing indicates that the students were viewed as having accomplished the task by themselves. In other words, the shift in the use of the first person plural pronoun to the second person singular pronoun can be interpreted as a display of the teacher’s cultural beliefs regarding task accomplishment. Thus, Poole’s (1992) conceptualization of teacher talk as a cultural symbol indicates her view that some of the social messages that are interactionally conveyed in the L2 classroom are embedded in the cultural background of the teacher. Furthermore, the analysis suggested that these cultural aspects of interaction affect the teaching and learning processes because they are the primary vehicles through which message content is conveyed.
In conclusion, the sociocultural approach depicts the L2 learner not simply as a source of linguistic data upon which the SLA researcher performs an “error analysis” but as a person who has a distinct social and cultural identity. Equally important, unlike the SLA negative outlook on the role of the learner’s L1 in L2 learning and use, the sociocultural perspective views the L1 as a foundation from which the learner can both develop his/her knowledge of the L2 as well as use the L2 for social interaction. In this process, the L2 learner may assert himself/herself as a complex social being, and/or manifest a sense of social identity, and/or follow the patterns of L1 discourse in L2 contexts.

III. Implications

The review reveals that the two theoretical perspectives on discourse transfer held different definitions of what counts as discourse. Discourse transfer studies within the SLA tradition adopted the text linguists’ definition of discourse as language organization, while language-oriented ethnographic studies viewed discourse from a more ecological perspective as social interaction. The mainstream SLA conceptions of discourse transfer phenomena exerted tremendous pressure among language learning specialists to consider the sources of discourse transfer problems to be chiefly cognitive-organizational thus neglecting the sociocultural dimensions of discourse that, after all, give substance and provide the content of L2 learners’ talk in face-to-face interactions with native speakers of the target language. A balanced research strategy for analyzing discourse transfer means combining the two conceptions of discourse.
Attempts to expand the view of what counts as discourse in the L2 learner’s speech have brought a shift in focus in SLA studies from phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features to a more sociocultural perspective, including discourse features and pragmatics and the learner’s “socialization through language and socialization to use language” (Ochs, 1986, p. 2). As Heath (1986) argues, “all language learning is cultural learning” or “learning that enables a member of the family and community to behave appropriately within that group” (pp. 145-146), and Wong-Fillmore (1989) emphasizes that it is “in the presence of social bounds ensuring ongoing relationships that language development progresses” (p. 325). In spite of these developments and the contributions made by Peirce (1995), and McKay and Wong (1996) that were brought into the fruitful debate between linguistically-oriented and ethnographically-oriented views on discourse, particularly McKay and Wong’s (1996) expansion of the concept of identity to include ESL Chinese learners, the field is still wide open, needing more investigation and documentation until a comprehensive theory is reached that takes into account an integration of both views to the role of discourse transfer in language learning and use.

With the review in mind and during the process of data collection, the researcher’s definition of what counts as discourse transfer was expanded to include both of the theoretical perspectives in the following manner. If we see discourse broadly as both the ways in which we structure knowledge, and engage in social practices (Foucault, 1984; Fairclough, 1992, Schiffrin, 1994), we can view the interactions between the Chinese ESL learners and their native-speaking interlocutors as a very particular arena in which discourse transfer evidence in the 4 learners’ speech can be further specified into two
major categories: (a) discourse transfer of language organization, and (b) discourse transfer of social interaction. The L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants in interaction was consequently analyzed for L1 influence according to both the social and organizational dimensions of discourse. The present study analyzed discourse transfer by first looking at the structure of L2 learners’ utterances to see how it was organized, and how a learner developed themes and made points in conversation with native-speaking interlocutors. The second cycle of analysis started to observe the patterns of language use in social interaction and to refer them back to L1 transfer, identifying for example, the Chinese students’ transfer of face rituals, or how second language use reveals the Chinese students’ sense of social identity. The following four categories of discourse transfer represented the foundation upon which the analysis of the phenomenon depended in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech, namely the organizational elements of discourse in terms of ordering propositional information and the use of metadiscourse strategies for the purpose of connecting individual sentences (utterances), combined with the framework of social interaction as general content and organizing principle (not merely as a sociolinguistic concern) which included manifestations of social identity and the role of cultural beliefs in shaping the Chinese participants’ world view. The main components of the category system of discourse transfer were deduced from the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech as consisting of (a) organizing propositional information, (b) overusing metadiscourse strategies, (c) manifesting social identity, and (d) performing rituals of face.

It is rarely possible for an ethnographer to lay out a specific plan of work before entry into the field. The work the ethnographer can accomplish will depend on numerous
factors that make themselves known only within the process of conducting the research.
The researcher followed a "research-then-theory" strategy (Long, 1985) to be able to
account for all sorts of data that may not fit neatly into purely linguistic or cognitive
categories of discourse and transfer analysis. This strategy netted a larger share of
analyzable data than the normal cognitive-linguistic variety. To balance the analysis of
data the two central concepts of "language organization" and "social interaction" were
employed to extend the scope of analysis of what counts as discourse transfer. The social
and organizational dimensions of discourse transfer are depicted schematically in Figure
2.1 which shows how manifestations of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants'
speech were assigned to these two distinct levels of discourse. The two discourse units of
analysis may be described in more detail as follows:
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Figure 2.1: A Conceptual Framework for Discourse Transfer Analysis
(a) Discourse Transfer of Language Organization

According to the first definition of discourse, using the L2 for communication entails using a set of “discourse plans” which learners can use to structure their arguments and present their points in a coherent manner. These discourse plans can best be thought of as cognitive schemata which may consist simply of fixed routines for performing a variety of discourse functions such as persuasion, argument, comment, and so on. What the analysis is going to be concerned with, however, are the L1 regularities found in learner’s speech regardless of the specific communicative intention that leads the learner to employ these plans in a particular interaction.

The mental representations of language organization that can be transferred to L2 speech include both propositional information and metadisourse strategies. The L2 learner’s presentation of ideas, facts, and concepts encompasses the propositional aspect of language organization. The analysis, therefore, attended to the ways in which the Chinese learners organized their ideas in L2 spoken performance. Propositional information can be distinguished from metadisourse strategies. The term metadisourse was used to refer to the linguistic markers in the learners’ L2 speech that do not add to the propositional information but help to connect the sentences and utterances of the 4 Chinese participants. Metadisourse analysis was used to show how the parts of a learner’s speech were related, and how the development of arguments was organized. In this way, analysis of metadisourse and propositional information can help the researcher interpret and evaluate the learner’s discourse transfer of language organization in his/her L2 utterances.
(b) Discourse Transfer of Social Interaction

Discourse organization focuses on how the Chinese learners’ need to communicate in the L2 involves following a set of mental representations that take the form of “discourse plans” which learners use to convey and receive meanings in their L2 speech. For the more interactive skills of communication that take place during social interaction, however, analysis of the L2 learner’s plans needs to be more flexible and responsive to the interactive events of which he/she is a participant. These discourse plans may be more sensitive to the learner’s awareness of the immediate social setting in which the interaction is conducted. Austin (1975) promoted the notion that language can be employed in a variety of ways to express the same social functions, and that a single speech act can be employed to express multiple social/pragmatic functions of language with variable illocutionary force. The analysis of social interaction was focused not only on the order and organization of the learner’s language but also on the communicative acts they were performing. Communication is highly social in nature. Data analysis should focus on the categories of social interaction that Chinese learners transferred to their interactions in the L2 social context. These categories should be organized around the ways the Chinese participants manifested their sense of social identity during their interactions as well as the ways in which their considerations of face have led to the transfer of Chinese rituals of face. The analysis of the patterns of language use was useful in uncovering the various social and cultural categories that the 4 Chinese speakers transferred to the interactive events in which they participated.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to conduct an ethnography on discourse transfer phenomena as produced by the 4 Chinese ESL participants. The study aimed to ethnographically describe the ways in which the 4 Chinese participants’ prior discourse competence in Chinese as a first language occurred in the context of casual interaction with native speakers of English. This chapter contains a report on the research methodology that was followed in investigating discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese students’ L2 speech. It consists of five sections: (a) the rationale and the prior ethnography are the basis for the study, (b) the pre-data collection stage which identifies the sites and respondents, access and entry, and the researcher’s role, (c) the data collection methods, (d) the data analysis methods, and (e) the steps taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings.

Rationale

SLA studies of discourse transfer have routinely identified the L2 learner’s transfer of L1 sociocultural norms and discourse conventions as significant factors that lead to miscommunication between L2 learners and native speakers of the target language. Takahashi (1996), for example, stated that “intercultural miscommunication is often
caused by learners’ falling back on their L1 sociocultural norms and conventions in realizing speech acts in a target language” (p. 189). These studies, however, were primarily focused on language *per se* with little recognition given to the social meanings and cultural rules of language use that are transferred when the second language is deployed in face-to-face interactions. As McKay and Wong (1996) stated, “For many years, error analysis and interlanguage analysis dominated this [SLA] research, encouraging a focus on the second language as a formal code, referenced to native-speaker proficiency as the norm.” (pp. 577-578). By focusing on differences in language *per se*, SLA researchers believed that differences between the L2 learners’ first language and the standard English of adult native speakers were at the heart of the problem. Rutherford (1983), for example, concluded that differences in language typology between the L1 and the L2 placed strong constraints on the rate of acquisition; that is, the speed with which subjects from different language backgrounds (i.e., Chinese, Korean, Japanese) were able to acquire English as a second language. As a consequence, SLA researchers focused almost exclusively on differences in language *per se*. Studies on contrastive discourse analysis (e.g., Connor, 1996) concurred with SLA researchers that miscommunication problems between L2 learners and native speakers were caused by large differences in discourse systems that had their bases in differences between languages. These researchers, however, missed the point: It is not only the degree of difference between languages *per se* that counts. What also seems to count is the sociocultural meanings of language differences. So, both language and interaction are important variables to investigate.
One reason for questioning the emphasis on differences in language and the adoption of error analysis as the method of choice among SLA researchers was that the "etic" perspective of the English native-speaking researcher became the standard against which to measure the L2 learners' success or failure in realizing different speech acts in English as a second language. Such research emphasizes the learners' need to master and adjust him/herself to the rules of discourse in the target language. As a consequence, researchers working on discourse transfer have come to view the role of the first language as an "interference" on the learning of a second language. Thus, in SLA, the patterns of the learner's first language were believed to get in the way of learning the patterns of the L2 (Lado, 1957). This has also been referred to as "negative transfer."

A second reason for questioning the narrow focus on language per se was the researcher's difficulty in determining that transfer has in fact taken place just by looking at the surface level of L2 data. What constitutes prior linguistic knowledge can be controversial. Early studies of transfer took a narrow view, considering language transfer as the physical carryover of L1 "surface" forms to an L2 context, generally with lexical or morphological modifications. SLA researchers (e.g., Corder, 1992; Schacter, 1992) have recognized, however, the fact that there was more to L1 influence than overt manifestations of L1 forms. Schacter (1992), for example, defined language transfer in much broader terms to include not only surface linguistic items but also all prior linguistic knowledge including the "imperfect" knowledge a learner may have of the L2. There is a growing consensus in various SLA circles that for data analysis to be more sophisticated, it needs to go beyond surface-level linguistic manifestations of language transfer to "deep"
level analysis which in turn could provide a better understanding of the influence of L1 in the second language acquisition process. More recently, researchers adopting a generative perspective on SLA have begun to question the "surface-level" method of error analysis and to look for more sophisticated approaches to analyze the deep level role of the first language in second language acquisition. Flynn (1998), for example, stated,

Much traditional L2 research was focused on surface-structure contrasts between the first language (L1) and the L2. Although such work is important, it often missed or failed to capture deeper generalizations about L2 learning needed for the development of unified theories of language acquisition. Surface-structure contrasts are often linguistic epiphenomena and can mask deeper similarities and differences between and among languages. Investigating deeper levels of language organization afforded by new and emerging developments in theoretical linguistics could lead to new insights about L2 acquisition, raise new questions, and answer some traditionally posed ones. (p. xii)

In conclusion, the combination of using error analysis and the definition of transfer as the appearance of L1 knowledge on the "surface" level of L2 performance have contributed to the overemphasis on a language per se approach to data analysis thus preventing the field of SLA from generating deeper insights about discourse transfer phenomena.

Sociolinguists have provided some clues to the problem. Canale and Swain (1980), Celce-Murcia and Dornyei (1995), and Olshtain (1993) have noted that the difficulties experienced by L2 learners in communicating with native speakers of English were caused not only by differences in languages per se, but also by non-language factors including the social meanings and the cultural rules of language use. According to the sociolinguistic view of language acquisition, a person is considered a competent speaker in a speech community if he or she knows both the language (i.e., vocabulary, grammar and phonology), and the cultural rules of language use (i.e., pragmatics). These include the
knowledge of when to speak (i.e., speech situations), which speech event is appropriate (e.g., conversation, lecture, or debate), which communicative code (i.e., verbal or non-verbal) and what style (e.g., confrontation or solidarity). To become a competent speaker of his or her first language, a child, during language socialization, must learn both the language and the cultural rules of using the language of its speech community. In the case of L2 learners interacting with native speakers, a problem might lie partly in miscommunication because L2 learners differ from their native-speaking interlocutors in their knowledge of the social meanings and cultural rules of using English as a second language. These sociolinguists remind us that L2 learners and native speakers learn different linguistic rules of their respective language (e.g., grammar, phonology and vocabulary) as well as different cultural rules (e.g., pragmatic rules known and used routinely by other native speakers) for using their native language in their respective speech communities.

Sociolinguists have convincingly argued that the communication difficulties of L2 learners lie partly in the differences in social meanings and cultural rules of language use between the native and the second language. But we need to identify the categories which determine the social meanings and cultural rules of language use which in turn influence the L2 learners’ discourse styles, and this calls for research beyond error analysis. The present study was intended to contribute to this direction of research. Because the native language and culture permeate the learner’s developing knowledge of the second language (Ellis, 1990; Selinker, 1992), it seems important for researchers studying discourse transfer to follow methods in their studies that can reveal the learner’s “emic” perspective.
The present study employed multiple methods of data analysis within an ethnographic design because it was motivated by the need to understand the phenomena of discourse transfer from the perspective of the Chinese language learner. Discourse analysis examined the social meanings and cultural rules of language use that undergird the Chinese students' discourse styles in English. Transfer analysis documented not only the concrete "surface-level" manifestations but also the deep-level evidence of what they are likely to have transferred from their native language to ESL contexts. These methods had important consequences in determining the scope of data analysis. Each time an isolated piece of language was considered for transfer analysis, discourse analysis categorized it as part of a larger integrated analytical framework of language organization and social interaction. Within the language-oriented ethnographic design of the study, the interpretation of data began with observations about the isolated piece of language, but through the use of qualitative and quantitative analysis eventually incorporated the data within a more holistic system that included the social, linguistic, and cultural categories of discourse transfer.

The upcoming sections of this chapter are devoted to a more detailed discussion of how transfer analysis, discourse analysis, the category system, and the analytical frameworks were employed by the researcher to provide a "thick description" and explication of the phenomena of discourse transfer among the 4 Chinese participants. The following discussion is focused on the pre-data collection stage which included the prior ethnography, sites and respondents, access and entry, and the researcher’s role.
Prior Ethnography

Prior to this study, an ethnography was conducted in the academic year 1995-1996 on a group of 9 Mainland Chinese ESL learners during their interactions with American students. The purpose of the prior ethnography was to investigate the ways in which the L1 influenced their “communicative competence” in the L2 (Hymes, 1972). The Chinese participants came through a scholarship program that allowed them to stay for nine months in the United States. In order to improve their English speaking and listening comprehension skills, their ESL teacher arranged for them to meet socially with native-speaking volunteers once a week. The researcher asked for the ESL teacher’s permission to record these interactions. Data collection methods included observations, interviews, written journal entries, and audio-tapings. Data analysis revealed that the Chinese participants’ L2 was influenced by their L1 in varying degrees. They transferred Chinese ways of communication to the L2 academic context. Moreover, they employed discourse patterns in the L2 that resembled the ways in which these same patterns were routinely used in Chinese as an L1. In conclusion, the prior ethnography was a major influence on the researcher which subsequently led to the dissertation topic. Table 3.1 indicates the steps taken by the researcher in all stages of the research including the prior ethnography.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in Research Activity</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwork (In the field)</td>
<td>Desk-work (Off the field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Prior ethnography</td>
<td>Data analysis reveals the focus of the present study (discourse transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaining access</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Human Subjects Review</td>
<td>Preparation and distribution of participation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site selection &amp; entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present ethnography starts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Audiotape-recording of sessions and observational fieldnotes start</td>
<td>Coordination of interactional sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Management of interactional sessions</td>
<td>Transcription of recorded sessions begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Conducting ethnographic interviews</td>
<td>Analyzing transcripts of recorded sessions through the combination of transfer and discourse analysis - Searching for L1 influence in common patterns of language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Audio-recording of sessions completed Final interviews conducted</td>
<td>Transcription completed Coding and assigning categories continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Peer debriefer independently assigns utterances to categories</td>
<td>Final refinement of the category system by the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Exit the field</td>
<td>Qualitative &amp; quantitative data analysis conducted Graphic data displays &amp; frequency counts Description, analysis, &amp; interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Research Activities in the Ethnographic Design of the Study
Sites and Respondents

The present study chose as its site an ESL program at a Midwestern American university that served the language needs of prospective international students who were admitted to enroll in different academic departments at the same university. As a supplement to classroom formal teaching, the ESL program arranged for its students weekly contacts with English native speakers who volunteered to engage in informal conversations with the ESL students outside the classroom. The researcher was looking for a group of Taiwanese ESL learners and a group of English native speakers to participate in the study. Four Taiwanese ESL students and three English native speakers agreed to participate in the study. The four Chinese participants who completed the study were 2 males and 2 females (see Table 3.2). The 4 Chinese students were placed at different proficiency levels (i.e., beginning, low-intermediate, high-intermediate, and advanced) in the ESL program after taking an institutionally organized placement test at the beginning of their enrollment. The 3 English native speakers included a male graduate student, a female graduate student, and a retired female journalist. The participants met in 90-minute interactional sessions held every week between one English and one Chinese speaker. Those present at each meeting consisted of one English native speaker, one Chinese speaker, and the researcher as a non-participant observer. The researcher placed a running tape recorder between the two participants. The participants talked about any topics that came to their minds that day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Placement Level</th>
<th>Academic Background</th>
<th>Prospective Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peng</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>B.A. in Economics</td>
<td>M.A. &amp; Ph.D. in Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate Low</td>
<td>Junior in Finance</td>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>B.A. in Music</td>
<td>M.A. &amp; D.M.A. in Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Biographical/Academic Background Data on the 4 Chinese Participants

Access and Entry

Access to the ESL Program was gained with the help of the ESL instructor who agreed to participate in the prior ethnography project. Entry was established by contacting the Director of the ESL program by telephone to explain the purpose of the study. At an appointment with the program Director, the researcher presented a formal letter that articulated the purpose of the study and the data collection methods. The Director then advised the researcher to provide a formal participation letter to all the ESL teachers in the ESL Program. The participation letters asked the ESL teachers to distribute the participation letters among their Taiwanese students. Attached to the participation letters were consent forms which the ESL teachers distributed to all the Taiwanese ESL students enrolled in their classes. The Taiwanese students who agreed to participate in the study were instructed by their teachers to return the participation consent
forms to the ESL Director's office. Within ten days of distributing the forms, the secretary at the ESL program contacted the researcher and informed her that the completed forms were available at her desk. That was the first time the researcher saw the participants' names. Four out of 6 Chinese participants completed the study. The researcher took the names of the Chinese participants and contacted them by phone to introduce herself and respond to any questions they might have about the study. Letters relating to matters of access and entry can be found in Appendices A, B, C, D, and E.

**Researcher Role**

As the main research instrument of the study, the researcher generated and refined the system of codes and categories that described discourse transfer phenomena in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants. A system of codes and categories is a researcher's descriptive conceptualization of the phenomena that starts from the "raw data." The raw data in the study were the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants that was produced as a result of their interactions with the 3 English native speakers. Out of this raw data, the researcher focused her attention on the L1 patterns produced by the participants in the L2 speech they used to reach their communicative goals in the L2 context. These commonalities among the participants were tentatively identified as patterns of L1 influence that characterized the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants. The process of building a category system out of raw data consisted of two stages: (a) an initial provisional classification derived from the data of the interactions, and (b) continued revision of the categories until a stage of "redundancy" was reached in which further data would not yield new categories to the already established system (Kasper, 1998).
A first reading of the transcribed sets of data focused on evidence of mother tongue influence on the learners' L2 speech. These insights began to emerge after a second run through the data during which the audiotape was running. The researcher started generating some more insights and some casual observations about mother tongue influence in the data. After a third reading of the transcribed data, the researcher began to identify instances of L1 influence in the learners' utterances. The next steps were to formulate a tentative set of codes and categories and to cluster them into major and subcategories. The researcher underlined examples of each category on the transcribed interactions so that the utterances of the participants could be employed in the analysis. The tentative category system was useful for subsequent analysis of the remaining data sets because any new utterances were assigned to a corresponding category or subcategory of discourse transfer. These repeated passes through the transcripts, and ongoing revisions of existing categories eventually led to the emergence of two analytical frameworks organized around the system of categories of discourse transfer. In sum, the researcher generated and refined the system of codes and categories of the phenomenon of discourse transfer. The refined system described how the 4 Chinese participants organized their arguments and socially interacted with the English native-speaking participants.

Data analysis meant both what the researcher was attempting to describe and how the researcher interpreted it. Because the researcher was the main research instrument, there was a threat of researcher's bias in reaching conclusions about L1 influence. One source of bias was the potential that the researcher would impose her own assumptions on the patterns of language use in the data. In other words, the data analysis can be a
reflection of the researcher's own bias of what it means for a Chinese ESL student to interact with English native speakers. The researcher, therefore, followed two steps to satisfy the implicit challenge of researcher's bias to the validity of the findings. First, a conscious effort was made by the researcher to include primary data in the form of transcribed interactions in the final analysis, not only to give readers an idea of what the data were like but to give access to the data themselves. Accordingly, thick description meant that the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 English native speakers were given a forum for displaying their own patterns of language use to the extent possible (a total of 170 displays of transcribed interactions in the body of the dissertation). In striking the delicate balance between researcher's interpretation and providing extensive primary data, the researcher chose to let the participants speak for themselves. The researcher tried to capture the expressed thoughts of the participants rather than relying exclusively on what the researcher has observed and interpreted. Because the data sources were limited (only 4 Chinese participants), the researcher adopted Lincoln and Guba's (1985) notion of the transferability of findings in which readers can make their own judgements about the applicability of the data to their own situations. Second, triangulation of transfer evidence was adopted in the study to ensure the trustworthiness of findings (James, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Wolcott, 1994). The triangulation served to guard against researcher's bias in identifying transfer cases in the 4 Chinese learners' L2 speech. Triangulation was included in the data analysis to make sure that at least two Chinese participants used the same pattern before including it as part of the final system of codes and categories.
Data Collection Methods

Data collection was divided into two stages in the research design. The initial stage of data collection was used to answer any remaining questions about the study from the participants and to eliminate any obstacles (e.g., transportation) that may prevent them from attending the predesignated interactional sessions at the times and places specified by the researcher. During the initial stage, the researcher submitted letters of “informed consent” to the 4 Chinese and the 3 English native-speaking participants. It was crucial that the researcher conduct her study according to the guidelines established by the Human Subjects Review Committee of the site university.

The Initial Stage

The initial stage helped to prepare the participants for the observation sessions, which were audiotape recorded. During the initial stage, the researcher offered further information about the study that the formal elicitation letter did not include, described the recording equipment, took down the times, dates of the sessions, and the phone numbers of every participant. The researcher also introduced the peer-debriefer who occasionally assisted in the transportation to and from the locations of the sessions. The researcher worked hard to keep the channels of communication informal and cordial between her and her participants. The effects of being observed were most apparent in the first taping sessions. There were signs of mild excitement, self-consciousness, wariness of the microphone. After one or two sessions, the recording equipment seemed to recede in the background and the conversations were the centerpiece.
According to the guidelines of the Human Subjects Review Committee, the participants signed a participation request form attached to the solicitation letter (see Appendix C & D). The letter contained information about the study and provisions for protecting the rights of privacy and confidentiality of the participants. The participation request form and the solicitation letter were intended to reassure that the participants would not be abused, and they clearly stated that they could stop participating in the study if they elected to do so without any need to explain their reasons. Moreover, the researcher repeatedly indicated to the participants that there were no undue pressures on them to continue to be members in the study while it was being conducted.

The Second Stage

The initial stage was followed by a succession of sessions of two types: audio-taped interactional sessions and ethnographic interviews with the participants. The taping sessions in which the Chinese learners and the native speakers agreed to interact with each other took place at school whenever possible or in the researcher’s home when a classroom session could not be arranged. Each of the Chinese students was scheduled to have an English native-speaking partner who was present for at least one of the taping sessions. The data from the interactional sessions consisted of successive, one and half hour tape-recorded observations spaced at intervals of about one to two weeks, beginning in July, 1996 and continuing for about nine months until March, 1997. The taping sessions resulted in 20 hours of recording that were made at school, and approximately 10 hours at the researcher’s home.
Each session consisted of ninety minutes of continuous recording. The first five to ten minutes were devoted to introductions and instructions on how to operate the recorder. At the end of this initial period, the researcher recorded whatever the participants said to each other for about ninety minutes. The researcher attempted to hold this order constant across all observational sessions. The division of each observational session into an “introduction” period and an interaction period was intended to balance two conflicting goals: (a) to achieve consistency of the conditions under which discourse transfer behavior occurred in the data sets; (b) to ensure some degree of comparability across learners.

Interviews

Interviews were adopted in this study because they complement observation in that they get at different aspects of thought and action from the participants. Bogdan and Bilken (1991) added that the interview is used to gather descriptive data in the participants’ own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how participants explain their experiences. The purposes of including interviews in this study included: (a) seeking the 4 Chinese participants’ input on L1 influence in their spoken English performance, and (b) seeking the Chinese and English participants’ perspectives and reactions to the occurrence of discourse transfer categories in the interactional sessions in which they have participated. Audiotape-recorded interviews with all the participants constituted an important source of data. Extensive interviewing of individuals can, however, pose an obvious threat to their privacy. The problem was exacerbated by the use of audio-recording and transcription equipment which resulted in highly detailed and
permanent records of speech. During the initial interviews, the researcher followed a recall format in which the participants recall from listening to the tape and reading the transcripts. After the initial interviews, the standardized format of recall was substituted with a less threatening format. Having actually used the stimulated recall format with two of the participants, the researcher was alarmed by the response from the two Chinese participants who were yet to be interviewed. It seemed that those participants who went through this type of interview felt threatened, partially because they saw their own words in print and partially because they heard their spoken English on audio-cassettes. The researcher reflected on the recall format and decided to substitute it with a less structured ethnographic interview (Spradley, 1979). The researcher was able to learn from this experience that even the best planned research designs need to have enough flexibility in them to adjust to the social and psychological demands of specific research techniques.

In sum, data collection consisted of a series of audiotaped sessions of casual interactions between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 English speakers during the time that they learned ESL in a language institute. Subsequent to the participants' agreement to be part of the study, the initial contacts and visits comprised the initial stage of data collection in which the researcher got better acquainted with the participants. The initial stage was followed by a succession of sessions of two types: audio-taped interactional sessions and ethnographic interviews with the participants. The researcher's reflections on methodology gave her the flexibility to alternate between different interviewing techniques that were agreeable to her participants without compromising the data collection efforts. The corpus of data gathered in the course of the study consisted of three sets: (a) recorded
audiotapes of interactional sessions between the 4 Chinese learners and the English native speakers (approximately 30 hours), (b) recorded audiotapes of ethnographic interviews conducted by the researcher with each subject (approximately 7 hours), and (c) the researcher's own written fieldnotes, observations, and reflections on data sets (a) and (b).

Transcripts

Data transformation processes took two forms including the transcripts and the data analysis. In the case of transcripts, data transformation entailed converting spoken language data from an audiotape to a written dialogue on paper. A transcript is a painstaking and time-consuming written record of the spoken interactions between the 4 Chinese learners and the English native speakers. Preserved in the transcript were the instances of discourse transfer information that were categorized and counted for the analysis. Anyone who has talked to or worked with ESL learners knows that they can present a challenge to the listener. A native speaker who has never had contact with ESL learners is likely to have a particularly hard time figuring out a second language learner's speech. Researchers and teachers in ESL stand a much better chance of understanding a second language learner's words, even though they may not succeed in every instance. In view of these considerations, the interactional sessions between the Chinese learners and the English native speakers were transcribed by the researcher. A lengthy, painstaking process of construction and revision was required in order to achieve an accurate, reliable transcript. A Panasonic standard cassette transcriber (Model no. RR-830) was used to expedite the process. The researcher made a transcript after each audiotaped session.
The record of learner speech during the interactional sessions was the most difficult part to transcribe. Also included was a record of what the native speakers said to the learners. Compared with the learners' speech, native speakers were much easier to understand. Still, due to the fact that the researcher herself is a nonnative speaker, some native speaker utterances were too fast or inaudible from the tape. Due to background noise in some sessions, the recording equipment did not capture every word uttered by the participants. With patience and repetition, however, much of the participant's words could be committed to paper. The complete set of audiotape transcripts (total 326 pages) was divided into four files that contain every word that each participant uttered. Each data set consisted of approximately twenty single-space printed pages for a 90-minute session. Scanning each page from top to bottom, one is able to see how the dialogue developed with separate entries for each of the interlocutors. Appendix F provides transcription conventions used in this study.

Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis involved highlighting specific aspects of the data for the purpose of looking for answers to the three research questions of the study. The different manifestations of discourse transfer as produced in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants were identified, isolated, and organized into sets of categories by the researcher. The lengthy data sets were used to analyze the individual differences between the 4 Chinese participants in terms of the quality and quantity of discourse transfer in their L2 speech. Analysis was also conducted to investigate the interrelations between discourse transfer and the interactional contexts in which it was produced.
The data analysis methods employed in this study were designed by the researcher to meet two needs: (a) to richly describe the nature of discourse transfer in interaction, and (b) to systematically report the categories of discourse transfer in the write-up sections through the successive interplay of qualitative and quantitative data analysis procedures. The first concern is by no means unique or idiosyncratic to this ethnographic study. Following Zentella's (1997) argument, Heath (2000) stated, "Linguists still struggle in their thickly textured studies of language use to solve the riddle of the relation between observed language behaviors that come out of the mouth and mental processes that go on in the head" (p. 53). The analysis needed to meet the combined challenges of uncovering the recurring patterns of "observed" language behavior that were followed by the 4 Chinese participants in their L2 speech as well as figuring out the "unseen" or mental processes of language transfer that went on "in their heads." For example, how much of what the 4 Chinese speakers are saying is transferred from the L1? And, how much of it is internalized L2 input? Another focus was on how much any one-time linguistic performance represented a pattern of discourse transfer that was exhibited by the other speakers. To solve the problem of relating the observed behaviors of social interaction to the mental processes of transfer, the researcher employed two data analysis methods: (a) transfer analysis, a method which was specifically developed for second language acquisition studies on language transfer, and (b) discourse analysis, a method that is used by ethnographers who are interested in the study of patterns of language use in various social settings. The second concern of combining quantitative measures and qualitative analysis in the write-up led the researcher to employ the analytical framework that was
developed from the category system to transform discourse transfer data into quantifiable measures such as frequency counts, ratios, and rankings. Transforming qualitative data into reportable write-up sections followed the principles of descriptions, analysis, and interpretation that were promoted by Wolcott (1994). The following paragraphs focus on each of these four components of the data analysis procedures that were employed by the researcher in her search for answers for the research questions of the study.

I. Transfer Analysis

Within the SLA discipline, several calls have been directed to researchers working on transfer studies for methodological rigor in identifying L1 influence on learners' L2 performance (James, 1998; Jarvis, 2000, Kellerman, 1983; Selinker, 1992). In order to ascertain that discourse transfer has unambiguously occurred in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech, the present study adopted a three-pronged approach to the data analysis: (a) identifying and classifying the 4 Chinese students' discourse patterns that have "potential" L1 influence, (b) confirming L1 influence by comparing between the learners' L2 performance and the patterns of the first language, and (c) triangulation of identified discourse transfer patterns by seeking evidence from the data that was produced by the other participants in the interactions. Triangulation of some patterns also involved seeking evidence from the ethnographic interviews and the researcher’s fieldnotes.

For the identification and classification of discourse patterns that may be influenced by the L1, the present study employed elements of James’ (1998) method of "transfer analysis." Transfer analysis is a suitable first step in identifying "potential" cases of transfer in the L2 learner’s interlanguage performance. As James (1998) pointed out,
"Transfer analysis is a procedure for dealing with these IL:TL discrepancies (and the associated errors) that are assumed to be the results of MT transfer or interference" (p. 6). The process is tentative in that discrepancies between learner performance and the target language are treated as manifestations of L1 influence and not as indicators of failure in learning the target language. With no preconceived assumptions about L1 influence, the researcher approached learner data looking for deviant patterns that could not have been learned from the L2 input and treated them as "potential" cases of discourse transfer. This was a suitable first step in the analysis because it netted a considerable amount of learner data that could have been influenced by the L1.

Comparing IL to L1 capitalized on the technical knowledge the researcher has of both Chinese as an L1 and English as an L2. This process involved referring the discourse patterns that were encoded in the L2 back to the original Chinese ways of speaking. James (1998) stated, "When you conduct transfer analysis, you are comparing IL with MT and not MT with TL" (p. 5). Being Chinese herself, the researcher made a deliberate effort at finding equivalent patterns in Chinese that corresponded to the discourse patterns produced by the 4 Chinese learners that were identified as having "potential" L1 influence in the first step of the analysis. When in doubt, the researcher asked the 4 Chinese participants about some patterns that they adopted in their L2 speech to see if they had been influenced by the L1. When the researcher did not find equivalent patterns in the L1 that she or her 4 Chinese participants were aware of, some of the identified patterns originally thought to have L1 influence were eliminated from the list of candidates of discourse transfer.
Triangulation of sources of data from the performance of all 4 participants was employed for ensuring the trustworthiness of the findings concerning the nature of L1 influence on the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech. After confronting a pattern of language use that could be potentially influenced by the L1, and comparing it to the L1, triangulation involved putting the same pattern on hold to see whether the other 3 participants or the same participant employed the same pattern in other interactions. The ethnographic interviews and the researchers’ fieldnotes were treated as supplementary sources of data that provided confirming/disconfirming evidence of the use of some of the patterns included in the final analysis. In order to ensure that the process of triangulation encompassed all areas of data analysis, assignment of learner utterances to specific discourse categories was also conducted independently by a peer debriefer.

II. Discourse Analysis

McKay and Wong (1996) stated, “The term ‘discourse’ has a frustratingly broad range of meanings in contemporary academic writing” (p. 578). One reason for this is that discourse itself has been defined in two different ways: a unit of language that is larger than the sentence, and as the interactive use of language. Where the first definition focuses attention mostly on the regularities that characterize language, the second definition focuses attention mostly on the patterns of social interaction that result from language use. Following the conclusions drawn from the review of literature, the present study combined the two concerns, analyzing how the linguistic regularities found in interaction were constrained not only by the structures and patterns inherent in the language, but also by the patterns of social interaction which frame the production and
interpretation of messages within a linguistic community. The researcher used this dual focus upon both discourse organization and social interaction to describe the ways in which the learners’ knowledge of the L1 may be employed for both the organization of arguments and the achievement of social goals in the L2. Discourse analysis was thus used in combination with “transfer analysis” to investigate the 4 Chinese participants’ discourse transfer of both the regular patterns of the L1 to their L2 speech and the ways in which they transferred the patterns of social interaction of the L1 to the interactional contexts of L2. Thus, the study combined the interactive and social dimensions of language use with the organizational dimensions of discourse.

III. Analytical Frameworks

Analysis started by investigating the linguistic manifestations of L1 discourse knowledge that were found in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. Transfer analysis and discourse analysis provided a preliminary description of the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech in the form of patterns, sentences, phrases, and expressions. Data analysis focused on different aspects of the influence of discourse transfer on the L2 learner’s speech during casual conversations with native speakers of English. A system of codes and categories was built by the researcher using the fundamentals of discourse organization and social interaction to describe the presence of these features of L1 discourse in the learners’ L2 speech. The category system (Table 3.3) was derived and then employed in the data analysis process to analyze discourse transfer and to provide structure on the researchers’ account of the data. Wolcott (1994) recommended adopting an analytical framework during qualitative data analysis because this strategy “imposes structure on the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>Related Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCOURSE TRANSFER OF LANGUAGE ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I. Organizing Propositional Information | — Putting One’s Position at the End  
— Topic-Comment Word Order  
— Invoking a Point from the Past  
— Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point |
| II. Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies | — Conjunction with “And”  
— Disjunction with “But”  
— Rhetorical Questions  
— Free Association  
— Revisiting |
| (a) Connectors | — Overusing “Maybe”  
— Answering with “Maybe” to a Yes/No Question  
— Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question  
— Answering with “Maybe” to a WH Question |
| (b) Qualifiers | — Saying “Yes” When Meaning “No” |
| (c) Miscues | |
| **DISCOURSE TRANSFER OF SOCIAL INTERACTION** | |
| III. Manifesting Social Identity | — Group Conformity  
— Uncritical Acceptance of Authority  
— Dependence  
— Referencing |
| (a) Sense of Community | — Predestination (“Ming”)  
— Fortune & Opportunity (“Yun”)  
— Spiritual Masters |
| (b) Cultural Beliefs | |
| IV. Performing Rituals of Face | — Convergence  
— Deference  
— Avoiding Conflict |
| (a) Respect for Others | — Putting Self Down  
— Refusing A Compliment  
— Turning Down an Invitation to Talk |
| (b) Self-Denial | |

Table 3.3: A Category System of Discourse Transfer
The category system thus served as an analytical framework for the different manifestations of discourse transfer found in the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech during their face-to-face interactions with the English native-speaking participants. Similar patterns of language use were organized into groups and a category name was given for each group (e.g., invoking a point from the past).

Data were entered under two main readings: (a) language organization and (b) social interaction. Because of the large amount of data, the categories of both components reached a stage of redundancy in which further analysis stopped yielding new categories. At this point in the analysis, the analytical framework became the filter through which new data must be counted as manifestations of the phenomena of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. In other words, the analytical framework was used as a reference to determine what counts as valid data and to delimit the range of acceptable units of analysis. This step was crucial for the purpose of transforming the major and related categories into quantifiable data.

A further check was necessary to ensure the consistency with which the utterances were assigned to categories in the analytical framework. A peer debriefer was asked to independently assign the categories right from the transcripts until an acceptable level of agreement was reached by both the debriefer and the researcher. The data were then counted and numbers were assigned for each category for each transcript. When the time came to perform frequency counts or ratios, the task was to count the total number of instances from each transcript that relate to each category within the same subgroup of categories. These frequency counts were then used to derive estimates of the percentage
value for each category and subcategory to identify, for example, how much more likely were specific patterns employed than others. After all of the L1 discourse transfer utterances had been categorized, tables were made of the number of utterances per each category. In addition to frequency of usage, the frequency of distributions (per each category) were depicted in a number of graphs. The value of these tabulations and graphs was to help the reader determine the scope of these categories of L1 discourse in the learners’ L2 speech, so that the reader could receive an accurate estimate of the place of each category within a subgroup of similar categories.

In conclusion, the category system used in the analysis of data performed two main functions: (a) It provided a theoretical filter on the types of data that were counted as manifestations of the phenomena of discourse transfer, and (b) It helped transform the categories into quantifiable measures such as frequencies, ratios, and rankings. The creation of the analytical framework fits well with qualitative work that seeks to identify patterns of language use and their frequencies. The framework also facilitates analysis by various quantitative measures such as frequency of patterns of usage which carry the potential to enhance the analysis of certain aspects of the phenomenon under study.

IV. Transforming Qualitative Data

The tendency to report findings in terms of percentages, however, runs the risk of obscuring important differences in the learners’ interactional experiences. Some of these differences can be attributed to the amount of L2 speech produced during each interaction. What the analysis was trying to offer is a qualitative assessment of the different manifestations of discourse transfer that were found in the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech.
Three procedures for handling evidence in qualitative data were conducted in the analysis: description, analysis, and interpretation (Wolcott, 1994). Answers to the three research questions of the study attempted to achieve a balance between the processes of description, analysis, and interpretation.

Description depends on repeated observations of discourse transfer phenomena in the data of the interactions between the 4 Chinese speakers and their English native-speaking interlocutors. The stress in description was on repeated observations of patterns of discourse transfer that corroborated each other in the 4 Chinese speakers’ L2 speech. The description of these observations served as a means to arrive at a category name for a group of observed patterns that share commonality with each other. For the purpose of demonstrating what was meant by each category, and the frequency with which each category was manifested in the data of the interactions, the first part of each answer included a definition and a frequency count of the category in comparison to the other categories in the same subgroup. Tabulations and frequency counts were offered at the beginning of each section to give the reader a quick glance at the frequency of each category in relation to the other categories. Graphic displays were used to show the frequency with which these categories were employed by the learners in their interactions. These data displays were meant to display which categories get used most frequently, and how different categories are employed by different learners.

As Heath (2000) stated, “The constant interplay of rich descriptive materials from fieldnotes and such simple quantitative steps as frequency counts or ratios helps researchers guard against rushing to select the “perfect” example from their qualitative
data to illustrate a point” (p. 55). In the present study, data analysis combined qualitative analyses of discourse structures and strategies with quantitative analyses that relate each category to a comparable subgroup of categories. Moreover, the graphic displays facilitated analysis by various electronic means, including concordances.

In order to present and describe specific speech events (e.g., miscommunication) that can reveal something significant about discourse transfer, the use of transcript data was incorporated by the researcher as an integral part of the descriptions. To demonstrate further what is meant by each category, the descriptions included examples of each category that were selected from the data of the interactions. In some cases, more than one example was used to cover the meaning of the category. In others, counter examples were given to offer a contrast or comparison point for the purpose of clarification.

Analysis is a matter of coordinating different kinds of information converging on the same category. These data may be taken from different participants, or from different interactions by the same participant. The focus of the analysis task was on establishing relationships, connection, and coherence rather than a mere listing of repeated observations of the same category. The purpose of the analysis was to offer an in-depth understanding of the categories that have been listed during the description process. The process of data analysis was designed to capture the dynamics of interaction that took place between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of English in the study. For example, analysis seeks to inform the reader about each category and how it relates to other categories in the same analytical framework. Because several different types of evidence should be used to support any single claim and in order not to allow the
frequency counts to obscure the interactional contexts in which they were employed, analyses of selected transcripts were used to supplement the quantitative forms of data display. In this way, the reader is enabled to emerge with a coherent reading of the different subgroups of discourse transfer and how they may be related to each other. For example, when the research was focused on the interactional contexts in which discourse transfer took place, analysis was done to determine whether the occurrence of transfer had in any way influenced the flow of communication between the two interlocutors. Discourse analysis focused on interactions where a disruption in the flow of communication had, in fact, taken place. If it was determined that the miscommunication was due to discourse transfer, analysis was then conducted to determined the categories to which the discourse transfer belonged.

It is important to point out, however, that the kinds of relationships that are claimed to exist between the different categories were not found to be causal relationships. While it is possible to establish and clarify relations between the different categories of discourse transfer, it is impossible to directly establish causal relationships in an experimental design. For example, when the analysis shows that there is a relationship between the categories of “overusing metadiscourse strategies” and the categories of “organizing propositional information,” the kind of relationship that is described, while not claimed to be causal, could promote further understanding of discourse transfer in general and the ways in which discourse transfer categories in particular are related to each other.

According to Wolcott (1994), “the term interpretation is well suited to mark a threshold in thinking and writing at which the researcher transcends factual data and
cautious analyses and begins to probe into what is to be made of them” (p. 36).

Interpretation follows the description and analysis sections of each answer. Simply put, interpretation means the researcher’s assessment of what the research is saying. By examining the data from the interactions, the analyst aimed to arrive at an interpretive reading of the processes involved in discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants’ speech during their interactions in the L2 with NSs of the TL. This is done in the form of a general discussion followed by the forming of hypotheses to account for the observed data. The description and analysis sections perform the function of establishing that the observed phenomenon of discourse transfer is genuine and not an artifact of measurement or observational procedures (e.g., errors in data collection or data analysis). Once the phenomenon has been established as genuine, the researcher searches for theoretical constructs that can potentially account for the data. This is referred to in qualitative data analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) as generating new hypotheses that are based on evidence from the data and description and analysis that were done by the researcher.

Interpretation is given in the final section of each answer which includes a new hypothesis about the phenomenon. Wolcott (1994) cited Agar’s (1980) as follows:

In ethnography... you learn something (“collect data”), then you try to make sense of it (“analysis”), then you go back and see if the interpretation makes sense in light of new experience (“collect more data”), then you refine your interpretation (“more analysis”) and so on. The process is dialectic, not linear. (p. 11)

It is hoped that the write-up sections depict this dialectic process, but the linearity of the dissertation necessitates that the procedures taken during description, analysis, and interpretation be reported in a linear format. The researcher also realizes that this study is an important first step in a continuous program of research studies to be conducted in the
future. More research is needed for the continual refinement of hypotheses and their integration into broader theoretical frameworks capable of more adequate explanations of discourse transfer than the ones we currently have at hand. The new hypotheses about discourse transfer generated from this study can be examined directly in relation to additional data (e.g., design the research to explicitly test the hypotheses). This can only result from a preponderance of evidence collected from multiple studies and multiple sources of data.

Steps Taken to Ensure the Trustworthiness of Findings

Five steps suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) to ensure the trustworthiness of findings were adopted by the researcher:

(a) Reflective notes: a kind of record in which the researcher, on a daily basis, or as needed, recorded a variety of information about the study and the participants. These notes also included the daily schedule, personal reflections, and methodological decisions made and the reasons for making them.

(b) Peer debriefing: a process that allowed new insights to be explored and interpretations to be enriched through the active involvement of another graduate student involved in language learning research. In order to ensure the credibility with which utterances could be assigned to the different categories generated by the researcher, the peer debriefer, working independently, assigned the same utterances to categories. Only after reaching a high degree of agreement between the assignments of both the researcher and the peer-debriefer could the researcher analyze the remaining sets of data.
(c) Member Checks: This strategy was built into the design of the study. The participants were placed in member checking groups during the interviewing process. All participants were invited to a final member check once the data has been analyzed and interpreted prior to the final write-up of the results of the study.

(d) Prolonged engagement: Proctor (1991) stated that “essence and appearance are no more difficult to disentangle in the social realm than in the physical or biological realms” (p. 165). Blumer (1969) also argued that one comes to know social reality through prolonged and intimate participation in it. The researcher in the present study spent 3 academic quarters observing and interviewing participants. The emergent nature of the study meant that the researcher was ready to learn from the field with no benefit of a preconceived theory about the phenomenon. The idea that a good study can only result from prolonged and maintained engagement in the field is widely held by qualitative researchers (see for example, Bogdan & Bilken, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

(e) Triangulation: The triangulation of participants’ perspectives that was gained through interviewing served to establish commonalities in the category system. This step ensured that the researcher was not subjectively engaged in the study to impose her own analyses and interpretations.

This chapter consisted of five sections: (a) the rationale and the prior ethnography that formed the basis for the present study, (b) the pre-data collection stage which identified the sites and participants, access and entry, and the researcher’s role, (c) the data collection methods, (d) the data analysis methods, and (e) steps taken to ensure the trustworthiness of findings.
CHAPTER 4

THE COMPONENTS OF DISCOURSE TRANSFER

Introduction

The first research question describes the different categories in which discourse transfer appeared in real communication situations between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of English. These manifestations of discourse transfer phenomena were grouped under the two major headings of language organization and social interaction. There are two findings on discourse transfer phenomena in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech. The first is that the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech was affected by L1 influence in four distinct domains of discourse: (a) organizing propositional information, (b) overusing metadiscourse strategies, (c) manifesting social identity, and (d) performing rituals of face (Figure 4.1). The second is that L1 influence has affected these four discourse domains in different but related ways and that L1 influence is subject to modularity. The present chapter was organized by the researcher to include five sections (Figure 4.2). Section I described L1 influence on the presentation of propositional information; section II dealt with L1 influence on the use of metadiscourse strategies; section III analyzed L1 influence on the patterns of social identity; section IV described L1 influence on performing rituals of face; and section V posited a modularity
Figure 4.1: Components of Discourse Transfer As Manifested in the 4 Chinese Participants' L2 Speech
Figure 4.2: Organization Chart of Chapter 4
hypothesis to account for the relations between the 4 components of discourse transfer found in the data.

**Discourse Transfer of Language Organization**

Discourse transfer of language organization was divided into two components: (a) organizing propositional information, and (b) overusing metadiscourse strategies. Section I dealt with organizing propositional information, and section II analyzed overusing metadiscourse strategies. The first discourse component of language organization was called "organizing propositional information" because it dealt with the regularities found in the learner’s speech in presenting their ideas and arguments. The first section was devoted to analyzing L1 influence on the ways in which the 4 Chinese participants made their points, and how they developed arguments in the course of their interaction with their English native-speaking interlocutors. The component of propositional information influenced the speech of the 4 Chinese participants in the following categories: (a) putting one’s position at the end, (b) topic-comment word order, (c) invoking a point from the past, and (d) answering with a seemingly unrelated point.

**I. Organizing Propositional Information**

The underlying principle of organizing propositional information in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech is a system in which sufficient backgrounding of the topic is followed by the speaker’s main point. From a western point of view, the Chinese participants’ L2 speech may seem to lack appropriate connections because of its reliance on appeals to history and seemingly unrelated points or digressions. Arguments seem to
be often delayed, and do not express a point of view in a "thesis statement" at the beginning of one's utterances. In sum, the underlying principle in the organizational patterns of Chinese ESL speech is that before they can express a point of view at the beginning of their utterances, Chinese speakers feel obliged to provide sufficient backgrounding for the topic of the conversation. Data analysis revealed four discourse patterns of presenting information that were commonly followed by the 4 Chinese participants:

(a) Putting One’s Position at the End (POPE),
(b) Topic-Comment Word Order (TC),
(c) Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP), and
(d) Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP).

A common denominator among these categories is that the speaker’s main point is deferred until sufficient backgrounding of the topic has been established.

Table 4.1 offers a summary of the spread of Chinese-based strategies for organizing propositional information that were found in the 4 Chinese speakers’ L2 speech. Table 4.1 shows the frequency and the percentage of the categories of “organizing propositional information” that were found in the data.
Table 4.1: Summary of “Organizing Propositional Information”

Out of a total of 363 occurrences in the discourse component of “organizing propositional information,” the category of “putting one’s position at the end” (POPE) was utilized 169 times occupying 46.56% of the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance. The category of “invoking a point from the past” (IPP) came second and was employed 96 times occupying 26.45% of the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance within this group of categories. The category of “answering with a seemingly unrelated point” (AUP) ranked third, having occurred 66 times occupying 18.18% of the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance. The category of “topic-comment word order” (TC) ranked fourth and was used 32 times which constituted 8.82% of the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance. The following sections include a description of each of these four categories in which samples selected from the data are presented for the purposes of demonstration and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putting One’s Position at the End (POPE)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic-Comment Word Order (TC)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Putting One’s Position at the End (POPE)

In this frequently used category, the Chinese speakers in attempting to get to the point of what they are saying, tended to use what may seem to a western speaker as long, ineffective orientations (introduction to the topic) before they reached a position or a conclusion on the topic. The first example comes from an interactional session that took place between Jim, a native-speaking volunteer, and Peng, a Chinese participant. In the opening to their conversation, Peng seemed to be disturbed with the way Taiwan was being portrayed in the TV media of the United States.

(4.1)

J: Taiwan was in the news recently and –
P: Yeah, another time congressmen fight on the congress.
J: Oh, that was in the news, too?
P: When I came to Columbus, the first news I got from Taiwan is congressmen fight on congress.
J: Oh, I think I saw something like that.
P: And the second news I got is also congressmen =
J: It’s till fighting?
P: = Fight in congress. Yesterday I talk to you that bribery is a very serious problem. I think maybe you will agree. People fight, congressmen fight on the congress they, they just not for people. They are for their personal benefits.
J: But so, but what are they fighting about when we sometimes see them on TV? Somebody is fighting, two people are fighting. They’re actually hitting each other.
P: Yeah, yeah.
J: So, why are they doing that? I mean what is it that they are fighting about?
P: Maybe if you are have a public building, if you want to support a kind of issue, uhn, transportation issue, maybe, you must, you must support, you must have one side, you know, maybe just for one company. So, you must, if this company they want to get the contract, you know. So, they will, they will get the*, they will ask the, ask the, congressmen to help him, to help the company to get the contract.

→ So, if the congressmen, they, he want to get any benefit, he will do his best. Uha, at the congress, so even fight, even they fight.
This excerpt is typical of the interactions that were collected by the researcher. The lack of clarity as to the speaker’s purpose of what he/she is saying, or in interpreting the main point of his/her speech, is caused by the fact that the Chinese speaker is transferring his/her L1 principles of discourse organization to express himself/herself in English. To organize his idea, Peng was using a discourse strategy in which the main point of what he was saying was deferred until sufficient backgrounding has been established. This discourse strategy of putting one’s position at the end commonly takes the form of a two-part sequence: (a) Topic, background, reason, and (b) Comment, main point.

Peng was obviously upset about the media coverage of his country. But he was more upset with the bribery and corruption that gave rise to congressmen hatred and fist fighting. He was trying to communicate his feeling of frustration to Jim but Jim did not seem to grasp what Peng was trying to say. The major reason behind this discrepancy in understanding was that Peng felt that he must provide enough detail about his point before saying why he was angry. He was obviously upset because these congressmen were actually corrupt and received bribes. That was not stated explicitly but after a few utterances he stated, “They just not for people. They are for their personal benefit,” to which Jim responded, “So what are they fighting about?” This discrepancy between the two speakers was later resolved by Peng when he repeated his attempt at explaining the reasons behind his frustration. Further in the interaction, he did not answer Jim’s question directly. Instead, he used an extended metaphor in which “you” stood for a congressmen who is involved in a development scheme on behalf of a company that has bribed him to land a contract. Because of the vested interest the congressman had, Peng argued, “he
will do his best..., even fight.” Peng felt that he must provide more background before mentioning his gripe about congressmen fighting in the parliament.

The above transcript illustrates the common discourse strategy of (POPE) among the 4 Chinese participants. Another example of the same discourse strategy comes from the interactional session between Marianne, an English native-speaking participant, and Julia, a Chinese female volunteer. Marianne asked whether Julia’s grandfather was living in their household. This question prompted Julia to provide sufficient backgrounding before she could feel comfortable to say that her grandfather “likes to live by himself.”

(4.2)

M: Is there, is there just your mother, your father, your two brothers, and you in our house?
J: Yeah.
M: You don’t have grandmother living with you or-?
J: Uhn, they maybe, they live in another place, but not very far, maybe drive about 30 minutes. Maybe my grand father don’t, doesn’t like to, uhn, have, make his children have some trouble about him. And my father, and my aunt, and my uncle, and sometimes they will to visit him maybe three times a week because not very far from our house. And, some, because, it locate, located between my house and my father's work place, so he can, my father visit my grandfather very easily.
M: That’s nice. That’s very good.
J: —> Uhm, uhm. So, he likes to live by her, by himself. He enjoyed it now, ha....
M: He wants to be independent. Uhn, uhn.
J: Yeah.
M: That’s very admirable.

Rather than starting with the fact that her grandfather preferred to live by himself, Julia attempted to cushion her statement with a background on the reasons why her grandfather lived away from the family home. She first explained that he lived in another place that was not very far from her home. Another possible reason was that her grandfather did not like to give his children trouble. Also, he was routinely visited by his two sons and a
daughter. Julia went on further to explain that “sometimes they visit him three times a
week.” Julia also clarified that because her grandfather’s house was located “between my
house and my father’s work place,” her father could visit her grandfather very easily.
Finally, and only after Marianne said, “That’s nice,” and “That’s very good,” Julia felt
comfortable with saying that “he likes to live by himself.”

B. Topic-Comment Word Order (TC)

At the word order level, Chinese was described by Li and Thompson (1976) as a
“topic-comment” language while English behaved differently in that it follows a “subject-
predicate” word order. Rutherford (1983) documented how Chinese learners of English
moved from the Chinese boundaries of “topic-comment” to the English boundaries of
“subject-predicate.” Following Taylor’s (1975) finding that there is less linguistic transfer
from the native language to the target language as a function of increased proficiency,
Rutherford’s explanation of the movement from the boundaries of the L1 to the
boundaries of the L2 hinged upon the Chinese students’ proficiency level in the second
language. He explained that as the Chinese students become more and more proficient in
English, they tended to use less and less topic-comment sentences.

Nevertheless, in contrast to Taylor’s (1975) and Rutherford’s (1983) claim that
there is less linguistic transfer from the native language to the target language as a function
of increased proficiency, data analysis revealed that discourse transfer occurred even at
advanced levels of proficiency. This study focused on 4 Chinese university-level students
who were relatively fluent in their second language. While they came from different levels
of proficiency, they all produced topic-comment word order sentences. Moreover, the
Chinese “topic-comment” word order can partly explain why Chinese students prefer to follow the “POPE” discourse strategy. From a language per se perspective, the common denominator between organizing one’s ideas in “topic-comment” sentences or “putting one’s position at the end” of a stretch of talk is the organizing principle that the main point (or comment) is deferred until sufficient backgrounding of the topic has been done. For example,

(1) J: A girl walk in the midnight by herself is dangerous. (4.3)
    [Topic] [Comment]

(2) J: To find a good husband is the most important thing for a girl. (4.4)
    [Topic] [Comment]

(3) J: To be a successful career woman in Taiwan is not very easy. (4.5)
    [Topic] [Comment]

These three examples taken from different occasions in Julia’s interactions reveal a pattern of the transfer of the “topic comment” word order similar to the transfer of POPE. In a similar fashion to “POPE,” Julia is quite comfortable with giving her reasoning right at the beginning of her sentence and then following with her main point or comment. This analysis partly explains that there is a relationship between the (micro-level) topic-comment word order of Chinese and the (macro-level) discourse strategy of putting one’s position at the end.

C. Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP)

The third pattern of discourse transfer that characterized the 4 Chinese participant’s L2 speech was the tendency to establish a “historical context” for their statements from which they linked their points to the present. The Chinese participants
used this patterns in two different ways: (a) opening with a personal anecdote (e.g., When I was young), and (b) more general statements about history such as “Five hundred years ago.” Examples from these related groups follow:

(a) Opening with a Personal Anecdote:

**(4.6)** (Speaking about his cat)

H: **When I was a child,** I have her and gee, so many years, and I like it. **But now** she is old so my father and mother always forgive her if she dirt our carpet or other naughty things, he-ha..., no problem. But when she was a child, we will punish her.

**(4.7)**

H: **When I was a child,** I study music because my father and mother push me to study. **But now** I like music very much, so I now push myself to practice.

(b) General Statements about History:

Because of the Chinese tendency to accept traditional values and social norms, Chinese speakers often preceded their statements with appeals to history. This gave their utterances a sense of established continuity.

**(4.8)**

P: **Twenty years ago,** it was common to raise five or six children. **But now** it is not common. People cannot afford to raise so many child. But twenty years ago, it was common, very common.

**(4.9)**

P: **Forty, maybe twenty years ago,** if you are just eighteen, it was possible. It was very common to get married. **Now,** it has changed. Thirty maybe not too late.

F: Thirty is not too late?

J: Not too late. But twenty years ago, eighteen was not too late.
H: My older brother, he has no problem like my eyes. **Several years before**, he must wear glasses like me, and he go to see the doctor, and the doctor put some needle in his eyes. **But now** my brother does not need to wear glasses.

The category of "invoking a point from the past" is a variant of the L1 discourse strategy of deferring the main point until sufficient backgrounding of the topic has been done. The Chinese speaker does not feel comfortable with stating a position at the beginning of an utterance. Rather, it is a common pattern in Chinese discourse to provide a historical context from which support for the speaker's position is provided. All the categories of organizing propositional information serve to provide sufficient backgrounding before the speaker's main point is reached. However, the consistency with which the category of "invoking a point from the past" was employed in the 4 Chinese speaker's L2 speech qualifies it to be categorized separately as a common discourse pattern that was transferred to English by these 4 Chinese speakers.

**D. Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP)**

A distinct variant of the "POPE" principle in Chinese discourse that was transferred to the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech was the category of beginning an answer with a statement or idea that is only globally related to the topic of the question and then gradually approaching the question at hand. This discourse category, which is prevalent in Chinese, characterized the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech while they were interacting with their native-speaking interlocutors. There are similarities between this strategy (AUP) and both (POPE) and (IPP) in that the speaker's main point is deferred until sufficient backgrounding has been done. Both (AUP) and (IPP) are different from
(POPE), however, in that they both routinely employ a marked opening statement. While (IPP) always starts in the past, (AUP) can be recognized by its almost irrelevant connection to the issue at hand, and then gradually approaching the hearer’s question. It seems that in Chinese as a first language, the option of departing momentarily from the subject at hand is not only available but also transferable to the second language context.

A basic assumption in the analysis of speech in English discourse, however, is that interlocutors have an unspoken agreement to move a conversation towards some mutually-defined goal. They cooperate and contribute by making each contribution “relevant” to the conversation (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). For example, when one asks another person a question, the person who was addressed is expected to cooperate by providing an answer if he/she can. The answer is also expected to be relevant to the question. Clearly, Jim, the American participant in the following example, wanting to know if Chi-Kong can be applied to improve musical performance, could expect that his interlocutor, who was a Chinese ESL student majoring in music, would know how to answer his question. If she knew this, according to Grice’s (1975) “maxim of cooperation,” she ought to reply by giving a direct and relevant answer. But she did not do this.

(4.11)

J: Ok, so, my question is, can you personally see some application of Chi-Kong to improve performance, not just in piano, but something else?

L: According to my learning experience, because my teacher, oh, when I study in university, she, she, uhn, to, generally speaking, she is, be consider a very excellent pianist, because when she, when she was 10 years old, she already perform on concerto with orchestra, and travel performance to Japan or America, Europe. She is very excellent. So, but I am not a very excellent student, he-ha, you know.
So when I study with her, she can't give me, her, her practice experience because she have no problem to, to practice the technique. And, she, sometimes, she just, uhn, tell me, uhn, play, uhn, practice this more. And, and then, your, your technique will naturally get mat-, mature.

J: Yeah.

The question posed by Jim was whether applying Chi-Kong could improve Linda’s piano performance. Linda answered the question but in a very elaborate way. She did not flagrantly violate the maxim of cooperation: She gave a verbal response. But it is clear that her response is not a direct response to the question Jim posed. First, she started with mentioning her teacher and that she was an excellent pianist. To support this fact, she mentioned how her teacher learned the piano at a very young age and was able to perform with an orchestra at age 10. Linda also mentioned the fact that her teacher went on tours that took her to Japan, America, and Europe. Then Linda started talking about herself. Even though her teacher was excellent, Linda said that she herself was not as excellent as her teacher. All the aforementioned introduction was irrelevant to the function of answering a question about the utility of a certain teaching method. But Linda saw that it was necessary to mention all these facts to reach the point that she herself has not benefitted from that method in her piano technique. Finally, Linda mentioned how her teacher never suggested the use of Chi-Gong. Instead, the teacher only recommended practice and more practice so that Linda’s technique “will naturally get mature.” While AUP seems to be an over-elaborate way to answer a simple yes or no question, it is necessary to remember that this category is consistent with the other three categories that were observed in the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech. What they have in common is that sufficient backgrouninging must be established first, followed by the speaker’s main point.
In another example of AUP, Huang attempted to answer Fiona's question "How many hours does it take to get to the ocean?"

(4.12)

F: If you are in the center of the country, for example, if you're in Taichung, the center, right?
H: Yes.
F: How many hours does it take to get to the ocean?
H: The ocean?
F: Right here, neither north, south, or west.
H: The west is, is better. Because, uhm, Taiwan is like a long, uhm, north and south is longer than east and west.
F: Ok, so kind of like this (F draws a picture)
H: Because like this =
F: Ok, I understand.
H: = Yeah, so if you want to see the ocean, drive to the west, maybe just like this.
F: Ok, alright. I got the wrong way.
H: Uha..., yes, you just drive to east or west or if you in the Taidong, you just drive to east maybe just take one hour.

Huang's initial answer "The west is better" was only globally related to the question. Then Huang talked about how Taiwan is shaped like a long leaf, and that the north and south are farther from the ocean than the east or west. Afterwards, he concluded that "if you want to see the ocean, drive west." He qualified this, however, by saying that if someone was in Taidong, they had better drive east. Finally Huang answered the original question: "maybe just take one hour." Again in this example, Huang employed the Chinese discourse strategy of not answering the question head on. Instead, he was more comfortable with providing background information first and then getting to the main point which was "one hour."
Different Organizing Principles of Discourse

Data analysis showed that the Chinese and English-speaking participants used different principles of discourse to organize their propositional information. The English-speaking participants were observed to follow a discourse strategy of opening a discussion with the introduction of the speaker’s main point so that other speakers may react to it and so that he or she can develop arguments in support of the main point as the conversation unfolds. Examples of this order of presentation are as follows:

(4.13)

M: Too bad, too bad. You know, I think that’s good, and I think the system in the United States is so permissive. You understand permissive? They are allowed to be bad and not be punished in the schools, and so they just get worse, I think, they just get worse, and we have bad problems. They need more discipline.

(4.14)

M: Sometimes you get a, a wrong impression of the United States from the movies. At least old movies were rather idealistic. You know what that is? Yeah, they were, you know, they showed the family everybody, everybody happy, everybody. Now, now everything is bad and blowing up. Have you been to the movies here lately?

In the two cases given above, Marianne, the native speaker of English, followed an order of presentation that can be summed up as follows:

(1) (Comment, main point, thesis), and (2) (Topic, background, support)

The English speaker feels comfortable putting the main point in what looks like a thesis statement at the beginning. This difference in organizing discourse between Chinese and English leads the English speaker to focus on the opening stages of the discourse as the most crucial while the Chinese speaker tends to look for the crucial points to occur
somewhat later. The result of these differences in organizing discourse is that there is a noticeable amount of cognitive dissonance happening in Chinese-English interactions than that found in conversations between English-English speakers. Compared to the relative automaticity that is found in regular face-to-face interactions, cognitive dissonance happens in Chinese-English interaction due to the constant violations of discourse expectations on both sides of the conversation. Discourse expectations can be best thought of as schemata (or mental pictures).

The English speakers were subjected to the process of cognitive dissonance about Chinese discourse. For example, one of the English-speaking participants expressed his view that Chinese is an indirect language. It is significant to note that his perception about Chinese as a language was extended to Chinese speakers as well.

(4.15)

J: Uhm, uh. The, uhn, one question I had, my question was it seems in Chinese, there are many levels of directness, and frequently it seems too that, it seems that Chinese speakers are not so direct.
P: You mean Chinese expression?
J: No, not the language. The language has enough. The language can be direct.
P: You mean our attitude?
J: Yeah.
P: Oh, you saw that? (thought that?)
J: It seems. Alright, so the point that the, the question is - Can you find as many levels of directness in English as you can in Chinese? You see my meaning?
P: Uhm, not really.
J: Alright, you can say one thing in Chinese in many different ways, and many different levels of, uhn, clarity =
P: Uhn, uhn, yes, different degree.
J: = Yeah. And my question is - Can you use find, can you use those same number of levels in English? Does the English have the, the same number of levels from your point of view? You see what I'm saying?
P: I am not quite sure-
Jim studied Chinese for two years and he has been to Hong Kong and China. Because of his knowledge of the Chinese language, he was concerned for the Chinese students to find as many levels of indirectness in English as there were in Chinese. His statement "it seems that Chinese speakers are not so direct," however, identified the patterns of Chinese discourse with the personality traits of its speakers. In this case, Jim as a native speaker of American English believed that because Chinese has many levels of indirectness that Chinese speakers are not so direct as persons. The analysis revealed that Chinese learners' discourse transfer of Chinese norms of interaction was subjected to native speakers' interpretations of speech events that resulted from differences between the Chinese discourse system and the discourse system of the target language community. These differences were seen by Jim as a reflection of personality or cultural characteristics rather than simply differences in discourse organization.

The data also revealed that the Chinese participants experienced a certain degree of cognitive dissonance when they were introduced to this organizing principle in English academic writing. This cognitive dissonance was clearly expressed in the following utterances by Linda when she was talking with Jim.

(4.16)

L: Chinese composition is very different to, uhn, English composition. Uhn-ah, sometimes English composition is very boring. They always, the structure is always, uhn, first one, what, what's meaning and second one is always they just describe something to, to tell you, describe, noun, uhn, and always, uhn, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and then con-, con-, conclusion.

J: Uhn.

L: Yes, it's very boring. Uhn-ha... (both laughed). Yeah.
Following the demands of English academic discourse was apparently frustrating to Linda as a Chinese ESL learner. For example, Linda thought that Chinese was an artistic language while English was boring. This mis-perception was caused by the cognitive dissonance she experienced when her expectations about how to write a composition were violated by the straightforward demands of the English essay format. At the heart of these demands was the organizing principle of introducing the main idea at the beginning and then offering support and background information.

Peng explained to Jim what he had to do everyday in the English composition class. His experiences were strikingly similar to Linda’s experiences.

(4.17)

P: But now my teacher he, he teach me how to write a composition. And always, everyday he concentrate that the first one you must mention the main topic, in the first top-, in the first paragraph. And the second one, the second paragraph, you must support your main topic, and the conclusion you must restate the first one topic, eh. But in Taiwan, in Chinese, the composition we won’t say that. Fir-, maybe we the first, the first one we just describe something, you know.

J: Uhm.

P: = And the second one, maybe the topic, just the topic. Chinese composition structure is more changeable, and more, more interesting, uhn-ha...(both laughed).

From the first half of his utterances, it was clear that Peng understood what he needed to do to organize a composition in English. In the second half, however, Peng compared this organization with what he was used to in Chinese writing. His description of Chinese writing organization revealed that he was following the Chinese organizing principle of offering sufficient backgrounding at the beginning, followed by the main idea.
Conclusion

The 4 categories of organizing propositional information that were discovered from the data of the interactions were: (a) putting one’s position at the end (POPE), (b) topic-comment word order (TC), (c) invoking a point from the past (IPP), and (d) answering with a seemingly unrelated point (AUP). The organizing principle underlying these 4 categories of Chinese discourse is that the main point is reached only after sufficient backgrounding has been established by the speaker. When compared to how English speakers organized their utterances, it was found that they followed a different organizing principle for structuring information. English speakers followed the principle of putting the main idea at the beginning of most of their utterances to be followed by support and/or background. The difference between these two organizing principles caused a certain degree of cognitive dissonance on the part of the Chinese speakers when they tried to follow the demands of an English academic essay. As will be discussed in the following section, the Chinese underlying principle of organizing propositional information had an impact on how they employed metadiscourse strategies to connect their utterances and to convey their feelings and attitudes about what they were saying.
(II) Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies

The second section was devoted to analyzing the three ways in which the 4 Chinese participants transferred metadiscourse strategies. The term “metadiscourse” is used to refer to the linguistic markers in the learner’s speech that do not add to the propositional information but help the speaker connect his/her utterances (Conner, 1996). Metadiscourse also serves the cohesive and interpersonal functions of language. In the present study, metadiscourse analysis focused on how the parts of a learner’s speech are related as well as the learner’s strategies to communicate the topic of his/her utterances.

The data of the interactions were analyzed to investigate the transfer of three categories of metadiscourse strategies: “connectors,” “qualifiers,” and “miscues.” “Connectors” were used by the 4 Chinese participants to organize their utterances by making connections through devices such as conjunctions, disjunctions, rhetorical questions, free associations, and revisiting. “Qualifiers” were devices placed within statements in response to questions from the native speakers of English. These qualifiers expressed the speaker’s uncertainty about what he/she was saying, and therefore showed how the Chinese speakers expressed their feelings and attitudes on a variety of issues. “Qualifiers” were organized around the use of “maybe” as a rhetorical device expressing uncertainty. They included the categories of “overusing maybe,” “answering with ‘maybe’ to a yes/no question, “answering with ‘maybe’ to an either/or question,” and “answering with ‘maybe’ to a wh-question.” The third and final category of metadiscourse analysis was focused on “miscues” that were given in response to negatively posed questions by the English native-speaking interlocutor. In Chinese, if the speaker intends to answer with
"no," the normal response to a negatively posed question usually begins with "yes" followed by a negative statement. The category of "saying yes when meaning no" was included to highlight the 4 Chinese participants' miscues in answering negatively posed questions.

Data analysis used Connor's (1996) definition of metadiscourse as a reference point of English NS norms systematically to identify potential cases of discourse transfer of metadiscourse strategies in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech. In transfer analysis, the analyst used Connor's definition of metadiscourse in English as a first step to classify the transfer of metadiscourse strategies from Chinese to English. According to Connor (1996),

The term "metadiscourse" is used to refer to the linguistic material in texts that does not add anything to the propositional content but helps the reader organize, interpret, and evaluate the information... Metadiscourse enables the writer to show the reader how parts of the text are related as well as to express his or her own evaluation of the content and his or her attitude. (p. 94)

Connor's definition refers to written texts and how metadiscourse strategies function to connect an English writer's sentences through a variety of rhetorical devices such as conjunctions, disjunctions, ellipses, and substitutions. The decision to apply the English metadiscourse criteria of written discourse to spoken performance was taken on purely methodological grounds. The first step in the analysis of the transfer of metadiscourse strategies was to investigate whether the rhetorical devices that were transferred to the L2 had different functions than the ones specified by Connor for English speakers, namely that they did not add anything to the propositional information. The rationale behind this step was that if they are used by the 4 Chinese participants to add new information.
(to advance an argument, for example), then there was a likelihood that these devices have not been learned from L2 input and that they have been superimposed on English discourse. That is, they have been employed by the 4 Chinese participants for purposes other than those that are routinely followed in English discourse.

With Connor's definition of metadiscourse in mind, the analyst examined the participants' utterances to categorize the rhetorical devices that they used to connect their utterances. Since the use of metadiscourse strategies was defined by Connor as not adding to the propositional content of utterances, it was decided by the analyst to focus on how the 4 Chinese participants violated this requirement by actually using metadiscourse to add to the propositional information that they were conveying to their listeners. If such functions were found in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech, they were considered candidates of the transfer of metadiscourse strategies from Chinese to English. Transfer analysis involved employing a three-pronged approach to the data analysis: (a) identifying and classifying the 4 Chinese students' discourse patterns that have "potential" L1 influence; (b) confirming L1 influence by comparing between the learner's L1 performance and the patterns of the first language; The researcher reflected on her own knowledge of the L1 and the frequency with which each strategy was used by the 4 Chinese participants; and (c) triangulation of identified discourse transfer patterns by seeking evidence from the data that were produced by other Chinese participants. After transfer analysis, a name was given for each category of the component of metadiscourse strategies. Discourse analysis involved an effort to determine what was said by the participants in the preceding and succeeding utterances of the use of these strategies. Discourse analysis was
performed on the categories of “free association,” “revisiting,” “qualifiers,” and “miscues” to determine the types of question and utterances that the English-speaking interlocutors articulated prior to the use of metadiscourse strategies. Discourse analysis served as a tool with which to locate and classify the types of questions the native speakers posed to the 4 Chinese participants. Accordingly, the 3 English native speakers’ questions were classified into four types: (a) yes/no questions, (b) wh-questions, (c) either/or questions, and (d) negatively posed questions.

A. Connectors

“Connectors” were defined in this study as words or phrases which are normally placed between two utterances and which signal some semantic relationship between those two utterances. Analysis of the interactions of the 4 Chinese participants revealed five connecting devices with each performing a different semantic function. They included: (a) conjunction with “and,” (b) disjunction with “but,” (c) rhetorical questions, (d) free association, and (e) revisiting.

Data analysis focused on whether any of these connectors were used to perform functions other than those commonly known in English discourse. The analysis revealed that the Chinese participants tended to use 3 of these 5 connectors for the added function of “supporting” logical relationships between propositions where none seemed to exist. In other words, 3 connectors were used to establish links between utterances that were propositionally unrelated. The connectors that were used for this added function in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech are (a) conjunction with “and,” (b) disjunction with “but,” and (c) rhetorical questions.
The 4 Chinese participants used these 3 connectors for the added function of establishing logical relations between unrelated utterances so as to push their arguments forward. When subjected to transfer analysis, this added function was interpreted by the analyst as discourse transfer phenomena in that the Chinese participants relied on knowledge they already had from the LI on how and where to use these connectors, and transferred this knowledge to the L2 context, all the while assuming equivalence between the two contexts in employing these connectors in face-to-face interaction. Moreover, because the organization of propositional information in Chinese is different from English in that the Chinese speakers were observed to delay their main points until sufficient backgrounding had been done, “connectors” in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech were employed not only for linking and relating sentences, but also were used by the 4 Chinese participants to provide unity to their utterances by fulfilling the function of adding new propositional information. This analysis showed that these connectors were used for a different purpose than that known in English discourse, which only covers the function of linking and relating sentences together.

This interpretation of the function of connectors in the 4 Chinese participants’ discourse is consistent with the analysis in the previous section of how they organized propositional information. A plausible way of accounting for the added function of connectors for the addition of new information is that the Chinese learners’ arguments tended to use connectors as backgrounding devices to add new information to their arguments as they went during in the interaction. For example, one of the functions of the Chinese-based metadiscourse strategy of conjunction with “and” that was transferred to
English by the 4 Chinese participants was to introduce new propositional information that was not logically related to already articulated points. This pattern of using a conjunction with “and” was consistent with the 4 categories that were already observed in organizing propositional information: (a) putting one’s position at the end (POPE), (b) topic-comment word order (TC), (c) invoking a point from the past (IPP), and (d) answering with a seemingly unrelated point (AUP). In these categories, the speaker’s main point is usually deferred until sufficient backgrounding has already been made. The connector of conjunction with “and” was thus used to provide unity to the speaker’s utterances by facilitating the addition of new information. In sum, the three connectors that were used by the 4 Chinese participants to add new information and to push arguments forward included conjunction with “and,” disjunction with “but,” and “rhetorical questions.”

In the case of using a conjunction with “and,” the 4 Chinese participants introduced new ideas that supported their previously mentioned points. In the case of disjunction with “but,” however, these new ideas ran counter to already articulated ideas. In the case of rhetorical questions in English, they were posed with no intention of obtaining an answer. In Chinese, however, the speaker alerts the listener that a new idea is going to be introduced. “Rhetorical questions” serve in Chinese as signaling devices or advance notices that some new point is going to be talked about. This function is at variance with the English norm of posing rhetorical questions that require no answer (e.g., How many times do I have to remind you?). In a different way, the 4 Chinese participants were observed to pose the rhetorical question as a strategy to add new information.
The other two categories of connectors, “free association” and “revisiting” were two metadiscourse strategies that were highly utilized by the 4 Chinese participants to connect their points in L2 speech. “Free association” was used for a total of 57 times, and “revisiting” was used for a total of 41 times by the 4 Chinese participants in their overall data sets. These two connectors were subjected to transfer analysis to investigate if they also performed additional functions to the one that was defined by Connor for English metadiscourse, namely connecting utterances and establishing relationships within and between utterances. The analysis revealed that both connectors were used in a manner that was different from the norms of English usage. First, “free association” performed the function of shifting the topic, or changing the subject, and introducing a totally new topic that the Chinese speaker preferred to talk about. The data sets showed that the Chinese speaker used rhetorical questions to inform the English listener of his/her intention to change the topic. “Free association,” however, was used by the 4 Chinese speakers without the benefit of alerting their native-speaking interlocutors of an impending change of the subject at hand. The English speakers interpreted “free association” as a digression from the flow of the conversation. “Free association” was seen by the 3 native speakers of English as disruptive and surprising. The Chinese speakers saw “free association,” however, as enriching the flow of the conversation by adding new interesting anecdotes. The same category was subjected to different interpretations by different language groups. What the Chinese language group saw as positive, the English language group saw as negative. Discourse analysis revealed that “free association” was a pattern of the 4 Chinese speakers’ native language that was transferred to their L2 speech.
The name of the category was invented by the analyst to describe what Chinese speakers do when they use this strategy. Because Chinese offers the option of “free association” to its speakers, this strategy was classified as a discourse transfer phenomenon.

Second, the data analysis revealed a metadiscourse strategy that was used by the 4 Chinese speakers through which they revisited a point that was mentioned earlier in the interaction. “Revisiting” adds coherence to a Chinese speaker’s utterances because it allows for further elaboration on points that were not given their due attention when they were first mentioned. “Revisiting” was thus found to be a type of connector between ideas about the same topic that are separated by another topic or topics. When the Chinese speakers felt that a point was first mentioned but was not well elaborated at the time of its occurrence, Chinese discourse gives speakers the option of revisiting this point later on in the interaction. From an English native listener’s perspective, “revisiting” may sound strange and repetitive. It sounds like a departure from the topic at hand to recycle a topic that was thought by the English NS interlocutor to be finished. Because “revisiting” is nonlinear, a native speaker of English may get the impression that a Chinese speaker who overuses “revisiting” during interaction is confused. The data analysis revealed, however, that when the Chinese speakers did not pay full attention to the typically English concern for the logical presentation of ideas, “revisiting” was employed frequently as a metadiscourse strategy during their face-to-face interaction. This was the basis on which revisiting as a connector was classified by the analyst as a manifestation of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participant’s L2 speech.
Table 4.2 offers a summary of the 5 connectors that showed the frequency and the percentage of the categories of connectors found in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connector Type</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction with “And”</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>60.83%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjunction with “But”</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>29.61%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Questions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Association</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisiting</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1307</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Summary of “Connectors”

Out of a total of 1307 occurrences of “connectors,” conjunction with “and” ranked first, occupying 795 times or 60.83% of the total performance in this category. Disjunction with “but” came second with 387 times or 29.61% of the total performance in this category. “Free association” ranked third with a total of 57 times or 4.36% of the total performance in this category. “Revisiting” ranked fourth, occupying 41 times which amounted to 3.14% of the total performance within this category. “Rhetorical questions” ranked fifth with a total number of 27 times or 2.07% of the total performance in this category. The following is a discussion of how the 4 Chinese participants used these five connectors in their interactions:
(a) Conjunction with “And” (AND)

In addition to using “and” to connect sentences, data analysis showed that conjunction with “and” was used by the 4 Chinese participants for the added function of advancing one’s argument. The way this was typically performed is by letting “and” precede new propositions that were not articulated in a topic sentence. In this way, “and” provided unity to the speaker’s utterances. For example,

(4.18)

P: Yeah, and (1) maybe two or three weeks ago, I heard on the 20 to 20. It’s a, it’s a program, television program, and (2) they have investigated some of American families, and (3) they talk about the Chinese “Feng-Shui.” And (4) they adopt the Feng-Shui ideas into their families, and (5) they will, they will relocate their, their settings, home settings, and (6) they, they maybe come from Chinese people’s idea.

In this interaction, Peng managed to use “and” as a rhetorical device that introduced 6 new ideas as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance Number</th>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maybe two or three weeks ago, I heard a TV program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>They investigated American families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They talked about the Chinese “Feng-Shui.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They adopt Feng-Shui ideas into their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>They will relocate their settings, home settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>They come from Chinese people’s ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“And” was used by Peng to introduce new ideas and new details on one topic, “Feng-Shui.” Consistent with the underlying Chinese principle of organizing propositional information, Peng put his position at the end of his utterance by employing the category of (POPE) and the idea numbered 6 was his main point. “And,” in this context, functioned to provide an anchor for the ideas that supported Peng’s final position. In addition to the
function of advancing his ideas, the Chinese discourse function of “and” was transferred to perform the other added function of contrasting between two topics that were in opposition to each other. For example,

(4.19)

P: When I come to the U.S., and I feel it is different. For when we are in Taiwan, we have six, in my class, we have sixty people together. And teacher write on the blackboard, and we will write on the desk. So, when I come here, we just have 13 people together and teachers can have their own opinion. And we can talk to each other. And maybe we disagree with each other.

In the above transcript, Peng was comparing between what he considered the two distinct cultures of the American and Chinese classrooms. However, when he wanted to contrast the Chinese and the American classrooms, he used “and” both for conjunction and disjunction. The group of sentences that contrast the American classroom with the Chinese classroom were not mere additions or conjunctions to the ones Peng already made about the Chinese classroom. Peng transferred the Chinese discourse function of conjunction with “and” to English to perform the addition of new information about the American classroom, even if this information was in opposition to his already articulated proposition about the Chinese classroom. The use of conjunction with “and” as a connector is perfectly normal in English discourse. Peng, however, used “and” not only in the English sense of connecting sentences, but also as a strategy to advance his argument about the difference between the Chinese and American classrooms. That is the main reason why the use of conjunction with “and” in this way was seen by the analyst as an overgeneralization of the normal English use of “and” to include the Chinese discourse function of disjunction.
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In the context of talking about her troubles with adjusting to the Music Program, Linda conveyed to Fiona that despite the summer heat, lack of air-conditioning, and lack of access to the department’s practice room, she managed to find another practice room that requires no access where she practices on the piano there. This room, according to Linda, was full of older pianos that needed to be repaired. So, in addition to the discomfort of having no air-conditioning during summer, Linda had to put up with unreliable instruments.

(4.20)

L: And in, this situation is in Weigle, Weigle building, and another building, uhn, their practice door is always open, yeah, they don’t yeah, the practice room, that the piano is very old, uhn-ha, very, and the is up, up-right style, the ground style, and, uhn-a, there have no air condition, is very hot. Last month I, uhn, I went to there practice piano, and the every time after I finish my practice, I am very tired, yeah, because it’s very hot, no air-condition, and the piano is very old, and I think many piano should be repaired, uhn-ha.... Some of their pay-dot (xx) cannot up-right, yeah, maybe I up, I step the pay-dot, but no any influence, uhn-ha..., nothing change, and, and some piano keyboard, when I, when my finger touch them, and after my finger, uhn, after I take away my finger, the key didn’t return, uhn-ha....

F: Uhn-ha.... It sounds pretty run down.

In this context, Linda used conjunction with “and” for both narration and description. She first described the practice room as always open and that the pianos there were very old. She then described the pianos as up-right, and then she went back to her description of the practice room to reveal that “they have no air-conditioning.” She then shifted to narration and told Fiona how she went there a month ago to practice on the piano. She told Fiona how every time she went there she felt so exhausted after finishing her practice. All along her interaction, Linda was using conjunction with “and” to describe the piano and narrate her ordeal with the room. Fiona’s remark was revealing in that she summed up what
Linda should have said at the beginning of her talk about the practice room. Nevertheless, Linda managed to use conjunction with “and” for adding new descriptive details and new narrative information about the topic of the practice room. Linda’s use of “and” to perform this added function is at variance with Connor’s (1996) definition of metadiscourse strategies in that “and” is used in the Chinese discourse function of adding to the propositional content of her topic, and not merely for connecting utterances and establishing relationships.

(b) Disjunction with “But” (BUT)

As with conjunction with “and,” the data analysis revealed that the 4 Chinese participants employed “but” for the added function of advancing their arguments by adding new ideas to their points. Transfer analysis revealed that this added function is a manifestation of discourse transfer from Chinese to English as a second language. Because the 4 Chinese participants employed disjunction with “but” for a function other than that which is normally recognized by English speakers, it was added to the list of connectors in the category system. The normal English use of “but” is to place it between ideas that run counter to or are in opposition to each other. Disjunction with “but” shows that the following utterance appears in some way that is counter to the idea presented in the preceding utterance.

The added function of disjunction with “but” that the 4 Chinese participants employed in their interactions is consistent with the Chinese categories of organizing propositional information that were discussed in the previous section. Due to the fact that the underlying principle of organizing propositional information in Chinese is based on
supplying sufficient backgrounding before the speaker’s main point is reached, disjunction with “but” is employed in its added function to provide direction to the speaker’s utterances. In order to maintain the momentum of the conversation, in the absence of a main point at the beginning, and to hold the attention of the listener to the so-far unarticulated main point, the 4 Chinese participants utilized disjunction with “but” for the purpose of ensuring that their arguments were gradually constructed to reach the final position at the end. For example,

\[(4.21)\]

H: I have a Russian teacher. And the teacher is very good. Originally, I, I will, I, he will tell me to Russian, uha..., I, I already study Russian with his wife. But there, the particle (political) is not good, so =

J: What is not good?

H: = The part-, the partitive, right?

J: Political, political situation.

H: Yes, it’s not. So, that’s why I choose into American. But, but if I, if I went to Russian, he, he told me maybe four years I can, four years or five years I just can get a master degree. But I can learn very much difference because the Moscow Conservatory is very, very top. I, I want to there, but, but if you just spent four years in American, maybe you can for doctor degree. It’s different. But, but in Russia, you can learn more, some skill, some music than American. You know, my past year (xx) like, I feel very good.

J: You feel good is because the musical education or because something else?

H: Maybe, when I just, out of my country in the plane I feel, oh, you know, I think, maybe I make a wrong, a wrong choice when I feel not very good. This is my first time go to another country. But after I, I arrive here, I have friends and I study with a cello teacher, I think very good. And in the campus, or in the Columbus, I feel better than in Taiwan. In Taiwan, I like enjoy myself. I like lonely. I like, but there’s so many people, but here, I can feel nobody know me. Yes, nobody know me and I have more private place than, bzi, something is better, but something is worse, maybe. Sometimes I can’t understand American say something.

In the course of this interaction, Huang narrated how his Russian music teacher almost convinced him to go to Russia to study music there. However, due to the unstable
political situation there, and the comparatively long time it takes to earn a master’s degree in Russia, Huang decided to come to America because in the time it takes to earn a master’s degree in Russia, he could earn a Ph.D. in America. When he arrived in America he had second thoughts about his decision. Here, Huang employed “but” to add new ideas to the original proposition about studying in America. First, he mentioned that he felt better about his decision because he had friends and a cello teacher. Another point he liked about America was that he liked the privacy. Compared to Taiwan, it seemed that he knew too many people there. However, he qualified this idea by saying that the English language still posed problems for him because he couldn’t understand what some Americans were saying. In this way, Huang employed “but” to add direction to his original position about coming to America. The use of “but” functioned to add these nuances to his proposition. On the one hand, it was good to be in America because it takes less time to earn a Ph.D. here. Huang also enjoyed his friends, his cello teacher, and his sense of privacy. On the other hand, Huang was still struggling with his listening comprehension in English. Huang’s use of “but” added unity to these diverse points. By using “but,” Huang managed to convey to Jim the totality of his feelings as he entered the United States to pursue his dreams.

Another use of disjunction with “but” occurred when it was used in combination with conjunction with “and.” Linda employed both types of connectors to add new information until the final point was reached. For example, in the following interaction, Linda was comparing between her Taiwanese and American music teachers. She employed both “but” and “and” to accumulate enough details to reach the conclusion that
practice in and of itself was not useful if it was not supplemented by a teacher’s suggestions on how to improve her technique.

(4.22)

L: You know, some, some student is very excellent enough. They can study with the excellent student, excellent teacher because they can, they can know everything by observation. They can know how to improve their, their technique by themselves, by observe how their teacher do, you know. But, for example, like me, I cannot, I don’t know how to learn from my teacher’s performance, if she didn’t tell me how to do. And now, my professor, my new professor in OSU. He, when, when I play some pieces, some small pieces for him. He can know where is my problem, and, oh, and most important, more important, he know how to correct it. He know how to solve my problem. Some teacher they know my problem, but they have no idea to improve my, to correct my, my problem. Maybe, they just say, uhn, I need some more practice. I didn’t practice very, very well. But I don’t believe, if I just practice at, in the same way, I cannot do it better although I practice maybe 100 times or more.

In conclusion, Linda’s use of “but,” like that of “and,” was geared for the purpose of adding up new detail (or background) to reach the final position that the key to real success in music study was a teacher’s diagnostic skill in identifying where her problems are and suggesting ways to avoid these problems.

(c) Rhetorical Questions (RQ)

In English, a rhetorical question is a question that requires no answer from the listener. In Chinese, its main function is to add emphasis and arouse the attention of listeners to what the speaker intends to say next (or the speakers’ next utterance) by holding the floor. In other words, one of the interactional consequences of posing a rhetorical question in Chinese is that the person who asked the question is able to allocate the next turn in talk to him/herself thereby holding the floor. Transfer analysis revealed that the 4 Chinese participants displayed a common pattern of realizing an additional
function for the rhetorical question that is at variance with the English norm. The additional function of the Chinese rhetorical question was that of revealing the speaker’s intentions about what he/she intended to say subsequent to the question. For example,

(4.23)

| F:  | How big is your family in Taiwan? |
| L:  | Uhn, I have two brothers. I am the youngest. |
| F:  | You’re the youngest? |
| L:  | Yes, uha. |
| F:  | Have your brothers been to the U.S.? |
| L:  | No, uhn, my, both of my brothers, they, now, they continue studying in universities. |
| F:  | Ok. |
| L:  | Yes, because in Taiwan, uhn, do you, do you feel strange, why now, I am graduate, and my brother, they continue to study? Uhn, it is because, in Taiwan, uhn, every, uhn, every adult man who, uhn, graduate from high school, if they don’t continue to study in University, they should to go to army. And my brother, both of them, they have the same situation. They, they, they didn’t succeed in the first time, university entrance exam. Yeah, at the time, they should, they should make a decision, uhn, because everybody should go to the army about two years, everybody, every male, they should go to the army. At the time, they think about this question, “Should I try once again to enter university at last time?” or, or “I should go to the army right now, to finish this, this responsibility?” Uhn, and, finally they decided to finish this responsibility, and after years, they, they try again to pass the university entrance exam. So now, I graduate, they, they continue studying in university, yeah. |

In the above transcript, Linda successfully used the rhetorical question “do you feel strange why now I am graduate and my brothers, they continue to study?” After posing this question, Linda talked about the fact that her brothers’ decision to finish with their military service prior to going to the university has meant that they could not have possibly come to the United States. Military service in Taiwan is restricted to boys, who are banned from travel before their military obligation to their country is fulfilled. The rhetorical question Linda posed provided a link between Fiona’s question “Have your
brothers been to the U.S.? And Linda’s (POPE) “So now, I graduate and they continue studying in the university.” By asking the question, Linda had created the chance to elaborate in greater detail about her brothers’ inability to be in the U.S. with her even though she was younger than both.

(d) Free Association (FA)

Unlike English, Chinese allows its speakers during the course of a casual conversation to freely add interesting anecdotes, events, and situations without fully observing the linearity of the interaction. For lack of a better label, “free association” was chosen because it describes what Chinese speakers do when they transfer this discourse category from Chinese to English. Free association performs a similar function to rhetorical questions. Unlike rhetorical questions, however, free associations can be seen by native speakers as disruptive and, therefore, less courteous. Because the Chinese speaker does not bother to reveal his/her intentions, free association sounds like the speaker is bringing a totally unannounced topic to the conversation as if it just occurred to him/her. For example, Linda and Jim were talking about Linda’s class and the number of her classmates, when Linda suddenly remembered something:

(4.24)

J: How many people in your class?
L: Maybe 12 or 13.
J: Uhm.
L: Uhm. Uhn-a. Oh, one thing I forgot. Today, I have full schedule, so busy,
J: Uhm.
L: You know last week =
J: What happened?
L: = Last Saturday, I went to, a, fruit farm to pick up apples and two pumpkins, he-
ha....
J: What? From apple trees?
L: He-ha....
J: Uhn.
L: In my thought, I pick up 
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{pumpkins from apple trees.} \\
\text{I like these.}
\end{array}
\]
J: Why can you get it?
L: Why can you get it?

What Linda’s free association managed to achieve was a total shift of the topic of the number of students in her class, and the introduction of a totally different topic that she clearly preferred to talk about. When she said, “one thing I forgot,” she was trying not to let this interesting piece of information go by without mention. The result was that she rushed into the subject of the fruit farm without making any revelation of her intentions. Hypothetically, a question such as “Do you know what happened last week?” would have prepared Jim better. But because Chinese offers the option of free association more freely than English, Jim was apparently surprised at this turn of events. Jim’s exclamation “What happened?” revealed that he was somewhat taken off-guard especially with the words “You know last week” coming at the end of Linda’s utterance about how busy she was.

(e) Revisiting (REV)

Revisiting is similar to free association in that the speaker brings in an unannounced point or topic, except in this case, the speaker is revisiting a point he/she mentioned a few turns ago. Possibly the speaker feels the point was not well-developed when it was first mentioned, and when revisiting occurs, it is an indication that only now he/she can give the point its due attention. For example, Huang, a Chinese participant, mentioned that drinking beer was not good for him because it could affect his hands. Because he was a cellist, he could hurt his hands deliberately.
H: Sometimes if I played for a long time, I will be very tired. Or if I drink beer, I will feel very hurt.

One page later in the transcribed interaction, Huang revisited the same episode about how beer hurt his hands.

H: But if I drink that, I will better. If I drink beer, it will be better, but that will cause some other kind of problem like my hands.

Revisiting as a connector was used by all 4 Chinese participants routinely. One of the most striking examples was made by Peng in which he twice revisited an earlier mentioned point. Peng first mentioned that stores in Taiwan were open 24 hours a day:

P: We can easily to buy everything because a lot of stores, they open 24 hours.

Later, Peng revisited:

P: If you want to drink beer, or if you want to eat something when you feel hungry, you can also eat at midnight. It’s easy to get.

Later, Peng said:

P: In Taiwan, some people they just like to work at night, and they will open their stores at night, very, very late. Maybe the whole night they will open.

B. Qualifiers

While connectors were treated as textual markers that signify conjunction, disjunction, rhetorical questions, free association, and revisiting, qualifiers were classified under a different group of metadiscourse strategies that are called interpretive markers. Qualifiers are synonymous with interpretive markers which are defined in this study as words or phrases which signal a feeling of uncertainty such as “I don’t know, maybe, etc.”
Qualifiers reveal the speaker’s attitude and/or feelings about what he/she is saying.

A major area of difference in interpretive markers between English and Chinese metadiscourse is the overuse of hedges or uncertainty markers (maybe). According to Thompson’s (1992) second edition of the Oxford Dictionary, the use of “maybe” indicates either “possibility or uncertainty” (p. 549). The data analysis revealed, however, that “maybe” was used by the 4 Chinese participants in contexts where “maybe” does not fit in English. One reason behind this apparent overuse of “maybe” is related to cultural difference. In Chinese, the overuse of “maybe” indicates not only a speaker’s verbal attitude toward certainty but also reflects the culturally-based preference for not sounding too sure about what one is saying. This overall attitude is preferred to being hard-nosed or being too confident without allowance for potential errors. Even though the use of qualifiers for the expression of uncertainty is preferred among Chinese speakers and seems to fit their cultural expectations, the transfer of such a strategy to their English speech must not be viewed as erroneous. Like connectors in this sense, qualifiers can be overused, superimposed, or overgeneralized in L2 speech, which might give native speakers a feeling of frustration.

Caution in treating these interpretive markers as overgeneralization rather than errors can also be supported by how the English native speaking participants viewed the overuse of “maybe” by their Chinese speaking conversation partners. The native speakers’ views on the overuse of “maybe” can be summarized as follows. For Jim, a male graduate student in his mid-30’s, saying “maybe” meant “no.” For example, if a Chinese student
responded to an invitation offered by Jim with “maybe,” Jim would interpret this answer as a “no.”

(4.27)

J: At many times, if I ask a Chinese speaker, uhn, “Would you like to meet?” The answer is “Maybe.” This is very difficult to understand. I am sure it has very clear meaning to native speakers, if there is (are) two native speakers of Chinese. But to me, that means “No.”

P: Oh, you will feel it’s “No”?

J: Yeah, I feel it’s “No” usually, and-

P: If the, his answer is “Yes,” they would, uhn, in native speaker, English speaker, they will, they will say exactly “Yes” or “No,” right?

J: I say yes or no, not all the time-

P: Oh!

J: Not all the time.

P: So, you mean Chinese people maybe say “Maybe.”

J: Yeah, they maybe say “Maybe” exactly.

From Jim’s perspective then, the consequence of saying “maybe” was a feeling of frustration coupled with a sense that the Chinese speaker was less than totally forthcoming about what he/she was saying. Even though the Chinese speaker had not committed a recognizable error (e.g., He/she could have answered with “Yes” or “No” but chose to use “Maybe”), the effect of overusing “Maybe” was really frustrating to Jim as a native English speaker.

The analysis was expanded to other native speaker data to investigate if Jim’s reaction to the overuse of “Maybe” by Chinese speakers was shared by the two other native speakers. Marianne, a female retired journalist showed some degree of frustration with the overuse of “maybe” by her Chinese interlocutors. For example, in her interaction with Julia, the following overuse of “maybe” occurred:
M: When you were younger, did you think about coming here? Did you kind of have a dream about coming here?
J: Ah, maybe, ha, ha, ha.
M: \(\rightarrow\) Maybe? Oh, ok, ok. Didju, did you get, do you get movies, American movies?
J: Yeah, or some soap, soap opera.

And another example was as follows:

M: I think that the jet ski is the overall name for them, the what you are talking about wave-whatever, you know, the name of it.
J: Uhm, uhm, maybe.
M: \(\rightarrow\) Maybe! Ok.

From the surface linguistic level of the transcribed interactions, and from listening to the audiotapes, the analyst concluded that Marianne's reaction was indeed a sign of frustration. However, further analysis revealed that Marianne contradicted this conclusion. The above two transcripts served as the subject of an ethnographic interview between the researcher and Marianne. When asked specifically about her reaction to "Maybe," after listening to the taped transcripts, Marianne suggested that "Maybe" meant exactly that. It did not mean either "Yes" or "No" but probably Julia's lack of certainty about what she was saying. Marianne's interpretation was at variance with Jim's, for whom Chinese speakers' overuse of "Maybe" was frustrating because it apparently increased the sense of uncertainty Jim was having at that time.

Subcategories of Qualifiers

Data analysis revealed that interpretive markers were employed in the 4 Chinese learners' L2 speech. Specifically, the overuse of "maybe" characterized the 4 Chinese
participants' L2 speech in the recorded transcripts. In order to manage the large amounts of data which manifested the overuse of “maybe” in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech, the analysis focused on categorizing the types of utterances that contained “maybe.”

Initial analysis identified two sub-types:

(a) Overusing “Maybe”

(b) Answering with “Maybe” to a Question

The second sub-type was further organized according to question type:

(1) Answering with “Maybe” to a Yes/No Question,

(2) Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question,

(3) Answering with “Maybe” to a WH Question.

Table 4.3 offers a summary of the qualifiers found in the Chinese speakers' L2 speech, and it also shows the frequency and percentage of the categories of qualifiers found in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifiers</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF USE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overusing “Maybe”</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering with “Maybe” to a Yes/No Question</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering with “Maybe” to a WH Question</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Summary of “Qualifiers”
Out of a total of 210 occurrences of “qualifiers,” “overusing maybe” ranked first, occupying 98 times or 46.67% of the total performance in this category. “Answering with ‘maybe’ to a yes/no question” ranked second with 67 times or 31.90% of the total performance in this category. “Answering with ‘maybe’ to a wh-question” ranked third with a total of 35 times or 16.67% of the total performance in this category. “Answering with ‘maybe’ to an either/or question” ranked fourth, occupying 10 times which amounted to 4.76% of the total performance within this category.

(a) Overusing “Maybe” (OM)

The first category was the use of “maybe” in declarative or narrative utterances. This category reflected the Chinese learners’ lack of willingness to sound certain of what they were saying, and was, therefore, characteristic of the Chinese cultural rules of use that favor humbleness and good mannered speech. For example,

(4.30)

M: Did anyone teach you how to cook?
J: I can.
M: You can.
J: But-
M: You want, you want your brother’s assistance for you.
J: Yeah, ha....
M: Uha....
J: Maybe they do it better than me, uha..., so.
M: Oh, don’t- no, you could do it very well.
J: Ha, ha. Maybe.
M: You can.
J: I will try.
M: You can, you can do anything you want to, you know.

In this transcript, the use of “Maybe” as a qualifier prompted Marianne to complement Julia and show her solidarity. Marianne wanted to know if anyone taught
Julia how to cook. Julia said she could but with some hesitation. Because Julia said earlier that her brothers knew how to cook, Marianne said that Julia wanted her brother's assistance. Julia said “Maybe they do it better,” so Marianne reacted with ”Oh, don’t, no, you could do it very well” thus offering Julia support and expressing her confidence that Julia could be a good cook. But then Julia said “Maybe” to which Marianne replied “You can.” Finally Julia said, “I will try” because of Marianne’s encouragement and support, to which Marianne expressed her solidarity “You can do anything you want to, you know.” In this way, Marianne indicated her support and solidarity and Julia showed her humbleness and good manners because she did not brag about her cooking. Instead, she gave credit to her two brothers.

(b) Answering with “Maybe” to a Question

One of the most problematic areas in which discourse transfer had a negative impact on the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech was the general category of answers or replies to questions posed by their English native-speaking interlocutors. The expectation that most of the native-speaking participants had in mind was to get a “clear” answer, with as little ambiguity as possible. Due to Chinese preference for using qualifiers, however, many of their answers actually started with the word “Maybe.” These answers were classified by the analyst into three separate groups according to three question types: (1) Answers to Yes/No Questions, (2) Answers to Either/Or Questions, and (3) Answers to WH Questions.
(1) Answering with "Maybe" to a Yes/No Question (MYN)

The data analysis revealed a preponderance of "maybe" replies to yes/no questions.

For example,

(4.31)

F: Are you going to be able to live in the University Village?
L: Uhn, I want to, but yesterday, their, office, uhn, tell me, the, the one-bedroom is gone. Other people rent it, yeah, they tell me. Maybe after September, there will be more, empty room, yeah. Maybe somebody, somebody, will, uhn, will change their mind. Maybe somebody will not continue to rent, uhn, uhn.

In response to Fiona’s Yes/No Question, Linda expressed her wish to be able to live in the University Village but there seemed to be no vacancy at the time she went to the Housing office. She already expressed her wish to have a one-bedroom apartment, but she was told by the office that “other people rent it.” Then, Linda engaged in a series of three scenarios that could increase her chances of getting a room. All three scenarios were preceded with “maybe.” The first scenario was that maybe after September there will be more empty room. The second scenario was “maybe something will change their mind” and cancel their reservation. The third scenario was that “maybe somebody will not continue to rent” and evacuate their apartment. Regarding Linda’s expressed wish to live at University Village, the use of “maybe” in these 3 scenarios indicated that she was treating maybe as “Maybe yes” and not “No” as Jim has stated. In any case, the use of maybe to answer Fiona’s Yes/No Question did not contribute to answering Fiona’s question. If anything, the use of “maybe” indicated Linda’s unambiguous position that even if an apartment at University Village is not available at the moment, she was hoping that she will be able to move into one very soon.
(2) Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question (MEO)

When given a choice among two clear options, the 4 Chinese speakers frequently choose to express uncertainty over one of the two options. Again, the English speaker’s questions were not answered directly as a result for the Chinese preference for uncertainty in an otherwise clear question format. For example, in the following transcript, Huang was recounting to Jim how he felt good about his decision to come to the U.S. to study music. Jim asked him whether he felt good for the quality of music education here, or because of something else:

(4.32)

J: You feel good is because the musical education or because something else?
H: Maybe, when I just, out of my country in the plane I feel, oh, you know, I think, maybe I make a wrong, a wrong choice when I feel not very good. This is my first time to go to another country. But after I, I arrive here, I have friends and I study with a cello teacher, I think very good. And in the campus, or in the Columbus, I feel better than in Taiwan.

Huang’s use of “maybe” to answer Jim’s question occurred right at the initial position of his answer. He used “maybe” to indicate that he was uncertain at first because “Maybe I make a wrong choice.” He tried to explain that it was the first time in his life to go the another country. There is a predictable mixture of uncertainty and excitement whenever a Chinese student takes his/her first trip to the United States. However, when Huang arrived to the U.S., he felt that he already had friends at OSU, and that he had a cello teacher, the instrument that he specializes in. Finally, he grew so accustomed to being in the U.S. that now he said, “I feel better than in Taiwan.” The use of “maybe” in this answer performed a complex role. On the one hand, it served Huang well to express his
uncertainty at the initial stage of being a student in America. On the other hand, it somehow provided a warrant for his subsequent sense of reassurance that his experience in the U.S. was a rewarding one. In a sense, the use of "maybe" served a more complicated role than if Huang had simply chosen one of the two options offered by Jim's question.

(3) Answering with "Maybe" to a WH Question (MWH)

WH-questions usually begin with a WH-word such as what, where, which, when, and how. In other words, WH-questions seek specific answers to questions that were posed to elicit specific information marked by the question word. The normal answer would usually address the question by paying specific attention to the type of question word at the beginning. The data analysis revealed that during their interactions with the English native-speaking participants, the Chinese speakers transferred the use of "maybe" to answer wh-questions. For example, Marianne asked Julia why she felt that her level in English was lower middle when she seemed to have a very good command of English:

(4.33)

M: Why? You seem to have a very good command of English. Why did you place in the lower middle?
J: Uhn, I don't know. Just from junior high school and senior high school. Maybe, uhn, junior high school, maybe, I am in the middle, maybe, up middle. But I study in the senior high school. The school was in Taipei, and my classmate their English was very well and but so, maybe because my classmates. My class maybe is the best in school. So, so, maybe my level is low middle in my class but maybe high level in the whole nation.

Julia's response started with "I don't know" which is an interpretive marker or qualifier that expresses uncertainty. She then invoked a point in her past as far as junior high
school. She said that in the junior high school she was in the middle level, or maybe upper middle of the class in terms of her English ability. However, when she moved up to senior high, her school was in Taipei, the capital. Moreover, her class was the best in that school. Finally, she expressed her position at the end by saying “Maybe my level is low middle in my class, but maybe high level in the whole nation.” The function of using “maybe” in this last utterance was to indirectly elevate Julia’s level from lower middle to high. She did not brag about her level, but in effect, she accepted Marianne’s initial compliment about her good command of English.

C. Miscues: Saying “Yes” When Meaning “No”

Saying “yes” when meaning “no” is a category of Chinese metadiscourse strategies that, when transferred to English, carries the potential of confusing or misleading native speakers of English. This category of miscues were counted in the data to a total of 18 times. We can consider how the pattern of the use of an English negatively posed question was a source of miscues between the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 native speakers of English who participated in the study.

The fact that a Chinese person answers “yes” to a negative question that he/she does not agree with may simply mean he or she is transferring a commonly used metadiscourse feature from Chinese to English. This, of course, has the potential of confusing the English native speaker because his/her expectation about how to answer a negative question was violated by this different L1-based strategy. For example, in the following transcript, Linda and Marianne were having a talk about Linda’s landlady and the fact that she took a check from Linda for her rent and when she deposited the check in
her account, Linda’s check bounced. Linda subsequently gave the amount in cash to her
landlady but the landlady still refused to return Linda’s check. Linda was afraid that the
landlady might deposit the check again in her account especially after her father sent some
money from Taiwan. Finally, the check was returned to Linda.

(4.34)

A: But she didn’t cash it, did she?
L: Uhn, uhn.
M: She didn’t cash the check?
L: Yeah, yeah, she doesn’t.
M: She didn’t?
L: She didn’t cash the check. But-
M: Well, that was good, that was good that she didn’t cash it.
L: Uhm, uhm.

This transcript clearly showed how miscues were caused by Marianne’s negative question.

Linda’s intention was to agree with the fact that the landlady did not cash the check:

L: Yeah, yeah, she doesn’t.
M: She didn’t?
L: She didn’t cash the check.

Linda was following the Chinese strategy of confirming the premise of the negative
question by saying “yes.” Marianne did not expect to have her interlocutor respond with
“yes” and then go on to say that the lady didn’t cash the check. A grammatically “correct”
response would be “No, she did not.” In order to confirm what she heard, Marianne felt
that she needed to repeat herself in a different way: “That was good, that was good that
she didn’t cash it” to which Linda responded with: “Uhm, uhm”- a nonverbal form of
agreement that does not need to be articulated in a “yes” or “no” response.
Evidence for the fact that the Chinese participants were using their native language system for answering negative questions with "yes" as a basis for interpreting and then producing the English system can be confirmed from the following transcript:

(4.35)

M: You never get snow or anything like that in Taiwan?
J: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
M: Do you?
J: I don’t. We don’t. I have never. Maybe in very high mountain.
M: Alright.
J: But we don’t have snow where we live.

Julia’s initial confirmation of her answer about snow in Taiwan carries the potential of causing some confusion on the part of the native-speaking listener. The data analysis and a member check showed that Julia meant to strongly deny that Taiwan has snow. However, the way the question was framed with “never” performing the negation led to Julia’s response. She reported that she meant to say “Yes, we never get any snow” but the miscue occurred when she followed the Chinese way of answering a negative question which is the opposite of the English way “No, we never get any snow.” Marianne, the native-speaking listener, reported that upon hearing Julia’s response in English, she did not realize that there was a linguistic mismatch between Chinese and English. Rather, she heard the responses as inconsistencies, or lack of proficiency. Moreover, the analysis revealed that both the English native speakers and the Chinese speakers were bound by the conventions of their respective languages: The Chinese as they sought to express themselves in English and the Americans as they sought to interpret what the Chinese speakers said in English.
In the following transcript, Jim and Peng were talking about a female athlete who got hurt while performing in the Olympic games. Jim wanted to know from Peng whether the athlete’s foot was permanently hurt:

(4.36)

J: But it’s not permanently hurt, isn’t it?
P: Yeah, not permanently. But she did hurt.

These examples of answering with “yes” when meaning “no” showed that miscues were commonly shared by the Chinese participants in the study. The analysis revealed that the source of the miscues lies mainly in the linguistic mismatch between Chinese and English in answering negatively stated questions.

**Conclusion**

Metadiscourse strategies formulate an important area in which to investigate the influence of discourse transfer on L2 speech. This section focused on the analysis of the three categories of connectors, qualifiers, and miscues in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. The analysis has shown that the 4 Chinese participants often transferred the metadiscourse strategies of their own native language in communicating with native speakers of the target language. The label that was used to describe these strategies in the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech is “overuse.” This is so because the 4 Chinese participants transferred these strategies to their L2 speech with modifications to adjust them to their common use in the L2. The analysis focused on the “added” functions of these strategies which indicated that the 4 Chinese participants assumed that these L1 strategies were functionally and structurally identical to the ones they encountered in L2 speech.
Because of a combination of their so far less developed competence in the L2, and the demands of the interactive situation including rapid online processing of L2 items, the 4 Chinese participants used these strategies frequently as they were employed in the L1.

In conclusion, the analysis showed that the transfer of metadiscourse strategies to the learners' L2 speech is coherent with their transfer of principles of organizing propositional information. Instead of presenting a list of transferred items, the analysis aimed to establish a coherent relationship between the two areas of discourse transfer that have been discussed so far in this chapter.
Discourse Transfer of Social Interaction

Discourse transfer of social interaction was divided into two components: (a) manifesting social identity, and (b) performing rituals of face. First, two sub-groups were created to account for manifesting social identity: (a) sense of community, and (b) cultural beliefs. The first major category was devoted to analyzing how the 4 Chinese participants' social identity was manifested in their language use: (a) patterns of language use that were commonly displayed by the 4 Chinese participants in their interaction with the 3 native speakers of English, and (b) the cultural beliefs that determined the 4 Chinese participants' world view. The first sub-group of "sense of community" included the categories of (a) group conformity, (b) uncritical acceptance of authority, (c) dependence, and (d) referencing. The second sub-group of "cultural beliefs" included the categories of (a) predestination "Ming," (b) fortune and opportunity "Yun," and (c) spiritual masters.

Second, the second major category was devoted to analyzing how the Chinese participants transferred the ways in which they performed different rituals of face in their interactions with native speakers of English. Two sub-groups were created to describe rituals of face: (a) respect for others, and (b) self-denial. The first sub-group of rituals of face "respect for others" focused on the ways in which the 4 Chinese participants displayed respect for others through (a) convergence, (b) deference, and (c) avoiding conflict. The second sub-group of "self denial" focused on how the 4 Chinese participants put themselves down in front of their interlocutors. The rituals of "self-denial" included: (a) putting self down, (b) refusing a compliment, and (c) turning down an invitation to
talk. The first part of this section is devoted for manifesting social identity, and the second part is devoted for rituals of face.

(III) Manifesting Social Identity

The third section is devoted to describing how the Chinese social identity influenced the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants in two major ways. First, it influenced the ways in which their Chinese social identity was embodied in their language use. Second, the Chinese social identity influenced the 4 Chinese participants’ world view. Data analysis focused on the ways in which the 4 Chinese participants in interaction with the 3 native speakers of English transferred aspects of their Chinese social identity. These were grouped by the researcher under the categories of “a sense of community” and “cultural beliefs.” The first sub-group “sense of community” was further divided into 4 categories: (a) group conformity, (b) uncritical acceptance of authority, (c) dependence, and (d) referencing. The second sub-group “cultural beliefs” was divided into 3 categories: (a) predestination “Ming,” (b) fortune and opportunity “Yun,” and (c) spiritual masters. The following two sections are devoted to the introduction and analysis of discourse transfer as a manifestation of social identity in the Chinese participants’ (a) sense of community, and (b) cultural beliefs.

A. Sense of Community

The 4 Chinese participants’ use of the second language revealed that they had a strong sense of belonging to a community as opposed to seeing themselves as individuals. This tendency toward a “sense of community” was manifested in 4 categories: (a) group
conformity, (b) uncritical acceptance of authority, (c) dependency, and (d) referencing.

In many of the statements they made, the 4 Chinese speakers frequently referred to other
members of their social group that would agree with them. This seemed to have mattered
to them a great deal. It seemed that no action was possible (or comfortable) without the
community behind it. The tendency to have a sense of community defined the
participants' social identity as Chinese. Descriptive statistics of the categories are
displayed in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF USE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity (GC)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncritical Acceptance of Authority (UAA)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence (DEP)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referencing (REF)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>346</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Summary of “Sense of Community”

Out of a total of 346 occurrences of “sense of community,” “uncritical acceptance
of authority” (UAA) ranked first with 128 times, occupying 36.99% of the 4 Chinese
participants’ overall performance. “Referencing” (REF) came second with 127 times or
36.71% of the total performance within this group of categories. “Dependence” (DEP)
ranked third, having occurred 53 times occupying 15.32% of the 4 Chinese participants’
overall performance. "Group conformity" ranked fourth and was used 38 times which constituted 10.98% of the 4 Chinese participants' overall performance. The following sections contain a description of each of these four patterns in which samples from the data are used for the purposes of demonstration and analysis.

(a) **Group Conformity (GC)**

Group conformity is defined as "seeing oneself through other people's eyes."

In Chinese society, whenever the interests of the individual differ from those of the community, the latter take precedence and priority. The available data revealed that this pattern of language use was so dominant in the 4 Chinese learners' L2 speech that it influenced their sense of responsibility to society. For example, in the category of "group conformity," the Chinese students transferred a hierarchical sense of society. Whereas in the U.S., each person is equal to any other, the Chinese believe that no two persons are ever equal. As Peng described,

(4.37)

P: I feel the eastern society, they still very care the class, the class, the people's class (rank) in your working environment. You must respect the elder class. But Americans seem not necessarily.

This transcript revealed that Peng was aware of his unique place in society from which ideally he could work in harmony with others.

The Chinese word "Li," which according to Gu (1990), means "polite appearance" has to do primarily with one's place in conformity to society (p. 238). Respect to others and their respect of the individual is the glue that holds Chinese society together.

It follows that in social encounters, emotions must be played down, and tendencies toward
aggression and boasting must be suppressed. The pressure to be reserved dictates that the
individual be ever under control with the emotions properly hidden. If Chinese persons
find themselves in circumstances which cannot be changed, they must simply avoid the
potential for conflict. Mr. Huang, for example, told Jim:

\[(4.38)\]

H: The Chinese is, my country not so, everything not so, not so open. We always
keep the thing in our heart, on our mind. So maybe when we heard something we
always think about that, and say oh or something. We don't react too much.

This common pattern of language use reflects the social meaning that being a member of
Chinese society which includes the need to be low key and non-confrontational.

The 4 Chinese participants come from Taiwan and are within the ages of 21-28.
They have experienced university life in Taiwan and were embarking on study in an
American university. The Chinese students' sense of social identity was largely governed
by traditional Chinese values after they have arrived in the U.S. even if they were exposed
to the different schooling experiences which they found here such as small classrooms,
small group work, and the potential for nonconformity in a class setting. Data analysis
revealed a strong pattern of seeking conformity within the group among the 4 Chinese
participants. Peng, for example, complained to Jim that the interests of the Chinese
community have priority over the interests of the Chinese individual. Peng stated,

\[(4.39)\]

P: I think in Chinese society if you are too special, somebody will pull you down.
Yeah, especially in your work, in your working environment. It is easy to see that
if you want to be very special, you are easily to be scold. So, people won't try to
special... I think if Bill Gates he, he goes to Taiwan, and he stay in a big company,
he is not easy to stand, to stand out.
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As long as the individual puts the interests of the community ahead of his own, Peng felt that there was no chance for any one person to stand out above the rest.

The following data sets reveal how the 4 Chinese participants’ feelings, thoughts, and actions were influenced by other members of their society. In one way, the Chinese students’ sense of group conformity can be thought of as a force that is more powerful than the solitary individual. This force influenced patterns of second language use that were employed by the 4 Chinese participants.

The first examples focused on the sense of social identity they manifested in the data. For example, Peng communicated to Marianne how everybody works in Taiwan:

(4.40)

P: In Taiwan if we open our stores at 10 o’clock, maybe we will close at midnight. → It’s common because I think, maybe it’s because the people working as a team. Chinese people, they are more, they want to, maybe they want to get more money. So, they will enlarge their working time. So lots of stores they open very, very late. And once I go with my American friends to the night stores. Maybe they sell Chinese food, or maybe ice-cream or a lot of small cakes. And these two Americans they are very, very excited because they say, “We have no night activity in America.” But they say in Twain we can, even 24 hours a day, we can get everything. We can easily to buy everything because a lot of stores, they open 24 hours.

M: The only place I know where that is is Meijer’s.

Peng’s main concept of Chinese people is that they like to work as a team. The statement that “the Chinese work as a team” because “they like to make more money” revealed Peng’s understanding of his identity. Group conformity can be beneficial to all members of the group if they unite to achieve a common goal (e.g., make more money). Peng even supported his idea by using a personal anecdote about two of his American friends who were impressed with the way the Chinese in Taiwan operated their markets,
and the fact that there was no such activity in the U.S. where they come from. It is as if
he was inviting Marianne to go to Taiwan to see how wonderful their markets were to
which Marianne said, “I like to see that.” Peng was so adjusted to the idea of group
conformity he believed that it is necessary for success in the business world.

The second transcript came from Huang’s interaction with Fiona. In this
transcript, Huang was talking about how his class as a group of Asian students was very
important to him in the early stages of his studies in the United States. Huang and his
classmates have established the practice of having a lunch box during the school day.
Because they lived in the dorms, it was difficult for them to cook. Therefore, Huang as a
member of the group volunteered to cook lunch for them. He deliberately cooked more
than he needed, so he could share with the other members of his class who were unable to
cook by themselves. Huang dutifully packed the cooked food in plastic containers and put
these in his backpack. At lunch break, he offered these “lunch boxes” to his Korean,
Japanese, and Chinese classmates. Huang’s strong sense of community and his
identification with his classmates as his new community was evident in his interactions
with Fiona:

(4.41)
F: What do you cook? What kind of things do you cook?
H: Oh, just like, usually rice maker =
F: Ok.
H: = and, and just fry like meat, or chicken something, and maybe fry that together =
F: Sounds good.
H: mix *vegets (vegetables), [ mix =
F: [ Sounds good., ha.... ]
H: → Ha..., and everyday, because, I eat lunch with my classmates, =
F: Ok.
H: = so, and they are Korean and Indonesia, and they, they always eat, maybe that’s not easy to them to cook everyday, because they are live in dormitory.
F: Ok.
H: So, everyday I always prepare the food more than I can eat, and share them.
F: That’s nice.
H: Uhn-ha.... We, we are very good friends. I, I feel, maybe we just know each other for two months, but maybe not two months, one month, two months, but I, we like each other, and, and now this quarter over, we fear we could stay, uha..., yes, maybe they will back to their country, back to Korea.
F: Then, you’ll go back.
H: Uhm, I, I will stay here.
F: You will stay?
H: Uhm, I will study university, uhm-ha.... So, I fear they could stay.
F: They are leaving?
H: Yeah. Uhm.

Even for a brief period, Huang and his classmates have formed a small community away from their homes in which they shared food together.

Group conformity has its advantages as well as disadvantages. Its main advantage is that the individual is never left to face the world alone. There is less pressure on the individual because anything can be shared including such personal business as romantic relations. However, it may seem strange from an American perspective to share one’s private secrets with schoolmates. In fact, in Chinese culture where there is a strong sense of community, the concept of privacy, so revered by Americans, is nonexistent. But the reassurance one gets from sharing with others is that it is a kind of psychological support in difficult times. In other words, one is never left to face the world alone. There is always someone who can share the burden and offer support. Linda reported that she felt this in an acute manner when she first came to the United States:
M: So, what do you do besides, uhn, practicing, and studying? Do you do anything for fun?
L: For fun, I think no. Personally not.
M: Not?
L: Because this quarter, I have too many class. I have sixteen credit hours this quarter. It's little more for me, especially for the first quarter, and especially now it's time close to final exam, and every week I have a lot of homework, and I still need to find some time to practice piano every day, and sometimes because I study here alone, I have no other family here. So, I need to figure out all my little problems by myself; for example, take care of my car, or to fill the insurance forms, and anything I will do it. So, sometimes it also spend me a lot of time.

Group conformity can mean giving up one's independence in exchange of the re-assurance of fitting into a group of people who will advise one on a multitude of life-important decisions. The extent to which the group can shape the actions, thoughts, and feelings of individual members was seen in the following transcript. Julia allowed her roommates to tell her what she should do in America, such as "find an American boyfriend." When she found a Japanese classmate who wanted to be a friend with her, she did not know what to do with this new development. Her only recourse was to e-mail her roommates in Taiwan to ask for their suggestions. Besides the fact that this was an interesting use of technology to reinforce one's feeling of group conformity, this episode also revealed how much Julia was dependant on her classmates in making important decisions about her personal choices. She stated that "they know what I am, who I am, and sometimes they can give me some suggestion I can do." Julia's actions were not the results of her own volition. Somebody was in the background, like a puppeteer, pulling strings that could lead one way or another. The case of sacrificing one's privacy in return
for gaining support from others was demonstrated in the following excerpts from Julia’s
interaction with Fiona:

(4.43)

F: Is there something that you like to gain from this experience?
J: Before, when in Taiwan, my roommate talked to me that when you go there,
maybe you have chance to have a boyfriend.
F: Wow!
J: But up to now, I don’t know no one. Maybe I have no chance to get a boyfriend
who is American. But in my pronunciation class there is a Japanese boy. So, I
know he likes me, but I don’t like him. Maybe two days ago, he asked me if I
have time, I can go with him to have a dinner on the weekend. But I say my
cousin will take me outside.

And later in the following interaction with Fiona, Julia mentioned:

(4.44)

F: What kinds of things do you like to do by yourself?
J: What kinds of things? Read, study, and listen to music. Or, just lie down my bed
and think about something that will not happen. But sometimes if I face some
problem I cannot solve it by myself, I will talk with my roommates and they will
give me suggestion. So, I like to talk with them because they are funny, and
because they are older than me. And they know what I am, who I am, so
sometimes they can give me some suggestion I can do. And sometimes they will
tell me about what they think about this thing if it happens to them. And I have
told them about this Japanese man too. So, they just to find someone to talk
about thing, and will give me some suggestion too.
F: Ok, and what did they, what did they tell? What were their suggestion?
J: I have not sent e-mail to them yet.
F: Ok.
J: I wait their e-mail.
F: Ok. (Both laughed).
J: My roommates are interested in this.
F: Your roommates?
J: In Taiwan.
F: In Twain!
J: They want to know the things happened between us. Maybe I will tell them when
I go back, ha....
F: Ok, wow!
Fiona’s question about the kinds of things Julia liked to do by herself was revealing. As a fully socialized member of a culture that emphasizes group conformity, Julia was baffled by the question. She never thought of herself as an independent entity apart from the group. So, after her initial response to the kinds of things she liked to do by herself, she transferred what she knew best “sometimes if I face some problem I cannot solve it by myself, I will talk to my roommates and they will give me suggestions.” It was in the context of talking about her “self” that Julia brought up the fact that “I have told them about this Japanese man, too.” As a fully socialized member of her society, Julia did not see anything wrong with that, but Fiona’s reaction “Wow!” revealed the disparity between the American and Chinese concepts of privacy and its place in the individual’s relation to the community.

From an American perspective, the price of losing one’s privacy and independence of action in exchange for “suggestions” from others seems to be too high. However, this pattern of group conformity was transferred by the 4 Chinese participants to the context of the United States. Their sense of community was embedded even with the chance to be independent and to enjoy their privacy in America. What Julia did with her chance at independence in America was to “keep in touch” through e-mail with her classmate. The following excerpts from Linda’s conversation with Fiona may shed light on what might happen to those brave enough to cut themselves loose from the group:

(4.45)

L: One day, I think it’s, it’s Friday, or Saturday afternoon, uhn, I have nothing to do. → I feel very boring. I want to go out to, and I think, where, where can I go by myself? I think, oh, I think I can take a bike to go to the City Center =
F: Good.
L: Yeah. I can took the No. 2, the bus. I can took a bus go to there. And, I go to there at 3 or, I think 4 o’clock on the afternoon. And I go back about 8 o’clock.
F: Wow!
L: I buy something and I go to the bookstore to find, uhn, some book, uhn, is concern, is about music. I don’t find anything I want to buy. And then, when I, when, when I want to go back, and I, I go through their gate, their entrance *gate =
F: Gate (with a correct /e/ pronunciation).
L: After I go out, yeah, I walk on the road, oh, it is very terrible, you know. Because on the weekend, uhn, the City Center on the downtown, is, there are just few people, and I think it’s strange to, to the citizen. They feel I am a foreign, foreign student, foreign people and I walk on the work, on the road by myself, just single girl, and everybody, I think, as usual, everybody after they, they finish their shopping, they just go to the parking lot to drive their car, and go out, and nobody like me, uhn, walk out, just walking on the road.
F: Right.
L: It seems strange to it, and everybody look at the me, especially, the beggars.
F: Beggars?
L: Yeah, they are beggars, and they, they, try to talk with me, and they tell me, oh, “Please give me money, give me some coins.” At the time, I really fire (afraid), afraid, I just keep, I just keep walking, ha, walk to the bus stop, and then took a bus to go back. After that time, I, I cannot go out by myself, uhm-ha. Yeah, I — think it’s not, it’s not a very good idea if you go out yourself. Because I think, most people in American, they drive =
F: Right. We do drive.
L: They drive to the shop.
F: We do.
L: Yeah, uhn-ha.... (Both laughed).

At the beginning of this transcript, Linda asked herself “Where can I go by myself?” and at the conclusion, she answered, “After that time, I cannot go out by myself. I think it’s not, it’s not a very good idea if you go out yourself.” What happened in the interim was that Linda had such a bad experience going out by herself that she concluded that it was not a good idea to go out by herself again. In other words, her interpretation of the probable cause of the bad experience was not that it was a bad experience but that the bad experience happened to her because she went out by herself. So, her solution was not to
go out by herself anymore to avoid having bad experiences. In the following transcript, Linda rationalized the outcome of her bad experiences by placing the blame on herself for not listening to her friends’ wishes:

(4.46)

L: Uhn, because really, it is my first time to go to Toronto, uhn, I am very excited. I tell time, ah, I want to go, go up to the City-tower, Cn-tower, I want to the Cn-tower’s top to, to in, in, visit it. But my friend, they are, they don’t want to go to there. They, they ever go to, they have already =

F: Been there?

L: Yeah, they have been there, and they say, they were waiting, uhn, me. They tell me, “Ok, I can go there by myself,” but they don’t want to go there again because the ticket is very expensive.

F: Ok.

L: But, when, when I go to there, there are so crowded, too much people there, and I think if I want, if I insist to go up to the tower, it will spend me too much time, maybe I need to wait more than one hour or two hour.

F: Wow!

L: Yeah, too much people, too crowded.

F: Sounds like it.

L: Yeah, because it’s weekend.

F: Right.

L: Yeah. There are many, too much there. And, then I give up, uhn, I think, and it is dinner time, we find the, we find the restaurant to eat it, eat dinner.

F: Wow!

Linda believed that because she did not respect the wishes of her two friends that she unnecessarily went to the Tower where she could not get any enjoyment. So, finally she succumbed to the demands of being a member of a group and let her friends take her to a restaurant they chose to have dinner. She gave up her wish to visit the Tower in favor of a restaurant her friends chose.
In many instances of their talk with the NS participants, the 4 Chinese speakers followed a common pattern of uncritical acceptance of the authority of those members of their community that occupied a higher status in the social/educational hierarchy. The authority figure in Chinese society is the only one who is authorized by society to tell the rest of the members how they should act in society. Decision making is top-down in isolation from those who are the targets of these decisions. Data analysis focused on utterances by the 4 Chinese participants that reflected the authority of parents and teachers toward their children/students. Uncritical acceptance of authority is defined as the acceptance of input from those who are older in age (e.g., father, mother, grandparent), or are better educated (e.g., teacher, school-sister, advisor). This input is given without the need for the authority figure to rationally convince or persuade the recipient of the merits of the decision that was made for them. The advice or decision is always handed in an unambiguous manner to the recipient who believes that the authority figure has his/her best interests in mind. In other words, the advice or decision may be harsh or irrational but the recipient welcomes it because he/she believes that it was given for his/her own sake. Data analysis revealed that there are two distinct subcategories of “uncritical acceptance authority” in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. The 4 Chinese participants displayed an uncritical acceptance of the decisions and advice of those members of their community who were either (a) better educated (e.g., teacher, school sister/brother, advisor, etc.), or (b) older in age (e.g., father, mother, aunt, etc.).
As far as teachers are concerned, the attitudes of the 4 Chinese students who have come to the United States remained governed by traditional schooling practices long after they have arrived in America. The Chinese teacher can encroach on the self-determination of the Chinese student but he does so with the full approval of the community. Moreover, advice given to the student can be understood as clearly in the student’s interest. The Chinese students expect their teacher to be far more learned than they themselves are.

When the Chinese student seeks the teacher’s assistance in a problem, the student expects the teacher to communicate his/her knowledge in a direct and basically unambiguous manner as part of the general value of education. The main reason behind a Chinese students’ uncritical acceptance of the authority of his/her teacher is that the student believes that direction and advice are coming from someone who enjoys higher status, more competence, and knowledge than he/she has. The teacher’s status bestows upon him or her the professional/social licence to use his/her knowledge to advice others.

For example, Peng’s decision to join the Ohio State University was made for him by his teacher who “told” Peng to apply:

(4.47)

F: Do you know anything about the Economics Program at OSU?
P: A little.
F: A little bit?
P: Yeah, my, my undergraduate teacher. He was, ten years ago, he studied here. And now his advisor is still in this university.
F: In Taiwan?
P: No, that advisor, his advisor, eh, Ph.D. advisor is now still in Ohio State University, so he tell me that I can come here.
F: Ok. Do you think you’ll be able to get into the program at OSU?
P: I just apply now. But I don’t know whether I can, I can attend this Fall. Maybe it’s too late.
Peng's undergraduate teacher "told" him that he could come to OSU because he felt responsible for his students' future advancement. Within the Taiwanese context, the continuity of scholars who share the same background and group affiliation shapes the degree of influence and future employment opportunities of members of the same group of academics.

The decisions of the teacher can easily override the parents' wishes, but they still revere his input. In the following interaction between Huang and Jim, Huang explained how a music teacher almost changed his life:

(4.48)

J: Do your parents play cello?
H: No, they just play piano. Cello, originally my parents want me to learn the violin.
J: That's what I thought.
H: You must feel strange. How can I choose a cello, and not choose violin?
J: I think you like cello better.
H: Oh, you being nice. Because when I first time I meet my teacher, he just say, uhm, → "You are too old to play violin." That, that time, I was just maybe ten years old. He say from now until you enter the university just 10 years left. It's not enough. He is so strange. Why it is not enough? But he told me you can play cello.
Because at that time, too many people play violin. Violin play is not enough.
I must have some competition to enter the university.
I: Have you seen your teacher?
H: Teacher?
J: Have you visited that violin teacher (louder) since you went to college?
H: No, no. But that violin teacher became my sister's violin teacher, =
J: So, you have seen him.
H: = Young, younger sister. He just told me I can't study violin, so she study violin. But now she plays very good. My sister play very good.

Not only did the teacher shape Huang's future, but he also determined his sister's.

The parents' role was secondary to the teacher in terms of choosing their children's musical careers.
The uncritical acceptance of the teacher’s authority in Chinese society does not mean that the parents and older siblings have less authority in determining their children’s actions and plans. But it is a different kind of authority which derives from the Chinese cultural concepts of filial piety and fraternal duty which constitute family obligations that can only be fulfilled through obedience and loyalty. The Chinese notion of uncritical acceptance of the authority of one’s parents and older siblings was illustrated in the following transcript from Julia and Marianne:

(4.49)

M: Well, tell me about your family?
J: Father, mother, and two younger brothers.
M: No sister?
J: No sister. That’s great, ha, ha....
M: Ha, ha, you like that?
J: Yeah, very much.
M: Do you? I have two daughters, and they just love each other. They did not always. When they were younger, there were rivalries, you know.
J: I don’t know.
M: You know what’s that? That means arguing, you know, sort of.
J: Aha.
M: But now that they are grown like they are very close. I always wished I had a sister. That’s why I wondered about you.
J: Because my brothers can share my ideas or what I thought, so I think it’s ok.
M: That’s interesting. I mean that’s interesting.
J: And sometimes if I have a problem, I can talk about it with my friends. So, I don’t think it’s a problem.
M: How about, how about your, your parents? When they -
J: Very kind (whispers)
M: Very kind?
J: I love them (louder).
M: Oh, that’s wonderful. That’s, that’s a real blessing to have parents that you love and respect. It really is. Unfortunately, there are families that are not quite so close, you know. Were they strict with you?
On the surface level, the fact that the Chinese adhere to the concepts of filial piety and fraternal duty can lead to a more harmonious co-existence in the Chinese family household than commonly found and expected in a typical American home. But beyond harmony, the authority of parents can determine whose “word” passes and whose wishes get enforced. In a somewhat similar way to the uncritical acceptance of a teacher’s authority, a father’s authority is perceived to be in the son’s or a daughter’s interest. The following excerpt is intended to illustrate the extent to which Julia as a daughter was willing to trust the judgements of her father and his sister:

(4.50)

M: How much, how much did you know about the United States before you came here? Did you always wanna come here? Or, were you forced to come here?
J: Last winter, winter, my aunt go back to my country, and maybe I never thought I will come here because I don’t know. And she told my dad I can go here, come here to learn the English here, and my father said, “You can go, you could go to the U.S. and learn English,” and I say it’s funny (Fun) and I think I can try to learn English here because I don’t think my English is very well, and so I like, I very excited about I can, I can come here to learn English.
M: You did get excited?

The whole decision to come to the U.S. was initiated by Julia’s aunt. It was her idea, and then she talked to Julia’s father who told Julia “You can go” only after which Julia felt excited about the trip. The uncritical acceptance of the father’s authority led Julia to feel that the trip will be beneficial to her, although she had no part in the decision to go in the first instance.

The actual manner with which Chinese parents or other adults may structure their interactions with their sons and daughters may differ from the way American educated white-middle class parents interact with their children. Most reports describing the
linguistic input produced by American parents suggest a "referential-propositional" structure of interaction during the early stages of acquisition (e.g., Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Slobin, 1985). There are grounds for believing that the propositional-referential component of communication is not a major aspect of the culturally-sanctioned Chinese adult input. Without the need to be persuasive, parents and teachers can literally "tell" their children what to do. The aim of the Chinese parent is not to convince his/her child by referential/propositional arguments. Rather, it is to create a sense of spiritual authority, and to establish one's place in the hierarchy of the ancestors. Parents use a sort of evocative language by alluding to shared spiritual beliefs about filial piety and invoking commonly appreciated metaphors and sayings of dignified icons such as Confucius. Such interactions are marked by the child's show of respect and total obedience to the parent with the tacit knowledge that the parent is a representative of the ancestors who deserve to be worshiped. Any dissent can be interpreted by the parent as a sin not only against him/her but also against the spirit of the ancestors which can be avenged in the future through poverty or misery. To keep one's ancestors happy and satisfied, the whole family needs to visit their graves every year. When asked about "Ancestor's Day" by Marianne, Julia said:

(4.51)

M: Do you know Ancestor's Day?
J: We will go to the graveyards where our forefathers live there, and we will take some vegetables or fruits, or something that can be eaten, and some paper money. And we will burn the money for them to use. And the food we will put on the table and we guess they can use the food, and something like this.

M: Does your family do that?
J: Yeah, every year.
M: Every year?
J: About April 5th or 4th.
M: That sounds nice.
J: Uhn-ha.
M: Well it is. To honor your, your forefathers, your ancestors.
J: Do you have something like this?
M: No.
J: No?

Coming from a Chinese background, Julia revealed to the researcher how shocked she was by her “Americanized” cousin’s manner of interacting with his mother:

(4.52)

R: Julia, you have a cousin who also studies at OSU?
J: I have two cousins.
R: Two cousins who study at OSU. Have they been here for a long time?
J: Yeah.
R: Ok, do you find any differences between you because you are from Taiwan? You both study at the college level. So, are there any differences in terms of your personality?
J: Very different.
R: How different?
J: I think maybe we will talk to parents sometimes will not very seriously. Kidding my parents. But the way it is different. Sometimes I will see my cousin make my aunt angry, ha....
R: Ok, you mean the way they talk to their parents is different even they are, of course, Chinese.
J: Uha, because they come here very young.
R: Ok, what about their personality? Do they always think by themselves, you know, like very independent?
J: Maybe. I have two cousins here, right? And one is older than me, yeah. One is younger than me. My older cousin is a little like Chinese, and he will listen to his parents. And if they told him something, he will listen and will do as they say. But they younger, because he come here very young, so he just like American, American. So, he is very different.
R: Ok, we were talking that she has two cousins here. They are Chinese but they came here at different ages. So, I was trying to ask her “Do they behave differently than her?” She mentioned that they treat their parents differently as opposed to us as Chinese.
The cultural context of first language acquisition/socialization can shape not only the manner of interaction between authority figures and children in a society but also the criteria and expectations of its members that they use to judge these interactions. These criteria and expectations can be seen as manifestations of social identity. The language one learns in childhood is not simply a neutral coding system of an objective reality. Rather, each language is a particular expression of a distinctive social identity, and this expression affects the ways in which parents interact with their children. This training is carried out in childhood and is transferred to the L2 during adult second language acquisition.

(c) Dependence (DEP)

In addition to receiving support and suggestions from peers/members of the group, and uncritical acceptance of the authority of adults, a sense of community can be a factor in producing "dependence" on other members of the group. Dependence is defined as the reliance on others in the fulfillment of the needs of the individual as a member of society. One component of sense of community is the recognition of the fact that a member can count on other members of the group to fulfill his/her needs. These needs can be small (e.g., getting a ride) or big (e.g., help with moving, traveling together, etc.). Dependence is related to the degree of imposition an individual member has on others for the fulfillment of his/her needs. One benefit of being dependent is that in exchange for sacrificing one’s privacy and freedom of action, any individual may count on others for the support he/she can get in the performance of a range of social activities. Dependence can
be seen as reciprocity: Through the sharing of concerns comes the sharing of responsibilities and chores that face members of the community as a whole.

A remarkable feature of dependence as found in the available data sets was that it was exhibited by the two female participants more than the two male participants. While this pattern of dependence among the female participants can be related to the cultural expectations towards the two genders, it also can be simply a function of the limitations of the data sets themselves. Even though the data sets were collected systematically and extensively, they remain limited by the fact that the interactions were recorded for only ninety minutes a week. It so happened that these utterances were made in the data sets by the female participants rather than the male participants.

Julia only came for language study during the summer after which she was supposed to return to Taiwan to finish her B.A. in Finance at a university. In the meantime, Julia remained totally dependent upon her family members such as her father, mother, aunt, and cousins. Due to the fact that it was her aunt’s idea to come to the States, the aunt took it on herself to facilitate Julia’s stay in Columbus. Because the aunt lived in an outer suburb of the city, arrangements had to be made for Julia to live near campus (on High Street) and instructed her son to “take care” of Julia who did not have a car or phone. The cousin had an American roommate. After each school day, the cousin would pick Julia up and take her to his place where she, the cousin, and the roommate will watch TV, have dinner, and talk in English. On the weekends, the cousin will take Julia around Columbus for sightseeing, or to his mom’s house where Julia could enjoy a home-cooked meal.
Julia was totally dependent on her cousin and his mom for her well being while in the United States. Julia, in addition, kept in touch with her parents by fax to inform them of the latest developments in her life in the United States. Because international phone rates are higher than the local rates in Taiwan, Julia used the fax to communicate with her parents as the least expensive option. Julia's utterances revealed how dependent she was on her cousin:

(4.53)

R: How did you arrange for the housing here in Columbus?
J: My cousin did everything for me.

And in the following interaction with Marianne, Julia mentioned:

(4.54)

M: Who drives you?
J: My cousin. My cousin do, do anything for me, ha....
M: That's wonderful.
J: He is very, how to say, he is unlucky, I think.

Julia transferred the same pattern of dependence on her brothers to her cousin. In the interactional session between Julia and Marianne, she revealed how she depended on her brothers for cooking meals.

(4.55)

J: Sometimes, maybe, I can say, always, my younger brother will cook for me, so I don't have to worry about that.
M: Did anyone teach you how to cook?
J: I can.
M: You can? =
J: But =
M: = You want, you want your brother's assistance for you.
J: = Yeah, ha.... Maybe they do it better than me.
M: You can, you can do anything you want to, you know.
Julia showed the same pattern of dependence on other male members of her (future) family:

(4.56)

M: Have you traveled in Europe?
J: Europe? No, no. I have not yet but I think when I marry, get married, I will ask my husband to take me to Europe. I very hope I can go to Europe.
M: You want to get married?
J: I will get married, I think, if I find a good man.
M: That’s, that’s good.
J: I think Europe is a very interesting place.
M: It is very interesting.

In conclusion, Julia’s tendency to depend on other male members of her family, although intensified by her experience of coming to America, was transferred from her Chinese experience.

Linda followed the same pattern of dependence on her family members, but she showed growing signs of independence from her parents’ authority. She would rather spend more time with her friends than try to keep in touch with her family in Taiwan.

At the early stage of her stay in the U.S., she had to depend on her parents for financial backing.

(4.57)

L: But you know here I think American living standard is higher than Taiwan and the tuition fee is very high especially now I cannot get any scholarship and my family, my father they support, support me to study here.

Later in the conversation, Linda told Fiona that she relied on her father’s and mother’s moral support:
L: Yeah, my father, he always very kind to me because my father and my mother they worry about me because they didn’t go with me to America. I go to America by myself and they don’t know what is my situation, and they say to find a more safety place to stay.

Linda was in the process of formulating new social relationships with her classmates.

Because she did not have the means to get around the U.S. all by herself, she used a new form of social networking. As the following transcript shows, Linda used her friendship with one of her classmates to hitch a ride to Niagra Falls:

(4.58)

L: Before one month, one of my classmates, her dormitory friends invited her to go to Niagra Falls.

F: Niagra Falls!

L: Yes and she invited me too. And we three people, we drive a car to go to there. It’s very far. We should drive more than six hours one way.

F: How long did you stay there?

L: Two nights.

F: This short.

L: A weekend. Oh, but it’s very tired when we drive. It’s a long distance driving.

F: Yes. That six hours is a lot of driving.

L: Yeah. It’s very far away from here.

After returning from her weekend trip to Canada, she decided to inform her parents who got used to receiving a long distance call from their daughter every weekend.

But she explained to Fiona that she did not tell them about the trip because they would have disagreed. So, she decided to inform them after the trip.

(4.59)

(4.60)
to there. They say, “Oh, you never, you never, you have not much experience drive, to drive the car on America.” They think it’s a long way to drive to Niagra Falls from Columbus.

F: So, they were sounding a little bit worried.
L: Yeah, but I tell them “No. I finish it.” I am very safety, don’t worry.

Unlike Julia, Linda was going through a transition in her dependence pattern. From total dependence on her parents as the only source of support and help, she was venturing out, formulating new relationships, which were becoming meaningful in her experience of living in the United States.

(d) Referencing (REF)

Referencing is defined as the verbal act of preceding an utterance with the plural pronoun “they” followed by the verb “say.” The main reason for including this pattern within the subgroup of sense of community is the use of the collective pronoun “they” as a warrant for adding credibility to what one wants to say. The lack of specificity of the pronoun “they” serves to indicate that people seem to agree with the speaker’s contentions. It also serves to alleviate the speaker’s responsibility for the truth value of his/her own words by placing it instead on a hypothetical entity of people. Without the need to be specific about the source of information, Chinese speakers can employ “referencing” at will in their discourse to back up the credibility of their claims.

This pattern of using language in everyday interaction was commonly shared by the 4 Chinese participants. It was transferred to their L2 speech during their interactions with the English native-speaking participants. Referencing indicated the 4 Chinese participants’ sense of community in that they employed it as a common way of preceding their claims. They all seemed to believe that if a lot of people agreed with what they were saying, then
their listeners too will agree. Moreover, the 4 Chinese speakers did not seem to realize that the idea that what they were referencing might be questioned by their listeners.

The following example illustrates this point:

(4.61)

P: I bought the corn. I feel their corn is expensive. Two dollars for one corn.
J: For one piece.
P: But I know the corn, they grow the corn, not for them, they are for animals.
J: So, why did you eat it?
P: Because I feel interested. A lot of people buy the corn, and I like to eat the corn. Because in Taiwan we have two different kinds of corn. One is for we can eat, but another is for animals. And I know the Ohio corn is not for people to eat.
J: I don’t know what you ate. What makes you say that it wasn’t for people?
P: It’s kind of different, different classes.
J: Because of what you know it’s a different class?
P: → I don’t know but I heard about that because when I studied the agriculture economics.
J: Alright.
P: They say American corn some are for, for just animals, because they, they are hard and what we eat is more soft.
J: But my question was how do you know it was for animals rather than for people?
P: I don’t know. I cannot tell.

But when Peng talked about a topic that he knew Jim found hard to believe, he attempted to disassociate himself from the source.

(4.62)

P: I heard one thing, maybe if you have a big problem, your physical problem they will say, “Ok” in front of your rooms, do you have a tree, you know. Is there a tree in front of your rooms? You know they say if you just cut the tree, your difficult disease will get relief, you know. So, it is very strange. Why does this tree connected to your disease? It’s very strange. So, their suggestion sometimes you don’t feel it is very logical.
J: Do they justify or they just tell you?
P: They just tell you, and they did not give any explanation.
J: I see.
In interactions between Chinese persons, referencing is unnoticed and does not, therefore, undergo the same kind of scrutiny. In one ethnographic observation in a restaurant, Jim was party to the conversation. His attempts at rationally assessing the source of information were not directly acknowledged by the two Chinese participants:

(4.63)

L: → I heard that in Twain, especially central part and southern part, most people believe in the democratic party. Is it true?
P: Yeah, in the southern part =
L: Is it true? I don’t know.
J: = Who said that?
P: = That’s, that’s true.
L: That’s true.
P: Because once I lived in Kaohsiung. You know Kaohsiung’s people. My friend told me even the Chinese immigrants from China. They say that our ruling party, Kuo-Ming Don, they never care about the people who live in the south part of Taiwan. They say in the southern part, people have a strong idea to oppose the government. It is true because I live in Kaohsiung for two years. I heard about that.

Peng’s support to Linda was triggered by Jim’s inquiry about the source of information. He said, “It’s true because I live in Kaohsiung for two years. I heard about that.”

In effect, Peng’s answer confirmed the referencing without the need to be specific about who started the rumor in the first place. Jim’s attempts at being specific about the source of information is a typically American approach (i.e., trust but verify). These attempts were unnerving to his Chinese partners. The idea of critically evaluating their sources never crossed their mind. Primarily led by an uncritical acceptance of authority, they did not feel the need to question the credibility of the group. As Jim asked Peng, “Do they justify or they just tell you?” Peng’s answer was that “they just tell you, they did not give you any explanation.”
In sum, the 4 categories of (a) group conformity, (b) uncritical acceptance of authority, (c) dependence, and (d) referencing advance our understanding of the 4 Chinese participants' "sense of community." By emphasizing the interests of the community over those of the individual, the Chinese participants followed patterns of language use that indicated their conformity to the group, their uncritical acceptance of authority, their dependence on other members of their community, and their referencing of what other members "could" have said as a support to what they were saying in their interactions with the 3 English native-speaking participants.
B. Cultural Beliefs

This section explores some aspects of the Chinese belief system as they were represented, discussed, and accounted for by the 4 Chinese participants. These cultural beliefs have their main value in socializing the individual through the messages and meanings that are implicitly conveyed through talk, discourse, and customary practice of Chinese people. Although Taiwan, like the rest of the Asian nations, has been undergoing rapid modernization, the beliefs shown by the 4 Chinese participants, who are college educated and socialized members of Taiwanese society, have been molded by their families and the larger society.

The data analysis showed that the 4 Chinese participants have, to varying degrees, constructed multi-layered “webs of significance” (Geertz, 1973) around three main Chinese cultural beliefs: predestination, fortune and opportunity, and spiritual masters. The analysis focused, therefore, on the ways in which these cultural beliefs were articulated by the 4 Chinese participants during the study. The analysis aimed to show that an understanding of these traditional cultural beliefs is part of understanding the discourse transfer phenomena in the 4 Chinese participants’ English. The different beliefs were connected and rendered as a coherent cultural system that captures the 4 Chinese participants’ world view. The links and relationships that were established in the analysis show the embeddedness of these beliefs in shaping the world view of these 4 socialized members of one Chinese culture, Taiwan.

The analysis task made it necessary for the researcher to detach herself from her Taiwanese culture in order to approach the analysis of this group of beliefs in an objective
manner. While recognizing certain unavoidable subjectivity, the researcher categorized these beliefs in a new synthesis so as to render them comprehensible to readers, particularly non-Chinese readers. The following summary describes these beliefs generically (i.e., as they are held by a large number of Chinese people). This task was done to give the reader an advance organizer of these beliefs. The subsequent analyses focused on how the participants articulated these beliefs in the L2 interactional context.

**A Summary of the Three Beliefs and How They Are Related**

While the following sets of beliefs were all articulated by the 4 Chinese participants on various occasions in their interactions with the English-speaking participants, the pursuant relationships between them were established by the researcher during the process of data analysis. One outcome of the analysis was to reach the underlying structures that unify a seemingly disparate number of beliefs and social practices, and to render them in an understandable diagram as they have been expressed through the 4 Chinese participants’ perspectives. The data analysis resulted in a schematic diagram (Figure 4.3) that shows how the researcher organized the 3 Chinese beliefs in a cohesive manner. The diagram was organized around the three central ideas in the Chinese belief system. First, the left box encompasses the first central idea on predestination (Ming), including fate, the life cycle, the relevant social practices of “Ba-Zi,” and “holding a chopstick.” Second, the central box encompasses the belief in fortune and opportunity (Yun) and is divided into two sections: (a) harmony in external surroundings which includes Feng-Shui theory and the practical application of Feng-Shui in the selection of a site for the family graveyard, and (b) strengthening the inner-self which is included in two parts. The first part is energy
Figure 4.3: A Schematic Display of the 4 Chinese Participants' Cultural Belief System
“Chi” restoration and the three practical steps to balance energy: meditation, Chi-Gong, and Yin-Yang balance in food, and the second part is two energy remedial practices: wearing a ring and Chinese traditional medicine. Finally, the left box encompasses the role of spiritual masters and is divided into two parts: (a) mediums including monks, palm readers and Yin-Yang eyes, and (b) historical figures including Guan-Gong and Chu-Yuan. It should be recognized that the diagram was not intended as a definitive description of the overall Chinese belief system. Rather, it was intended as a “conceptual map” that represented how the 3 central Chinese beliefs were manifested in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech.

The three most central ideas from the participant’s perspectives were (a) the belief in predestination (“Ming” in Chinese), (b) the concomitant belief in human beings’ ability to improve life through fortune and opportunity (“Yun” in Chinese), and (c) the belief in the role of spiritual masters who can be divided into two categories: (1) mediums who can mediate between “Ming” and “Yun” by attaining high spiritual powers that can break away from the human physical limitations of time and space and look backward in the past or forward into the future, and (2) historical figures who stand for certain desirable attributes such as knowledge, justice, loyalty, etc. These historical figures are revered by the Chinese as role models that need to be respected and commemorated on a regular basis.

(a) Predestination (“Ming”)

In Chinese philosophy, life and death move in a largely predetermined pattern. The Chinese view to life and death resembles an ever progressive motion toward a predetermined goal. There is little that the individual can do to alter his/her fate.
Moreover, life and death are not viewed as static poles or distinct realms. In fact, they are often considered by the Chinese to be different sides of the same coin, so to speak. Life and death are relative terms which may stand for the same thing depending on the partial view from which they are seen. In other words, they are processes of the same phenomenon that can be seen as the unchanging flow of being in successive stages of existence. This leads the Chinese to have a dialectical style of thinking about life and death which differs from a western way of thinking that tends to be more dichotomous toward, for example, night and day as distinct from each other or life and death as opposite states of being and non-being.

(b) Fortune & Opportunity ("Yun")

The second belief is more hopeful in that it carries the element of "Yun" or opportunity. Along with the limitations of the predetermined cycle of life and death comes the chance to improve one's present life. This belief is based on the concept of life energy ("Chi") and the interrelationships between "Yin" and "Yang," the negative-positive, feminine-masculine, passive-active, cold-hot forces and characteristics of matter. "Chi" is believed by the Chinese to exist in all living things. It is invisible but alive and circulates continuously within the living human body. One can strive to achieve a higher state of being - a spiritual balance that can transcend the eternal cycle of life and death by (a) being one with nature (harmony), and (b) reaching a state of spiritual balance within oneself (mind-body-spirit). One has to learn the source of energy "Chi" in oneself and in physical surroundings, and to channel it to achieve balance and harmony. To correct any imbalance between Chi and the other circulatory systems in the body, one needs to
stimulate or regulate the flow of Chi to avoid bodily malfunctions and disease. Chinese people believe in making a variety of efforts to contribute to their own physical, spiritual, and mental balance. These efforts are applied to the external as well as the internal causes of imbalance, and can be classified into (a) making the external "surroundings" conducive to personal growth and development, and (b) self-strengthening in order to correct any internal imbalances in the body's overall harmony.

(c) Spiritual Masters: Mediums & Historical Figures

The third component of the Chinese belief system is the role of spiritual masters (i.e., mediums and historical figures). Many Chinese believe in spiritual mediums because they are perceived to act as agents who can negotiate and bridge the gap for the Chinese people between their predestination (Ming), and the continuous effort to improve the energy drive in this life (Yun). In Chinese, the spiritual masters are called "specialists in the theory of destiny." When a Chinese person goes to see a medium, he/she will ask about both the "Ming" and "Yun" of his/her life. Through their close knowledge of the spiritual and material worlds, these mediums can suggest the ways that can bring about the desired improvements in others' lives. The spiritual mediums who are able to move between predestination (Ming) and the current life struggle (Yun) take various forms in Chinese culture. They work as monks, palm readers, and Feng-Shui masters.

In addition to mediums, Chinese historical figures act as role models to ensure the moral development of society that is passed on from generation to generation. These historical figures symbolize certain desirable qualities such as justice, patriotism, honesty, and so on. This moral dimension constitutes an integral component of the Chinese
character in a way similar to many African and Native American cultures. In sum, the role of these spiritual masters (either as mediums or historical figures) is recognized by many Chinese people as valued and respected.

Table 4.2 offers a summary of the 3 cultural beliefs mentioned by the Chinese participants in the interactional sessions and shows the frequency and the percentage of the cultural beliefs found in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF USE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predestination &quot;Ming&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune &amp; Opportunity &quot;Yun&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Masters (SP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Summary of Chinese “Cultural Beliefs”

Out of a total of 31 occurrences of “cultural beliefs,” “fortune and opportunity” (Yun) ranked first, occurring 14 times or 45.16% of the total performance in this category. “Predestination” (Ming) ranked second with 10 times or 32.26% of the total performance in this category. “Spiritual masters” (SP) ranked third, occurring 7 times which amounted to 22.58% of the total performance within this category. The following 3 sections are devoted to an exploration of how the 4 Chinese participants articulated and accounted for the three main beliefs presented above.
A. Participants’ Perspectives on Predestination ("Ming")

(a) Fate

The first belief is in predestination. Peng expressed the Chinese view to life as being an ever progressive motion toward a predestined goal that does not stop with death on earth. The view to life as moving in a circular and continuous way is shown in his perspective that a person’s life is not determined by choice, but is rather governed by a fate that a person has to live through. Any attempt by the person to resist or get away from his/her fate is seen as fruitless by Peng because, according to him, no matter how hard a person tries to get out of his/her preassigned fate, that person will eventually fulfill his predetermined role in life. Peng stated his beliefs to Jim in the following interaction:

(4.64)

P: They say your fate is destined. You cannot change your fate.
J: But that’s what the, this religion says?
P: Yeah, it is religious. They say your fate is limited, and we are under the guidance about our fate. Maybe why I will come here is destined. Everything was decided.
→ Maybe you feel this I create! No. In America, you say I will and I would and I could, but in China, we don’t think that way. We say everything we do is destined. It is decided, not we choose, you know. We have no choice. What the path we walk, it’s is all determined.
J: I am sorry, what?
P: What the road we walked are all determined. We have no choice.
J: Don’t some Chinese people think that they have the power to make some changes? I mean don’t they feel as if they are controlling what they do? You see my meaning?
P: I can understand but they say that fate is destined. Maybe we are just under this Gwan (fate). So, you, when you play, no matter how you go, you are just under, you are restricted under this Gwan. You know, you cannot go out of this Gwan. You know, if you do all your ability, you will get a lot of trouble, and finally you will come back to this Gwan. You know what I mean. So, this is your fate. This path is your fate. It’s determined.
J: I see what you’re saying. I am trying to ask the question in a better way. So, somebody feels that..., there is some Chinese person who feels that he or she is making some change. This feeling is just, uhn, an illusion, right? You see what I am saying?

P: Yeah, they are good. It’s an illusion.

According to Peng, the predetermined life cycle resists individual, subjective changes which would interfere with the natural cycle of life and death.

(b) The Position of Holding Chopsticks

The general feeling of helplessness in the face of an unchangeable reality has led the Chinese people to believe in other equally unchangeable realities and to link them to certain predictions that cannot be altered. A mundane example of the absolute force of predestination in daily life can be found in how Linda perceived the relative distance of holding one’s chopstick in predicting how far they will be away from their family.

This interaction took place at a Chinese restaurant in Columbus. The researcher left the recorder working while Linda was talking to Jim:

(4.65)

L: People say, if you are old, if you used to use the chopstick and hold it a long distance, you know this means, it is possible for you to go, to go to some country, to go out along distance. For example, I am, I am the long distance chopstick user, and then now I go to America.

J: Does that mean you will never get close to your parents?

L: Some people (are) used to the chopstick in the middle. But, you know. But it is just a tale, you know. It’s just a tale story, not, not really. But you know, now, if we think of it in a different way, I think the people who use the chopsticks at a long distance have more wisdom. Why do you do that? To spend less energy. Yeah, you use a long distance is more efficient. If you use this way (She puts her fingers close to chopstick), it is difficult, right? And if use this way, it is more easy, right? So, don’t change your style if you use in the middle. Please keep it.
(c) **Ba-Zi**

The belief in predestination governs a Chinese person’s choice of a future spouse. The method of matching couples for the purpose of marriage is very old in Chinese society and culture, but it is still known by the participants. For example, Julia explained to Marianne how Chinese parents rely on “Ba-Zi,” a method of calculating the compatibility of couples by matching aspects of their biographical data, to give their approval of their sons’ or daughters’ choices for marriage.

(4.66)

J: When a man and a woman want to get married, their parents will get their “Ba-Zi.” This means their birthdate including the year, month, and day of birth. They will then match make the two, the birth of the two people to see if they fit together, match together.

M: Match, that is a good word.

J: And if it is not, maybe their parents will think that they will not have a good marriage, and so sometimes their parents will not allow them to get married. Because maybe they will fight together, or just the woman will bring bad fortune for the husband.

The utterances made by Linda and Julia express how the belief in the life cycle shapes the social practices of “holding a chopstick” and “Ba-Zi,” the conventional way of matchmaking in Taiwan even to this day.

(d) **The Continuity of The Life Cycle**

Peng is a true believer in the Chinese concept of predestination. In his interactions with his American roommate, Peng was surprised to learn that Americans did not believe in the concept of the continuity of the life cycle. When Peng had a conversation with Jim, he attributed this to a religious difference.
P: I talked to my roommate. He doesn’t believe that if you do good in the present life, you can get benefit from your next generation. He doesn’t believe that. He just believes that Christian religion tells you if you do good now, you can go to paradise. But in Buddhist (thinking), we believe that if you do good now, next generation, you will be a good man. So, sometimes it is religious difference.

J: Where does he come from?

P: He’s an American. So, he has no idea of the life cycle. So, he does not believe that. So, sometimes it is very different thing from the west and east I found. But my friends from Korea and Japan they believe that life will recycle.

J: Yeah, there is nothing really like that in Christianity.

Peng’s concept of the nature of life and death and the connection between them which is different from his American roommate can be attributed to the difference in world view that each side holds of the role of choice and predetermination in life and death.

B. Participants’ Perspectives on Fortune & Opportunity (“Yun”)

Faced with the unchangeable nature of predestination in the Chinese belief system, Chinese people equally believe in the possibility of altering their predestinated fate. The Chinese word for these concepts is “Ming-Yun” which is a compound noun indicating the inseparability of fate and opportunity from each other. This word demonstrates the dialectical view the Chinese hold of the world as distinguished from the dichotomous view that most westerners have of the world in separate entities (e.g., life vs. death, day vs. night). The Chinese belief in “Yun” (opportunity) was manifested in the participants’ perspective in two main ways: (a) making “surroundings” conducive to personal growth and development, and (b) inner-self strengthening in order to correct any internal imbalances in the body’s overall harmony.
(a) **Making Surroundings Conducive to Personal Growth and Development:**

(1) **Feng-Shui Theory**

Feng-Shui is the basic Chinese way of making natural surroundings conducive to personal growth and development. In Chinese, Feng means the wind, while Shui means water. Feng-Shui theory aims to achieve a balance between these elements in living or working environments, so they do not contradict each other. An imbalance will be reflected on the people who inhabit these dwellings in terms of bad health or financial loss. If, on the other hand, things and surroundings are correctly ordered right according to Feng-Shui theory, this will have positive effects on the inhabitants' well-beings and financial security. Feng-Shui arrangements can range from major decisions (i.e., the choice of the location of a house, office, company, ancestors' graveyard, etc.) to small decisions (i.e., the arrangement of furniture, plants in a house, etc.). The main purpose is to achieve "harmony" in the surroundings, which in turn will influence the residents' health, prosperity, continuity of "offspring," and harmonious relations with family members or colleagues in a company. In other words, the Chinese believe that their surroundings should be full of good circulation with no sharp edges or imbalances in the flow of energy, so their health, careers, and home life will be harmonies. In his interaction with Jim, Peng described how he was pleasantly surprised to watch a T.V. program in which an American family adopted Feng-Shui ideas to rearrange their home. In contrast to his reaction toward his roommate's disbelief in the cycle of life, Peng felt reassured that, in Feng-Shui, there was something that both Chinese and American cultures can agree upon:
P: We say, “Feng-Shui.” I heard in the, on the television. And maybe two or three weeks ago =

J: Geographic location?

P: = Yeah, but, now. there is an English man, they say “Feng-Shui” translated name, English name. They, I heard they, they use a spell meaning, they say “Feng-Shui.” And maybe two or three weeks ago, I heard on the 20/20. It’s a, it’s a, it’s a program, television program, and they, they have investigated some of American families, and they talk about the Chinese “Feng-Shui.” And they adopt the Feng-Shui ideas into their families, and they will, they will relocate their, their settings, home settings, and they, they maybe come from Chinese people’s idea.

J: Were the ideas that the American family used the same as the Chinese ideas?

P: Yeah, yeah.

J: Oh, really?

P: Maybe they say, if, when you go into your room, your doors, you open your doors, you had better not to see your restroom or kitchen, you know. =

J: Alright.

P: = If you see, if you open your doors, you see the kitchen, maybe you will get fat, you know.

J: Uhn-ha. Get fat?

P: Yeah. But, but everyday you come home, you see is kitchen, and you want to eat something, yeah. And everyday you come home, you can, you, you see the restroom, you want to go to the restroom, so you maybe your stomach will have a problem. Yeah, so, they, they, they say you can adjust your, your building, if you have, if you see the kitchen, when you open up, maybe you can, eh, between your, your door and kitchen, you may set some glass and that will block the, the two different site, you know.

J: To distinguish.

P: Yeah, to distinguish, yeah. So, it is, we say “Feng-Shui” in, in Chinese.

J: What, what does that mean, the word? Uhn?

P: Feng, Feng is the wind or air, Shui is the water. In the old times, the wind and the water will, they affect our daily lives. In the old times, you know, every day the, the wind will, they affect our daily life, so we combine these two words. They are all vital to our daily lives.

(2) The Location of a Graveyard

Another example of practicing Feng-Shui is choosing the location of a graveyard site for one’s Chinese ancestors. The choice of the location of a graveyard originally stems from the concept of “filial piety.” The Chinese believe that they need to carefully
prepare their ancestors’ funeral rituals in accordance with the Chinese tradition, including choosing a final resting place for their ancestors. The Chinese always commemorate their ancestors and continue to honor their family traditions. It is believed by Chinese people that the “right” choice of a graveyard has a positive impact not only on the present life, but also on the future generations of the family. In order to achieve this goal (i.e., the right choice of the location of a graveyard), the theory of “Feng-Shui” is used to help the Chinese people make the right choice of a graveyard site for their ancestors. In Linda’s conversation with Jim, she made the following remarks and observations:

(4.69)

L: Yeah, uhn, and I, I ask the shop owner (funeral home employee) and I’m talk to him, uhn, because in, in Chinese opinion, we, my father or my mother they, uhn, are Chinese, we always very, uhn, we say, “The ground, the patient is very important to your family future.” Yeah, and I ask him, “Are they famous American, here?” He say, “Yeah.”

J: He did?

L: He say, “Yes.” [But sometimes = ]

J: They didn’t know.

L: = ha.., you don’t care, uhn-ha..

J: No, I didn’t know. I didn’t know. Do you mean the location?

L: Yeah, the buried, buried ground location. And he say, “But sometimes because it is about, it’s the government, uhn, policy problem,” yeah. We can’t, we can’t, uhn, it’s, it’s impossible if you want to buy the ground and it is illegal.

J: To buy it?

L: The ground. To bury your died family =

J: To bury them?

L: = Uhm, bury them.

J: Oh, I see.

L: Yeah, to bury your, your died family. The ground must be legal, too.

You know, you know in Taiwan, uhn, we say the best location is, must be near the mountain or the river, the water, uhn-ha...

Peng further mentioned one example of how the second richest man in Taiwan chose a “dragon son” location for his family’s graveyard to enhance his success in the business
world. Peng's statement becomes understandable if we know that in Chinese "dragons" stand for royalty. Only an emperor could adorn his clothes with the drawing of a dragon. So, a grave in a "dragon son" location represents the highest possible status for one’s departed relatives. It also signifies prosperity and success for one’s next generations.

(4.70)

P: We say, "Dragon son." You know, you know, in Taiwan, uhn, most, maybe the second richest man, their, their ancestor is located in the dragon son.
J: Oh, where is the dragon son? Is it a special place or is this-?
P: Dragon, we mean in the old time, he is a kingdom. They represent a kingdom. Eh, king, yeah. So, they believe, we, we say, your ancestor will, will care of you, uhn-ha..., eh. It is helpful to, to his family. Yeah.

Linda asked Jim, her American interlocutor, whether he believed in the desirability of choosing a suitable location for one’s family grave site. Jim, however, tended toward accepting whatever made sense to him and rejecting those elements that did not fit his notion of "common sense.”

(4.71)

L: Do, uhn, how do you think about the profession, the ground profession, do you believe this? He-ha....
J: Something about it makes sense. I mean, for example, if you choose some place that is very low, or in, in that area, rain spouts could be quite dangerous.
L: Uhn.
J: Uhn, or if you choose some place that is very high, but the ground is soft, maybe the building will fall down, because maybe this building is heavy.
L: Uhm, one thing, uhn, I want, I want to know, uhn, that American they believe that, the good ground location is helpful, will helpful to their family.
J: No.
L: No? [Maybe = That’s not. ] I am sorry, maybe?
L: = Maybe next generation.
J: I don’t think so. If they are religious. No, people are independent, in some sense, they are independent from each other and if they are religious or they believe in that, that each person has a soul then that’s the thing you must
cultivate. Where you put the body is, is not relevant to, to the future of the family. Uhn, I’m not saying it’s true, but I’m saying that’s what they believe in general. If you just look at some American, what does this person believe about, where I, where he or she buries the dead people in the family, my feeling is the main thing that is required is to respect the person in some sense, that’s all. And all that means is that you don’t let the dogs eat the body or you don’t, you, you must respect the body, prepare the body and bury the body or destroy it or burn it. But, uhn, where you actually put it after the person has been prepared is not important for the history of the family. And, basically, it has to be clean and isolated from some place that, isolated from, so, there won’t be any disease created from the, the body. That’s all.

Compared to the 4 Chinese participants, the American native speakers did not express interest in all spiritual matters as life after death. Marianne, for example, when asked by Julia whether she regularly visited her ancestors’ graves, in the context of talking about Ancestor’s Day, expressed a lack of knowledge and interest in “spirits.”

(4.72)

J: Do you have something like this?
M: No.
J: No?
M: We have cemeteries. But I never feel like they are there, you know, their, their spirits. Do you know spirits?
J: Spirit?
M: A spirit. Like a soul, soul. S-O-U-L. =
J: I know soul.
M: = You know, now, their body is gone. They lived their lives. Their spirit is, is gone for a while, some place, but not in the cemetery. That’s the way I feel about it. So, the last time I went to the cemetery, I couldn’t, I couldn’t find their graves. I just couldn’t find them. There are too many of them, uhn-ha....
J: Too many, yeah.

(b) Inner-Self Strengthening:

In addition to their attempts to bring harmony with nature, the Chinese believe in the need to live in harmony with oneself. Like Feng-Shui, the concept of energy (“Chi”) equally applies to a Chinese person’s efforts to achieve a balance from within.
The Chinese believe in the concept of “Chi,” energy which is the circulation in the body. If the “Chi” is circulated well inside the body, the body will be in a healthy condition. Peng explained the concept of “Chi” to Jim as follows:

P: Sometimes they feel that the Chi, you know, is like a vessel. They circle your whole body, so you, if your, your Chi, is blocked, you know, so you can, if you they blocked, maybe just in your left, left hand, so you, your left hand maybe, maybe have trouble, you can use your right (xx). So if you, if you make this blocked, if you open this, this gap, you can let your Chi circle smoothly, you know.

J: So, how, how do you open it? You by pressure or by this way?

P: No, maybe just by to learn the, to learn how to exercise, =

J: Uhn, ok.

P: = Eh, exercise your Chi inside your body, heh. It will relieve your pain.

In order to improve the “Chi” inside the body, the Chinese participants share the belief that the following practices can improve their Chi: (a) meditation to balance the energy of the body and enhance inner peace, (b) practicing a combination of “Chi-Gong” drills to facilitate the circulation of “Chi,” and (c) balancing daily food intakes according to Yin-Yang principles.

(a) Meditation

Peng explained to Marianne how “meditation” helped him reach spiritual inner peace by channeling the energy inside his body:

M: What did they do when they meditate exactly? I mean what is the purpose of this meditation?

P: Oh, I have practiced one, eh, three months. And first, when you begin to practice the Zen, you just, you know they tell you the basic, basic method, you just sit and
you don’t have to think about anything, and the, at the first time, you will feel, your mind has a lot of confused thinking. They will interfere you, and in your mind, and if you after one or two weeks, you can feel that you, you, you close your eyes, but you can exercise your mind.

M: Oh, it’s like your mental focus.

P: Yeah, you can concentrate your mind, and, and if you have one, one week, one month later, you will feel, you are easily, first you, you are not easily to get, and we don’t mot-, eh, motionless, but one month later, you feel it is easy, to get, to get half an hour and you don’t, you haven’t, you won’t move. And you can just sit there. And you will feel you are very calm, and you will feel like your, the blood inside your body, they smooth, they cycle. =

M: It’s a blood cycle.

P: = Yeah, smooth, very smoothly. And you will feel that your spirit are very good.

M: So, in the face of pressure and your life in general, when you meditate, you maintain your sanity, your mental focus, and so on.

P: And, if I was a, when I was a student, I feel it will change my behavior, you know. I feel more calm, and more, I, I, I won’t do things very rudely. I can think because, because I, I train myself to, to do things more, more slow, you know. It will totally change myself.

M: You mean like you are more focused more, more, uhn, calm down that you are not like always, uhn, nervous, and angry, =

P: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

M: = so you are always taking life one step at a time. So, you are slower than most people, but that does not mean that, you know, you’re losing your focus or that you are out of touch with, with life.

Marianne demonstrated more interest in the subject of meditation than in that of visiting a graveyard. Meditation, for her, may be more consistent with the American belief in the “pursuit of happiness” than the subject of departed relatives.

(b) Chi-Gong

Linda pointed out the benefits of practicing “Chi-Gong” as one form of exercise of improving the “Chi” inside her body. One benefit that Linda perceived was that Chi-Gong could even cure cancer. She explained this benefit to Jim as follows:
In China, I know, some, uhn, there are some, some people. I think we, we can say them doctor, uhn, but they can help their customer. Some people sick, they can help their customer by some on visit, visiting special technique. I don’t know how to say that in English. Chi-Gong, you know. Chi now is become an American word. C-H-I, is a power inside your, you, it’s energy inside your body. It’s a kind of energy. And we cannot see, see where it is, but they say, it is really, it’s just around your body and it’s very strange. Some people they, maybe they, they have cancer, and they cannot, uhn, medicine, uhn, doctor they say it’s no use, uhn, medicine is no, no any help to you now. Uhn, they are very upset, but some people, some example, some people they, they become better by, by, uhn, after they receive the, the, Chi-Gong.

J: I don’t know that much about it. Someone tried to demonstrate it a couple of times to me.

In order to convince Jim of the utility of Chi-Gong, Linda further supported her belief in it in three ways: (a) Chi-Gong was good for overall health, (b) Chi-Gong could enhance beauty and fight the aging process, and (c) Chi-Gong was good for vocal artists. First, Linda mentioned that her father’s friend wasn’t feeling well, but after following Chi-Gong, his overall health and well-being improved to the extent that he felt and looked ten years younger than his real age. It is important to view Linda’s words in the context of this interaction as part of her belief system and not as medical facts that need to be supported by solid scientific evidence. In her interaction with Jim, Linda explained that her father was a firm believer in Chi-Gong because of his friend:

Yeah, my, my father he believe this. He believe Chi-Gong because one of his friends, uhn, after he learn Chi-Gong and I, my father say, he, his look, he looks, uhn, younger 10 years, and his body feels strong now.

J: Did he heal somebody with it? For example, if you were sick or your mother was sick, he made your hurt feel better?

L: This Chi, my father’s friend his situation is very strange, because, uhn, he cannot find any disease in his body, but he just feels very uncomfortable. It’s very strange.
J: That’s why he studied them?
L: Yeah. Uhn, somebody believe in recommendation, you can try. If it is unhelpful, unhelpful to you, uhn, at the same time, it will not be dangerous to you.
J: Uhm, yeah, I see.

Second, Linda’s sister-in-law has experienced the negative side effects of putting on make-up. To demonstrate her point about the harmlessness of Chi-Gong, Linda expressed the feeling that Chi-Gong was good at slowing down the aging process, without the negative side-effects of make-up:

(4.77)

L: So, my, my sister-in-law, one day, some day she, she buy some make-up, some expensive make-up, and my, after I, my father he, he see that, he, he says, “Uhn, make-up is no use.”
J: That’s true.
L: You can, you can just try to learn how to, how to use the Chi-Gong is more helpful to you. Uhn-ha, make-up is more expensive.
J: Did she take it back to the store?
L: Uhn-ha.... No, I don’t think so. After you wash your face, you, you feel terrible, uhn-ha..
J: So, your sister-in-law still buys make-up?
L: Uhn-ha.... No.

Third, another perceived benefit of Chi-Gong was relevant to Linda’s music field. For Linda, “Chi-Gong” was a great method for vocalists who want to have more control of the balance between their diaphragm and their vocal cords:

(4.78)

L: In Taiwan, I have heard from some students, they are vocalist. And their teacher teach them how to, uhn, breath, control your breath. Some teacher use Chi-Gong. They, they introduce them to the Chi-Gong concept. I think it’s helpful to control your breath, but in piano teaching, I, I don’t know any other special technique.
Balancing Daily Food Intakes According to Yin-Yang Principles:

The importance of Yin-Yang balance in daily food intakes was articulated by Huang in his interaction with Marianne. Huang perceived the benefit of achieving a balance between the "Yin" (cold) and the "Yang" (warm) in food and drink as crucial to his health. According to the Chinese, food is divided into either "Yin" (cold) or "Yang" (warm). Taking large amounts of one type at the expense of the other may offset the "Chi" inside one's body. So, a balance must be achieved between Yin and Yang preferably in every meal one eats. Chinese dishes are often recommended on the basis of their balance of Yin and Yang. Huang explained to Marianne how beer (a Yin type of drink) can cause pain in his left hand. Being a cellist, Huang realized that he must avoid drinking beer because it interfered with his performance on stage. Huang expressed his belief in Yin and Yang in more detail:

(4.79)

M: I know. That's what I say. I just don't believe we can just not do everything that's fun or delicious. Just it's a, a matter of using your common sense, I think, just, uhn, as long you feel good. Did you ever, did you ever have any health problem? Did you break any bones?
H: Uhm, no.
M: Good.
H: But I, I have, have some, maybe not very serious problem with my hands. I have (been) hurt before. Now, not, still not very good. It's my left hand.
M: Well, that's not good with playing a cello.
H: Sometimes if I play for a long time, I will be a very tired, or if I drink beer, I will feel very hurt.
M: Beer makes you hurt?
H: Yes. Beer.
M: I wonder why?
H: Because, uhm-uhm, not in Chinese, but Chinese always say, "The beer is one kind of cold food." It's very cold, like the green bean, green bean is very cold, too.
M: Really?
H: Yes. And, uhn, uhm, yeah, one kind of fruits in Thailand, *cocos (cocoanuts)*? I don’t know how to say it myself, and if, if we eat that type of food, we will cause some pain especially if you have been hurt before, and then will know it will hurt again.

M: Really?

H: Yeah. You will feel that strange. It’s, it’s a very cold fruit.

M: What, what kind of fruit are you talking about?

H: The beer.

M: No. Fruit.

H: Oh, the fruit.

M: Like a melon, some kind of melon?

H: No, just, uhm, just some water in them.

M: Watermelon.

H: No, not watermelon, yeah. I want to say them in, coco-nut, =

M: Coconut.

H: = Coconuts, yes. Just water there. That’s very cold. But if, if you feel like my face, yes, if I have this problem, I can drink that, maybe that just my, my body not very poor, like some, I don’t know how to say the problem. But if I drink that, I will be better. If I drink beer, it will be better but that will cause another kind of problem like my hands, or something.

M: So, beer is good for something then.

H: Beer is good for something. Uhm, uhm.

M: I never knew that.

H: Yes. That’s like in Chinese medicine tell me.

M: Yes. Chinese medicine is fascinating.

(2) Remedial Practices

The self-strengthening process can be summed up as the restoration of energy “Chi” to improve the harmony inside the body. However, additional steps need to be taken for channeling the imperfections in one’s physical shape. These steps may range from the simple wearing of rings to more advanced medical remedies.

(a) Rings

For example, Peng pointed to a gap between two of his fingers which is believed by the Chinese to cause loss of money. His mother warned him that his physical condition might have grave consequences in terms of his attempts to save money because he might
constantly spend most of the money he earns in a careless manner. Peng’s mother suggested that Peng wear a ring which can bridge the gap between his fingers and stop him from wasting his money in the future. In the following transcript, he described his belief in wearing a ring to Marianne:

(4.80)

P: You know, if I take this off, and I have leaks in my two fingers, between my two fingers. So, my mothers told me that if I, for my leaks are very, I have big leaks.

M: You mean the gaps between the two fingers?

P: Yeah, so I will lose my money. So, if my mother gives me this, I can fill the gap, and I can save a little money, uhn-ha....

M: Good.

P: Uhn-ha.. You have heard about that?

M: No, it's first time I heard it. Because Connie has the same type of ring, the same design with jade, uhn, but she told me that it was given to her by her father as a gift.

P: Oh, no, it just my mother give me. She said, “Oh, your, your gap is too, too =

M: Too wide, yes.

P: = Yes, so my mother, when I, eh, four years ago, my mother give me this, she said, “You must save us some money.” Uhn-ha....

M: Ok, and then, did you? Uhn, have you experienced that you saved some money? Or, does it work in other words?

P: Yeah, I, I, usually I get money and I will spend it quickly.

M: But since you started wearing the ring, is, is there any improvement?

P: Not very big improvement, uhn-ha. But people believe that it’s better. My mother’s two fingers are connected together, but some people, I, I’ve, I heard, I heard some people, I have seen people that their gaps are bigger than I.

M: So, they would have to buy a ring, otherwise, =

P: Uhm-ha..., they will lose money.

M: = That’s not good.

P: Some Chinese beliefs are very, uhn, very precious.

(b) Chinese Medicine

Huang talked to Marianne about the benefits of Chinese medicine as a solution to many health problems. Chinese medicine relies on channeling the energy in the body so it can heal itself without the undesirable side-effects of western medicine. Huang described
the benefits of using two types of Chinese medicine: (a) acupuncture: the Chinese medical specialty that is believed to normalize organ malfunction, regularize blood circulation, balance metabolism, and a host of other benefits, and (b) I-Chow: a similar method of Chinese medicine. First, he explained how acupuncture has cured his facial skin problem:

(4.81)

H: Do you know about Chinese the, one kind of cure?
M: The acupuncture?
H: Oh, yes. Acupuncture. I think it’s very good. But do you think that’s strange?
M: Do I think it’s strange? Uhn, first time I heard about it, I thought it was very strange. But, uhn, now, you know, I heard people, friends that had it done. And it’s very good. I can’t imagine those needles. Have you had it?
H: Yeah, yeah. I have.
M: Have you? What for?
H: Uhm, on my, my face, I had a skin problem and it was painful. It’s very hurt. And I can’t solve the problem, or I, I find the doctor. And just use the needle like that in, in my body. That’s very cool.
M: Did, uhn, it’s true that the needles don’t hurt?
H: Maybe just when it touch your, your body, it hurt some.
M: Just a little bit.
H: A little bit, yeah. But when it’s into the body, just feel it’s not hurt, just like somebody pinch you, that’s not hurt, and then, then you will feel very good. And some of the doctors, their skill is very good. Their skill is very good. I think once you feel the needle into your body, you will feel very good.

Later Huang further explained that acupuncture actually cured his brother’s near-sightedness:

(4.82)

H: Uhm, in, in Taiwan, there are so many different doctors who use acupuncture to cure their patients. That’s very good. And my brother, my older brother, uhn, he had some, not problem, like, like my eyes. Uhm, he, he several years before, he needed to wear glasses like me, and he go to see the doctor, and the doctor put some needle in his eyes, around the eyes. He just, I look this very careful, =

M: I know.
H: = I think. Yes, how can, how can he do that, and but my brother not hurt, just lay, lay on the bed, and maybe one hour, he feel very comfortable. Ear, just around eyes, and with hands.

M: The hand, too?

H: Yes, the hand, too. Because they have some relationship with the eyes. But now, now my brother don’t need to wear glasses.

M: Really?

H: Yes, now my brother never wears glasses.

M: Why don’t you do that?

H: No, because I have no time. I think I must.

Second, Huang mentioned another variation of acupuncture which is called “I-Chow” to Marianne:

(4.83)

H: Sometimes, they, they, uhm, they burn some kinds of, like plants, the roots of plants.

M: Really?

H: Yes, they just put on the needle and burn that and because, uhm, that’s the name is in Chinese is “I, I-Chow.” Chow is one kind of weed. That’s the weed’s root, just put on the, on the end, on the top of needle and burn that. And then with the some heat, will push through the needle into your body. If you, you hurt here, and this will push through the needle and more deep into the body, and will be very comfortable. You will feel very warm, uhn-ha..., very good.

M: Oh!

H: Yes.

M: I wonder if we have Chinese doctors here to practice that.

In sum, the 4 Chinese participants demonstrated similar perspectives on the utility of using some form of energy restoration or Yin-Yang balance for the achievement of numerous benefits and improvements for their physical and spiritual well being. Externally speaking, Feng-Shui theory can be applied to surroundings (e.g., house arrangements) in order to ensure the flow of energy or Yin-Yang balance so that surroundings will be conducive to personal growth and development. As for the inner-self strengthening, Chi-Gong, meditation, and Chinese medicine play a vital role in restoring energy and achieving
harmony inside one’s body. These two aspects demonstrate that in order to cope with any challenge in predestination (Ming), the Chinese believe that they can offset the imbalances in life (Yun).

C. Participants’ Perspectives on Spiritual Masters

It is common practice for the Chinese people to seek help from spiritual masters especially when faced with uncertainty in their life. The spiritual masters in Chinese culture can be classified into two major types: (a) mediums and (b) historical figures. First, the mediums (e.g., monks, palm readers, Yin-Yang eyes) act as agents who hold special powers to foresee the future or to gain access to previous life and in turn provide suggestions or guidance for those in need. So in social practice, the Chinese may seek suggestions from these mediums for a wide range of matters (e.g., predictions of presidential elections, career development, marriage, personal health problems, etc.). Second, some Chinese historical figures (e.g., Guan-Gong, Chu-Yuan, etc.) who have attained a high moral standard were chosen by the Chinese people as good role models that ensure their moral development from generation to generation. Thus, in practice, the Chinese commemorate these historical figures in their festivals or actually worship them in shrines and temples. The following sections include descriptions made by the 4 Chinese participants of these two types of spiritual masters in Chinese culture.

(a) Mediums

Because they are perceived to have reached a high state of spiritual existence, mediums can in theory bypass the limitations of physical time and space and connect with the metaphysical world. The belief in the spiritual powers of a medium is so entrenched in
Chinese culture that many Chinese depend on them for predicting the outcome of crucial events in their lives. For example, during election times, it is common for voters to seek the advice and predictions of living spiritual mediums regarding who will be the most likely candidate to win the presidency.

(1) Monks

According to the data sets, Peng mentioned how a monk predicted the outcome of the 1996 presidential elections:

(4.84)

P: You know in Taiwan, eh, on March, we had, uhn, our presidential elections, and there's, before this election, there is a monk, he predicted, he has this power. He predicted that our president will get 5 hun-, 5 million, and, eh, 5 million and eighteen hundred thousand vote, and what he predict is just, the difference is just, when the result came out, the different just, is just 1300 vote.
J: Wow!
P: Yeah, it's very close. So, some, when this news was released from the newspapers a lot of people were surprised. Why this man has the power?
J: Yeah, it's pretty surprising.
P: Yeah, uhn, it's very difficult to understand by science.
J: Has he done other things? This particular monk?
P: Oh, now he is famous.
J: Oh.
P: Uhn-ha.... He is very famous.
J: Did he predict other things?
P: Before this thing, I, I, I don't not know much about him. But I just heard from the newspapers.
J: Uhm, maybe he wants to be president.
P: Uhn-ha.... No, no.

(2) Yin-Yang Eyes

In another case, Peng mentioned that one man who has a special power can see through another person's previous life. Peng attributed this man's special power to see into another person's previous life to his having Yin-Yang eyes:
P: A man has seen a person's head in a pig's body. He has seen that person's former life, you know. His former life in a man's body. You know, but he, he has the power to see, you know.

J: What does he have?

P: So, he asked the, the, the religious, the monk, what, what's happened. He said, "Oh, this, this pig, her former life is a man." But he did not transform very well, so if you have the power, you can see he is, he is still a man.

J: Oh, I see.

P: So, if you have the power, you can see your next generation, your former generation. It's strange, uhn-ha... You know what I mean?

J: Yeah, I know what you mean. I see what you mean. So, do you believe in this?

P: I have no power. I have no this power, uha. If I have, I can see your previous life. It's strange, it's, when I heard this, it was I feel, I feel it strange.

J: But, can you, can you study that how to do that? I mean is there somebody that would teach you?

P: Oh, we say, he has the Yin-Yang eyes. He has a power, his eyes can see your former and future life.

J: So, so, so you must be born with this power. You can't learn.

P: Your, your power is inherited, inborn.

J: So, you can't just try to develop it.

P: Yeah, not every one can do that. Just some, a little people can do that.

J: Uhm, uhm.

P: So, in, in Taiwan, we have some very mysterious people.

J: So, the people ask him a question and he would say, "What was that?"

P: What?

J: Do they ask the question to those people what was I?

P: Yeah.

J: Really? Can they, can they give an answer?

P: Yeah, they will gave an answer. I have one=

J: For, for pay?

P: = Yeah, sometimes for pay. Most people you should pay them. Yeah, but in my opinion, uhn, I will kill myself, don't try. Some mysterious things are, maybe good, maybe not good. And it would be a big influence on you, maybe be, uhn, because, why, why you come to ask them? I think every time but, when you want to, want to ask them, it is because you have something unhappy, and, and something bad, some bad situation, and you cannot make, uhm, decision by yourself. And now you are at a loss. So, if they give you a good advise, everything is good. If they give you some bad news, it's very terrible.

J: Do they justify, or they just tell you?

P: They just tell you and they did not, they did not give you any explanation.
(3) **Palm Readers**

According to Peng, a palm reader can also predict a person’s future by reading the lines in one’s hand and suggesting proper actions that can improve the advice seeker’s future.

(4.86)

P: Oh, eh, Chinese, people believe, do you know the, people can read your fingers?
M: The palms in your hand?
P: The palm, yeah. They, they can tell you, they, they, they believe that every, every stripe =
M: Your line, yeah.,
P: = Yeah, line will change everyday. Uhn, eh, if you have done something wrong, or if you have done something good, your path, your stripe will change.
M: I see.
P: And it will influence your future life. Some predictor can read your rings, and they can tell how your life will be in the future path, so, if you have a bad fortune, they can tell you how to improve.
M: Avoid that.
P: Heh, avoid that. Maybe you can.

(b) **Historical Figures**

In addition to spiritual mediums, Chinese people believe in the need to commemorate the anniversary of famous historical heroes who represent good role models for the coming generations.

(1) **Guan-Gong**

A Guan-Gong statue can serve as a justice symbol. Many store owners in Taiwan put a Guan-Gong statue in front of their store windows because they believe that it is good for business. Peng revealed his perceptions of Guan-Gong to Jim:
P: But lot of Chinese people believe that. If you want to build a new building for your, for your home or your company, you know. And a lot of business in Taiwan, they will have his own statues, "Guan-Gong," you know. You know, uhn-ha..., they have, their, eh, stature, in his company. Maybe they, they will pray for the Guan-Gong for, to give him good luck, you know. It's common.

J: Guan-Gong is what?

P: It's an old story in, in our history. He will fight the evil man and protect the good man. And even the, the good man. He is a great, uhn, general in the old age. So, people believe that Guan-Gong will give a fortune, and good luck.

J: Oh, I see.

P: And he is the symbol of justice. So, you may see a lot of stores, they have this kind of statue in his home.

J: Uhm, he is a real historical character?

L: What? Sorry?

J: He's, he actually existed?

P: Yeah, he was in history. Maybe, maybe 2000 years ago in the older China.

(2) Chu-Yuan

Another historical figure that the Chinese celebrate every year is Chu-Yuan, an intellectual poet from the time of the warring states (circa 400 B.C.). In a time of political turmoil, the poet made several proposals and poems advising his mentor, the emperor, on how to run the country effectively. When the emperor would not listen to the poet’s advice, the poet decided to commit the ultimate sacrifice to his country by drowning himself in the river. The emperor, awakened by his poet’s sacrifice, asked the people to rescue his body so that a proper funeral could be performed for the poet. Every member of the community rallied to get there first, and the dragon boat races commemorate this attempt. This custom took the form of a festival in which the Chinese people celebrate the poet’s dedication and patriotism and uphold the value of intellectuals in their everyday life. They celebrate the poet’s loyalty to them by making offerings of rice and other food to the
fish in the river so that they can eat those instead of the poet's body. The big event is the
dragon boat race. Teams race against one another in long boats decorated with a dragon's
head on the boat. Linda expressed her belief in the Dragon Boat Festival as follows:

(4.88)

L: This is, uhn, this activity is for special holiday, to, to memorize, uhn, uhn, one of
our poem, poet, poetist.
M: Poets.
L: Poet.
M: To commemorate his poem.
L: Chu-yuan, his name is Chu-Yuan, yeah, he, uhn, he live, uhn, a long time ago.
And at his age, uhn, his era, he, by, he is very kind man, especially, uhn, to his
king. Yeah, but at the time, uhn, because uhn, there are so many, uhn, because
other, uhn, the King, uhn, the government, uhn, the other, other officer in his
government don't like him, because he is always say something very friendly
(frankly) to his King, and other officer they, they uhn, they don't appreciate him.
And, and finally he, he doesn't speak in their country, in their government. And
then, uhn, and then he, one day, he, he is very upset, and very disappointed, and
he, he throw himself into a river. Kill, he, uhn, he kill himself.
M: Did he really?
L: Yeah. And, and after that, uhn, his king knows he is the good man, and he very
regretted.
M: He regretted?
L: Yeah. And he, uhn, he set up, uhn, the date, Chu-Yuan kill himself the day, uhn,
to memorize him.
M: Oh.
L: Yeah. And at the time, why we, we will row the boat, uhn, to memorize him
because when she in, uhn, jump, jump into the river, and the King regard, regretted
very much, and he, he want to, he order his people to put a lot of food into the
river, because he, he afraid, some, other, the fish will eat Chu, Chu-Yuan's body,
when he want to kept the body, uhn, very well. He, he throw a lot of food into,
into the river, and then row the boat and drum, and, uhn, use the drum to make a
lot, a big sound to, to afraid fish.
M: To, to frighten the fish.
L: Yeah. To frighten the fish. And, and try to, uhn, to keep his body entire, uhn, his
body don't, don't be eaten by fish.
M: Yes, yes. I think you, we would say, keep his body intact.
L: Yeah, intact.
M: Intact. I-N-T-A-C-T that means keep it the same.
L: Yeah. Don't be destro-, destroyed.
M: Yes, not disintegrate. Disintegrate means to break apart, to, to, go.
L: So, uhn-ah, this holiday we say is a different name. One name is Poet, Poet’s Day.
M: Poet’s Day.
N: Another name is Dragon Boat Festival.

In conclusion, this section explored three central ideas in the Chinese belief system and related them through the participants’ own words to a considerable number of everyday Chinese social practices. Consistent with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) concept of “transferability,” the “raw” data in the form of the participants’ words are available for the reader to construct new meanings and establish new connections without being limited by the researcher’s interpretation of the three central ideas in the Chinese belief system and the social practices that are based on them.
IV. Performing Rituals of Face

The concepts face and self have played a significant role in formulating the categories of rituals of face. They provide a context from which the data analysis proceeded. The first section offers an account of how the categories of (a) respect for others or (b) self-denial were assigned according to the concepts of face and self. The second section covers the introduction and definition of each category along with examples of each from the data of the interactions.

Rituals of face were defined in this study as the kinds of interactional routines that characterize conversations in Chinese and are intended by the speaker to maintain a sense of propriety in the interactions. In the Chinese language, the earliest recorded examples of the preoccupation with politeness in interaction date back to the time of Confucius (551 B.C.). Related to how people interacted with each other, Confucius’ theory of an ideal social order accounted for social relations and their quality because they have a tremendous effect on the overall structure of society. According to Confucian philosophy, the nature of the social relationship between two persons is intrinsically related to the kind and quality of the face-to-face interactions that take place between them. Confucius introduced the concept of “Li,” which means a “sense of propriety” to make sure that the Chinese people observed the socially appropriate procedures for interacting with each other. The Chinese word for “Li” is “ritual” which means that speakers need to perform rituals of propriety during their interactions so that everyone is assured of the other’s respect and love, which makes for a virtuous and peaceful society. The ideals promoted by Confucius are still very much alive in Chinese society today. The 4 Chinese
participants who were fully socialized members of Chinese society have read Confucius’ classics as part of their schooling. They transferred these face rituals to their English speech during the interactions with the 3 American participants in the study.

**Face**

Face or “Mianzi” in Mandarin carries a range of meanings based upon a core concept of “honor.” The way the concept of face is used in contemporary Chinese society was described by Yang (1945):

> When we say in Chinese that one loses face, we mean that he loses prestige, he has been insulted or has been made to feel embarrassment before a group. When we say that a man wants a face, we mean that he wants to be given honor, prestige, praise, and flattery, or concession, whether or not these are merited. Face is really a personal psychological satisfaction, a social esteem accorded by others. (p. 167)

The concept of face was transferred from Chinese to English by the 4 Chinese participants. In other words, Chinese assumptions about face continued to appear in the patterns of language use employed by the 4 Chinese participants during their face-to-face interactions with the 3 native speakers of the target language. The 4 Chinese participants interacted in the L2 while keeping in minds the face needs of the native-speaking participants.

As Scollon and Scollon (1995) stated, “On the one hand, there is a need to be involved with others and to show interest in what they are saying. On the other hand, there is a need for the self to maintain some degree of independence from others and to equally show that their independence is respected” (p. 36). The two sides of face, self and others, must be balanced simultaneously in any interaction.
Self

According to Scollon and Scollon (1995), “The idea of ‘self’ which underlies western studies of face in communication is highly individualistic, self-motivated, and open to ongoing negotiation of face” (p. 36). The Chinese concept of self is a more group-conformist self, one which is more connected to membership in a group such as the family or one’s classmates. There is no conflict between self and others. The two sides can be projected simultaneously in the performance of Chinese face rituals. The Chinese speaker tries simultaneously to find just the right way of saying something which shows the degree to which he or she is interested in the other participants and the degree to which he or she is proclaiming his/her own insignificance compared to that of the hearer.

Chinese face rituals have a double-sided nature (either the raising of the other or the lowering of oneself). There is one side in which the speaker humbles and abases him/herself, and another side where the speaker raises the hearer’s sense of worth. The analysis revealed that the Chinese face rituals which were transferred to the interactions included six rituals which were divided according to their functions into two sub-categories. The first set of categories served to show respect for others, while the second set served to show that the speaker is in a state of self-denial. The first category includes rituals which were transferred as a function of respect for others: (a) convergence, (b) deference, and (c) avoiding conflict. The second category includes rituals which were performed as a function of self-denial: (1) putting self down, (2) turning down an invitation to talk, and (3) refusing a compliment. The following sections describe the above categories in more detail and provide examples from the data for each category.
A. Respect for Others

The trio of "convergence," "deference," and "avoiding conflict" revealed how the 4 Chinese speakers attempted to give their hearers face during the interactions. Table 4.6 is a summary of the 3 rituals of respect for others. The table shows the frequency of occurrence and percentage of usage of these rituals as they appeared in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF USE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergence (CON)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference (DEF)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Conflict (AC)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Summary of "Respect for Others"

Out of a total of 76 occurrences of "rituals of respect for others," "convergence" ranked first, occupying 34 times or 44.74% of the total performance in this category. "Deference" ranked second with 32 times or 42.11% of the total performance in this category. "Avoiding conflict" ranked third with a total number of 10 times or 13.16% of the total performance in this category. The following is a discussion of how the 4 Chinese participants performed this ritual of respect for others in their interactions.
(a) Convergence (CON)

Convergence is defined as the Chinese speaker's claiming common ground with the native speaker. This expression of common ground by the Chinese speaker can be in the form of sharing the same points of view, opinions, or attitudes of the native speakers toward a variety of different issues. Convergence can additionally mean the Chinese speaker's outward expression of admiration of the native-speaking interlocutor. The following is an example of convergence by sharing the same point of view of the native speaker.

(4.89)

F: It's a beautiful city. Yes, it's much nicer than Los Angeles that in my opinion it's a beautiful city.
P: Yeah. My friend told me. I have a friend now in San Francisco. He say there is no snow in the winter.

In the context of a discussion on Peng's previous visit to Los Angeles and his impressions about the city, Fiona expressed the opinion that she preferred San Francisco to Los Angeles. Fiona liked San Francisco's weather, the bay area, and the mountains.

After hearing Fiona praise San Francisco, Peng converged with Fiona's opinions and preferences that San Francisco was a better city than Los Angeles. By mentioning that his friend told him that there is no snow in San Francisco during winter, Peng was trying to seek common ground with Fiona and share her opinion that San Francisco was really a beautiful city. Peng was not only respecting the authority of Fiona but also brought in additional support from his friend that attests to the fact that San Francisco was a beautiful city, for the fact that it did not have snow in the winter made it even more attractive and
convenient to live in. The effect of this ritual was that Fiona’s face needs were reassured and her sense of security as a speaker on the topic of U.S. cities was not threatened by Peng. Even though Peng might have visited L.A. in the past, he was still willing to identify with the native speaker because he thought she was much more qualified than him to speak on the topic of U.S. cities.

An example of the Chinese speaker’s convergence with native speakers as an expression of interest and/or admiration took place during the same interaction. Fiona mentioned her age which was more than Peng’s age.

(4.90)

P: But you look, you look very young.
F: I look very young?
P: Yeah.
F: Thank you.
P: Yeah.
F: Thank you.
P: You look very young.

Peng ritualistically attempted to negate the difference because he said that Fiona looked much younger than her age, thereby trivializing the degree of difference between the two. The function of sharing common ground in terms of age is to indicate that both speakers are more alike than they are different. Even though Fiona was older, Peng insisted that she was as young and attractive as any other girl Peng might have seen recently. This ritual was intended to maintain Fiona’s face needs and to feel more comfortable talking with Peng.

In other contexts, convergence indicated the Chinese speakers’ attempts to fit in and share their views on a variety of issues. One of these issues was the use of discipline
in education. Julia was telling Marianne that standards in Taiwanese schools have recently changed. Having suffered corporal punishment herself as a student, she was happy to report to Marianne that corporal punishment has become a thing of the past because it was lately banned by the Ministry of Education. Marianne did not hesitate to express her opinions on education according to her strongly held view that discipline was essential for good education. When Julia found that Marianne was lamenting the disappearance of corporal punishment in the U.S. as a cause of the student’s lagging behind in their studies, Julia converged to Marianne’s view that corporal punishment should be reinstated in schools:

(4.91)

J: And our, our teachers in elementary and junior high school, they strike, strike.
M: Strike.
J: Yeah.
M: Are they allowed to do that?
J: Yeah, allowed.
M: Are they?
J: Yeah, but now, before in the past its allowed, but now it’s changing, now.
M: Too bad, too bad. You know, I think that’s good, and I think the system in the United States is so permissive. You understand permissive? They are allowed to be bad and not be punished in the schools, and so they just get worse, I think, they just get worse, and we have bad problems. They need more discipline.
J: But now in Taiwan it will not be allowed any more because we can watch on the TV night news. Some teachers beat or strike his students, and his students’ parents will sue the teacher, and the teacher will, be, be blamed or something like.
M: Ah, don’t they? Yes, there is a real problem there.
J: Aha, but I don’t think it’s very good about change this because some students were very very bad and the teacher cannot control the students or teach the students. I think this will be a big problem.
M: I do, too, aha, yes, and we’ve seen that in the United States. Would you like to have a sip of your, your lemonade?

Far from rejoicing in the fact that corporal punishment in Taiwanese schools has become a thing of the past, Julia converged closely to Marianne’s view that discipline was
an essential component of education. Julia’s convergence with Marianne, even if she did not totally agree with her, served Marianne’s face needs by reassuring her that her views on education were right.

In the next transcript, Julia shared with Marianne the fact that even though her parents disciplined her when she was a child, she still loves them. Julia already knew Marianne’s views about the role of discipline in education.

(4.92)

M: How about, how about, your, your own parents were they strict with you?
J: Strict?
M: Aha, Ah.
J: When I was young, because when, when my brother and I do something wrong or something bad, they were very strict. But I think it’s right because they, we should know what is wrong what is good.
M: And how did they discipline you? What did they do if you did something wrong?
J: Oha, like, like.
M: Like a ruler.
J: Maybe.
M: A stick.
J: Ha, ha.
M: Ha, ha. They hit you.
J: Yeah.
M: Did they?
J: When I was young, young children.
M: Just a little bit.
J: Yeah, a little bit, but very hurt, ha, ha.
M: Ha, ha.
J: And our, our teachers in elementary and junior high school, they strike, strike.
M: Strike.
J: Yeah.
M: Are they allowed to do that?
J: Yeah, allowed.
M: Are they?
J: Yeah.

A similar pattern of convergence with the native speaker’s views emerged in Huang’s interaction with Marianne. Huang started out by complaining that his two years of
compulsory military service have prevented him from coming to America to pursue his higher education. However, when Marianne expressed her view that military service was good for young people, Huang converged with her view by saying, “It helped me grow up.”

(4.93)

H: This is my first time to leave my country.
M: Is it?
H: My country, if I’m a boy, I can’t leave my country until I finish my, my military = duty. Yes, I must, after that, then I can leave my country. So, it’s my first time, uha....
M: Did, did you have to get a special permit, to come to the United States?
H: After =
M: From your country?
H: = Yes.
M: Did you?
H: Of course. Yeah. Uhm, if I, if I still not finish my military duty, I think that’s very difficult to, to do this. Maybe impossible.
M: Maybe.
H: Yeah. Uhm, uhm.
M: I don’t know if we have, uhn, compulsory military training or not in the, here.
H: Uhm, uhm. That’s =
M: I don’t know, do you?
H: = I think that’s, that’s in your country, that’s option.
M: I think so, too.
H: Yes. But in my country, you have no choice, ha...., you must.
M: I think it will be good for young people.
H: Uhm, uhm.
M: I really do think that. I think that in, uhn, in this country, I think that young people are spoiled, uhn-ha....
H: Oh, uha....
H: Yes. Some of them really =
M: What do you, what do you think?
H: = Yes. I think.
M: I think so.
H: Because they don’t know others, other body’s feeling, but after I, after I into my country’s army, I can feel that because there are so many different kinds of people there. There like a little soci, little society, and you can, you can’t let selfish, you must do something.
M: You got to consider the other person all the time.
H: Yes, you can't do what you want to do. I think that's very good. Let me grow up, uhm-ha....

In conclusion, the transfer of considerations of face to the L2 context dictated that the 4 Chinese participants converge with the 3 native speakers either in terms of expressing admiration or adjusting to their views on a variety of issues.

(2) Deference (DEF)

Deference is defined as the outward expression of agreement that is initiated by the Chinese speaker due to the superior status of the native speaker in terms of age, knowledge, experience, and so on. Deference was ritualistically performed by the 4 Chinese participants in recognition of the native speaker's face needs to be respected and given credit for what he/she has accomplished. For example, at the beginning of Peng's interaction with Marianne, she introduced herself by saying that she had previously been a journalist. In the 50s, Marianne had her own program on city radio, and she interviewed many people as part of her program. After half an hour, Peng "revisited" Marianne's previously mentioned point about her program and asked her, in effect, to elaborate on what he thought was Marianne's highest accomplishment in her career.

P: So you told me you have one, you have a radio program. So, I know, you must be interested in language and people.

This was an open invitation for Marianne to recount her most memorable moment when she got to interview John Forsythe, a big actor in the 50's. She recalled how gentlemanly he was especially when he knew that she came all the way from the Midwest to New York city to have an interview with him.
M: The first time, the first interview I ever got in New York, do you know, you probably don’t know the name.

P: Who?

M: John Forsythe, he is, he is an older, uhn, character at, uhn, Charlie’s Angels. Did you ever see that, that show?

P: No.

M: That television show? Well, where else did I see him? He was also on Dallas =

P: Dallas, oh, Dallas

M: = that TV show. Well, anyhow, he is, everybody here knows John Forsythe. And the first time in New York, I run up to him and, and we were in this big, big, uhn, luncheon, and I ran up to him and you know, I put the microphone. And I said, I said, “Would you talk to me?” And he said, he said, “Yes, sure, sure.”

P: Yeah, but he, he has no time, uhn-ha....

M: He was, oh, he was willing to talk to people. But there was a whole bunch of us that had him on, they had the same thing I had, you know. And this was that Press thing, the Press, uhn, Luncheon. And so, I got the thing up there, when I realized that, that I’m gonna get my, gonna talk to him, my hand starts to shake.

P: Uhn-ha... He is so popular and famous.

M: And handsome, uhn-ha.... And I thought here I am, and my hand starts to shake, and he put his hand on mine, and he patted it, and he said, “Oh, who are we, and where are we from?” That was really nice, but he was so sweet, pat me. He said, “Oh, who are we and where are we from?” Uhm-ha.... You know here I am talking to this, this gorgeous man, uhm-ha....

Deference as displayed in Peng’s show of interest in Marianne’s past career gave her a chance to relive the past and reminded her of her interview with John Forsythe.

In another context, Linda expressed the idea that something Jim suggested was also suggested to her by her own teacher, thus elevating Jim’s social status from a fellow student (i.e., equal) to the status of her teacher (i.e., superior).

L: I have problem because my, my hand is too small to approach the music position, and my professor, he, he is, uhm, he is very flexible. He, he, will help, he will teach me to change my finger position, and my hand position, and to find the, the best way to me, and then, I can play it as other students, who has, who has big hands.
J: Wish Thora Rocha’s hands have about your size up.
L: Uhn, uhn
J: /A’Wish Thora Rocha/.
L: Oh, Art’wish. Oh, she is. =
J: She has very small hands.
L: = I didn’t, yeah. I think, yeah, he always give me this example.
J: That way she’s got small hands.
L: Yeah, he say, she also has a small hand, but she can arrange, arrange the, the performance technique, like to, to arrange the finger position, and some peda-(pedagogical) technique to help us. He say, uhm, if we really, uhn, if we really try to, to overcome our problem, it’s not, it’s not, uhn, really impossible to this.

Linda reacted to Jim’s example by first recognizing the name of the performer and then by saying her teacher always gave her the same example. She did not openly compliment Jim on his knowledge of the music world but rather subtly mentioned that her professor who is very knowledgeable on the subject, always used the same example mentioned by Jim. This ritual of deference had the effect of not only expressing agreement with Jim’s opinions, but also giving him the reassurance that what he was saying really mattered to Linda.

(c) Avoiding Conflict

In a manner that is consistent with the rituals of convergence and deference, the 4 Chinese speakers went through a similarly elaborate ritual for avoiding conflict with their native-speaking partners. This ritual reveals that what was really important for the 4 Chinese speakers was to maintain a smooth social relationship with their interlocutors. It did not really matter who was right and who was wrong, who had a point, and who did not have a point. What really mattered was maintaining a good rapport with the native speakers even if this meant a total change of opinion which was stated earlier, or going along with what the native speaker was saying even if it was not necessarily felt to be true by the Chinese speaker.
In the context of talking about her upcoming recital as one of the requirements to earn a double degree in the Music Department, Linda was so ambivalent about her musical performance ability that Jim started asking her whether she was “good enough to give a recital.” Jim thought that if he repeated his question in a louder voice then Linda would finally understand what he was talking about. Unfortunately, Linda misconstrued Jim’s raised voice as though he was angry with her personally. In order to avoid conflict, even if it meant debasing her ability, and to keep the rapport between them going, Linda’s answer to Jim’s question was “Of course not.”

(4.96)

L: Yeah. And you know, before we graduate, uh, every east (xx) to major students, we need to, uh, present, a recital, our, uh, our solo recital. The requirement for, for piano pedagogy major is one, one recital and a paper. And the requirement for piano performance is two recital but no paper. So, I don’t know. Uhm, what will be the requirement for double degree?

J: Probably two recitals and a paper.

L: Yes, probably.

J: You know enough music to give a recital?

L: Sorry?

J: You know enough music to give a recital?

L: Music recital?

J: Do you know enough music to give a recital? (Much louder)

L: Uhm-ha....

J: You must by now.

L: → Of course not, uha....

J: No, is that right?

L: Ha....

J: Uhm. You get to choose the music yourself?

L: Uhn. Mostly, I, I discuss with my, my professor.

J: Uhn. What would you like to play in your recital?

L: What would, uhm, this quarter, my, my professor give me four pieces. One is Beethoven Sonata.

In another encounter, Huang was telling Jim how a friend of his knew so many secrets about the proper preparation and consumption of coffee. Among one of the
nuances of drinking coffee that Huang mentioned in the interaction, one was that if someone who wants to drink a cup of coffee stirs his/her cup in a certain direction (i.e., anti-clockwise) then the coffee will taste salty like sea water. If, on the other hand, the cup was stirred in the opposite direction (i.e., clockwise), then the cup will taste like a regular cup of coffee. This story did not make a lot of sense to Jim who could not let this thing go on without applying some “common sense” to the issue of stirring a cup of coffee. But because Jim started his objection by saying, “I never heard of that. I mean this is hard to believe” which was apparently interpreted by Huang as saying “You friend is lying” or even worse “You are lying,” Huang chose to back off from the potential confrontation. Huang tried to absorb Jim's objections by shifting the blame on his friend who Huang stated might have told him a lie: “Maybe they lie to me,” indicating a withdrawal from the attempt to convince Jim of the truth value of his story. This ritual of avoiding conflict indicated that Huang preferred to seek agreement with Jim rather than conflict. The fact that he was willing to accuse his friend of being a liar was considered by Huang a better route than to defend an unverifiable story.

(4.97)

J: I have two friends who like coffee, no, three friends, who like coffee. They can smell the coffee and decide where it comes from.
H: Uhm, uhm. And cook coffee has so many different way to cook that. Like use a glass, yeah. They say you stir that, you just can this way, and you can't the other way, uha.... I, uhn, they, they always say if you just stir that, maybe this way and that way, the coffee will become a sea, uhn-ha.
J: → I never heard of that. I mean this is hard to believe.
H: I don't know, uha.
J: I never heard of that. I think it's, it's, uhn, I think it's important to have some motion in the water, so that all the, all the coffee becomes wet. But the direction, this is not important.
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H: Uha.... Maybe they lie and they, they told me, if the cook coffee’s water, the water is boil by the, by =
J: Gas or electricity?
H: = by the gas or by, just by the gold.
J: It’s mineral?
H: Coal, coal.
J: From coal?
H: Yes, by the coal, and the taste is different. Is it really? Uhn-ha....
J: Uhm, they must be very sensitive. My feeling is no. However, if there really is, if they really have, have a coal fire, it’s possible that some of the smoke from the coal, or the dust from the coal might go up into the water. So, in that respect, yeah. But otherwise, not. Just for pretty.
H: Just the water, right?
I: Yeah. Exactly.
H: I think so. I think how can they taste that.
J: If the water is different, if the water has some mineral, and that’s different. But just what kind of fire, this is not. This is not something. I think there is no difference between, uhn, no difference in taste than in any other fire except for that one possibility, some contamination from the smoke. Otherwise, not, this is too much. They’re making a story. Who, who told you that?
H: Uhn-ha..., my friends.
J: Your friends, oh, I see. You got very nice friends.
H: Ha.... Not back to my country, maybe. Ha... (Both laughed).

B. Self-Denial

On the other side of the coin of respect for others, the 4 Chinese participants transferred rituals of face placed under the sub-group of self-denial. Self denial is defined as the Chinese speaker’s effort at maintaining the social harmony of the interaction. This is done by utilizing three rituals: (a) putting self down, (b) refusing a compliment, and (c) turning down an invitation to talk. Instead of the expectations of western speakers who are accustomed to compliment replies, self-confidence and expressing their opinions freely, Chinese speakers opt for the trio of “putting self down,” “refusing a compliment,” and “turning down an invitation to talk.” Data analysis indicated that the 4 Chinese participants transferred these face rituals from Chinese to English contexts assuming that
they were identical to face-rituals in English. Table 4.7 is a summary table for “rituals of self-denial” that shows the frequency and the percentage of use of these categories in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech during their interactions with their English native-speaking interlocutors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putting Self Down (PSD)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing A Compliment (RAC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Down an Invitation to Talk (TDIT)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Summary Table of “Self-Denial”

Out of a total of 39 examples of rituals of “self-denial,” “putting self down” ranked first, occurring 23 times or 58.97% of the total performance in this category. “Turning down an invitation to talk” ranked second with a total of 11 times which amounted to 28.21% of the total performance in this category. “Refusing a compliment” ranked third, occurring 12.82% of the total performance within this category. The following is a discussion of the three categories of self denial that were found in the data of the interactions.
(a) Putting Self Down (PSD)

“Putting self down” means that when given an opportunity to praise oneself, the 4 Chinese participants spoke reluctantly about their accomplishments and instead sought to belittle and debase themselves. The function of this ritual for the 4 Chinese participants was to maintain the face of the English native-speaking interlocutors by not bragging about their accomplishments. The 4 Chinese speakers transferred the ritual of “putting self down” sometimes without any prompting from their interlocutors. This showed that this ritual has been deeply ingrained in their schemata to the extent that they performed it as a form of habitual behavior. For example,

(4.98)

J: Ok, so, my question is, can you personally see some application of that to improve performance, not just in piano, but something else?
L: According to my learning experience, because my teacher, oh, when I study in university, she, she, uhn, to, generally speaking, she is, be consider a very excellent pianist, because when she, when she was 10 years old, she already perform on Concerto with orchestra, and travel performance to Japan or America, Europe → She is very excellent. So, but I am not a very excellent student, ha, you know.

Linda, in the context of praising her teacher’s accomplishments, did not forget to debase herself by saying, “My teacher is excellent. But I am not so excellent as my teacher.”

This ritualistic application of “putting self down” showed that Linda had respected the authority of her teacher in the presence of her interlocutor.

This pattern was also shared by Peng who while talking about math to Marianne basically said the same things about himself and his teacher. In fact, Peng almost used the same words that were used by Linda when she talked about the difference in ability between herself and her teacher.
M: You just like mathematics?
P: No, no, no. I don’t like mathematics.
M: Don’t you? How can you be in Economics?
P: Uhn-ha. I don’t like mathematics very well, but I can, I just can use mathematics. I don’t like mathematics.
M: Alright, ok.
P: You know, you know what I mean, because sometimes we have no choice, we must use mathematics skills, but if you ask me to learn just mathematics, oh, I feel terrible, uhn-ha..., too difficult.
M: But I don’t like even to balance my checkbook. I don’t. I prefer to learn another language. Well, I am glad to hear you don’t like mathematics because I can’t, I don’t trust anybody who likes mathematics, uha....
P: Uhn-ha.... But sometimes I feel mathematics is easier to express something, especially some kind of phenomenon, economic phenomenon. You can use ec-, mathematic formula to express more easy because =
M: You can, I can’t, uhn-ha..., not me.
P: = Uhn-ha..., I can’t but my, my teachers can. Uhn-ha.....
M: Oh, ok, uhm-ha....
P: Because some, sometimes we just use words, it’s difficult to express a lot of our idea, but if we say, ok, I can tell exactly what I want to say if I use mathematics skills, I can tell, ok, that’s the result, uhn-ha.... But I, I think, mathematics is not very, is not so important in our daily life.

Marianne commented that while she herself did not like math because she was not good at it, Peng must be good at math. Peng put himself down in response to prompting from his interlocutor. Peng showed a reluctance to accept praise from Marianne (e.g. You like math) and instead focused on how he might not meet her expectations. Peng was reluctant to accept Marianne’s praise and instead put himself down as a sign of humility.

The main purpose of this ritual was to put Marianne at ease by indicating that she was not really in the presence of a math wizard whose abilities far exceeded hers. This ritual also showed that Marianne was always placed by Peng in a superior status in contrast to Peng’s inferior place in relation to her.
Another example that demonstrated the Chinese speaker's ritual of "putting self down" was found in the interaction between Julia and Marianne. When asked how fast Julia could read one Chinese novel, she debased herself by responding, "My roommate is fast, but I am not."

(4.100)

M: What type of novels did you read? Is it all in Chinese or did you try to read English novels?

J: No, No, No, never. Ha! Ha! Ha! I have to look for the vocabulary from the dictionary all the time, so terrible. In senior high school, in summer and winter vacation, uhn^ our teacher, tell, gave some novel not very long and tell us to read, and we have test.

M: Oh! test. And this was in English?

J: Uhm.

M: And, how about the Chinese novels? Did you read a lot of novels or like one novel every month, or how fast did you read?

J: How fast?

M: Yeah.

J: Uhm. Not fast. My roommate is fast, but I am not.

M: So, what is your average? Did you read a novel a month?

J: Maybe, uhn, maybe one week one^ novel.

M: How thick? (Julia used her two fingers to indicate the thickness.) Oh! Not very thick. (laughs) Ok, but that's nice, I mean to read novels every day. Are these novels romantic novels? Are they historical novels? What type of novels are they?

J: Both.

M: Ok. Romantic events in the past, in the history? Or, like a nowadays?

J: History? Uhn.... I both like to read the two kinds.

M: Ok, great. Historical and romantic novels. Ok.

(b) Refusing a Compliment (RC)

A ritual that is related to self-denial is that of refusing a compliment. Rather than giving reasons why the Chinese speaker does not really deserve praise for something, he/she may reject a compliment that was given in good faith. One impression that emerged from observing this ritual was the Chinese speaker's unwillingness to accept a
compliment. The 4 Chinese speakers were unwilling to accept praise from the English
native-speaking interlocutors. Instead, they were only willing to debase themselves as a
sign of humbleness in front of their native-speaking interlocutors. In the eyes of American
speakers, the ritual of refusing a compliment may be erroneously interpreted as the
Chinese way of asking for more praise, an outcome that is definitely not intended by the 4
Chinese speakers.

(4.101)

M: Uh, uh, and you learn English as, as you were going to your, your schooling?
P: Uh, I think, English, I start from, start learning English from Junior High School,
and I think maybe 10 years ago, 10 years ago.
M: So, you’re better than some of our students.
P: No, no, no.
M: Uh-ha..., yes, yes.
P: But, studying English in, in high school, in Taiwan, it just learn some basic, basic
uses, so when I came here, I still feel my English is not enough to com-, to
speaker with the native, native Americans.
M: Uh, I think your English is very good.
P: Uh-ha, but, but =
M: Very good. But, any, every, I would say that almost every, uh, international
person from many, many different countries, any that I ever talk to have always felt
hesitant about their English. They feel that they are not very good at it, you know.
But it is amazing how, how, uh, accurately, most international people speak.
They choose the correct word where as I think, that, that we Americans have
sometimes have sloppy speech, just use, you know any words that’s pretty close
what they want to say. Uh, but, but, you and people that I’ve talked to, speak
correctly, and, and I, I admire that, I appreciate that.

As the above interaction shows, Marianne was trying to encourage Peng by praising his
command of English. But when he refused to accept the compliment, Marianne responded
by heaping more praise on Peng. The same ritual of refusing a compliment was performed
by Linda who refused to accept Marianne’s compliment by saying that the amount of time

spent learning English was disproportionate with the level of English language ability even of college students in Taiwan.

(4.102)

M: I don't know how you learn English. I mean I think that will be such a difficult language to learn. Unless, unless you grew up with it, you know.

L: Yeah. In my country, education system, uhn, every student, we should learn English, uhn, in, when, when we are, uhn, junior high students, school, when we, when we are (L laughs) junior high school student and the senior high school student. Yeah, so probably, uhn, each student will learn English about 6 years =

M: Oh!

L: = during their, uhn, high school learn, studying, yes. But it, but I doesn’t seen a very, although we, we spend a lot of time on English study, but I don’t think so, everybody can get a high, uhn, a higher English ability because in, in our education system, we, we always entrance exam test. And everybody just try to remember all of the rules, all of the English grammar, and, and the spelling, to remember the vocabulary, but their, uhn, spoke, uhn, speaking ability is not, uhn, is not promote. A lot of, a lot of, uhn, a lot of students, even, they can’t, they can’t speak English very well, even they study more than 10 years or, or, uhn, we and college student.

(c) Turning Down an Invitation to Talk (TDIT)

Consistent with the Chinese face ritual of “refusing a compliment” is the Chinese ritual of refusing an invitation to talk. In this third ritual of self denial, the Chinese speakers were observed to reject the task of talking about what they knew (e.g., their country). The function of this ritual is to show that the Chinese speaker is unworthy of the responsibility just assigned to him/her by the native-speaking interlocutor. Compared to the superior status of English native-speaking interlocutor, the Chinese speaker either finds him/herself totally lacking in knowledge about the world, or that he/she has not attained the requisite language ability to talk adequately about anything. This sense of unworthiness is projected against a backdrop of reverence and respect to the interlocutor. Data analysis revealed that the main purpose of this ritual was that of reassuring the
native-speaking interlocutor of the inferior status the Chinese speaker had compared to that of the native speaker. This ritual is intended to inflate the interlocutor’s sense of worth while at the same time deflating that of the Chinese speaker’s. For example, in the interaction between Peng and Marianne, Peng showed an undue amount of reluctance to accept Marianne’s invitation to talk about his country. It is noteworthy that Peng himself asked Marianne whether she knew anything about Taiwan. When Marianne said “not much,” Peng showed his uncritical acceptance of the authority of Huang, another Chinese participants, to talk about this topic. After Marianne told Peng that Huang did not talk much about his country, Peng again sounded reluctant and indecisive about talking even after Marianne said to him “I like to hear more.”

(4.103)

P: Yeah. We, I live in the countryside Taiwan. I studied and worked in Taipei. Before I came here, I always, I live in Taipei, capital of Taiwan. I don’t know whether you know about Taiwan?
M: Not much.
P: Not much. Uhn-ha....
M: Do you want to tell me about it?
P: → I don’t know whether Mr. Huang (another Chinese speaker) has told you?
M: Not, not much.
P: Oh.
M: I like to hear more.
P: Uhn-ha....

In the following interaction, even when the invitation is not specific in nature, and fully open, Huang would rather say, “I have nothing” than to talk upon an invitation from Jim.

(4.104)

J: So, uhn, is there something you would like to talk about? Some pretty good item?
H: → Uhm, I don’t know. I have nothing.
J: Oh, here. When did you come to the United States?
H: Uhm, in, two months ago. Two months ago I just arrive here.

Huang's reluctance could be interpreted as a sign of low proficiency. The ritual of
"turning down an invitation to talk" helped Huang not to lose his/her face because of lack
of knowledge of English. In the interaction between Jim and Linda, the same ritual was
employed for a totally different purpose.

(4.105)

J: Do you want to say something about the bicycle?
L: Uhn?
J: Do you want to talk about the crisis?
L: My bicycle?
J: Right.
L: Uhn-ah, it's not a good story, uhn-ha, yeah.

Because Linda's bicycle was stolen, she did not want to talk about her experience. The
reason behind her refusal to talk was not because she lacked knowledge of English but
because she thought that "it is not a good story." This means that Linda refused to go
through the details of something so embarrassing that it may bring about a loss of face to
her own person. In this case, refusing an invitation to talk is far better than having to tell
the painful details of her stolen bicycle story. Linda transferred the ritual of refusing to
talk about something that may cause undue loss of face. Thus, through self-denial, Linda
avoided a great deal of embarrassment in talking to Jim especially about an embarrassing
story. The above examples indicated the consistency with which the Chinese participants
transferred this ritual from Chinese to English contexts of usage. The Chinese speakers
followed these rituals assuming that this was the proper way to maintain "Li" (i.e., a sense
of propriety) in the L2 interactional context.
Summary and Conclusions

The data analysis revealed that the 4 Chinese participants transferred the prior linguistic, social, and cultural knowledge they gained while acquiring Chinese as a first language to the new context of the L2 (ESL) during their interactions with native speakers of the target language. The influence of the L1 on the 4 participants’ L2 speech was varied and full of nuances. A preponderance of evidence (with a total of 2390 occurrences of discourse transfer) pointed to the strong effect of the 4 Chinese participants’ native language on their discourse performance in the L2 (see Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Organizing Propositional Information</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>64.23</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL of Language Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Manifesting Social Identity</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Performing Rituals of Face</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL of Social Interaction</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Discourse Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Summary of Overall Use of Discourse Transfer Categories

Specifically, the L1 influence was clear in 4 components of discourse: (a) organizing propositional information, (b) overusing metadiscourse strategies, (c) manifesting social
identity, and (d) performing rituals of face. Chapter 4 was divided into four sections each focusing on the analysis of one of these components of discourse transfer. Data analysis consisted of successive displays of quantitative measures followed by transcripts of patterns of language use offering evidence of the transfer of L1. The goal of the data analysis was to document and describe the quality and quantity of the discourse transfer phenomena from the L1 to the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants.

None of the theoretical interpretations encountered during the literature review offer a completely satisfactory interpretation of the underlying processes involved in discourse transfer. It could very well be the case that discourse transfer as a phenomenon in L2 speech is largely independent from what the available literature would lead us to believe about it. First, the SLA perspective envisages a highly cognitive process in which elements from the learner’s L1 discourse knowledge are fossilized in the learner’s interlanguage system and therefore the learner fails to acquire the full range of discourse competence (knowledge) that native speakers have of their language. Second, the sociocultural perspective focuses on the role of society and culture in shaping the discourse performance of L2 learners, and therefore neglects the internal “information-processing” operations involved in the production of this phenomenon. What is needed is a theoretical construct that can more adequately account for the complexity of the phenomenon of discourse transfer as it was observed and analyzed in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech.

A modular view allows for integrating the components of discourse transfer and accounts for the production of discourse transfer phenomena into the L2 speech of the
Chinese participants in the study. The data analysis revealed that the production of discourse transfer patterns in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech is the product of a redundant and coherent system of interrelated discourse components that reinforce and support each other. There are four basic components of Chinese discourse that characterized the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants: propositional information, metadiscourse strategies, social identity, and face rituals. Each of these four components mutually influenced the others, and so they formed a coherent system of communication or discourse. For example, due to the fact that the 4 Chinese participants did not express a clear position at the beginning of their arguments, they employed cohesive devices for the function of adding propositional content to push their arguments forward. They stated their position at the end after they felt that sufficient backgrounding has been established. Similarly, the data analysis revealed that there was a strong relationship between the social identity patterns which reflected the hierarchical world view of Chinese society and the dichotomous use of face rituals toward self and toward others. The embeddedness of the different discourse components that characterized the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants had a strong effect on the discourse patterns which they come to use in the L2 context. As Kellerman (1995) stated, “When it comes to verbalizing events in a second language, learners may not look for the perspective, peculiar to that language; instead, they may seek the linguistic tools which will permit them to maintain their L1 perspectives” (p. 141). As far as they were concerned, the 4 Chinese participants used the patterns of language use that they were most familiar with to achieve communicative ends in the L2 context. They achieved these ends in a manner that was consistent with their
sense of social identity which in turn dictated the social rituals needed to maintain face and social harmony in everyday interaction.

**The “Modularity” Hypothesis of Discourse Transfer**

| Hypothesis I. | It is hypothesized that a cognitive modular system unites and pulls together all the manifestations of discourse transfer behavior produced by the 4 Chinese ESL participants in the study. |

The findings of the present study suggest that discourse transfer effects may be best thought of in terms of cognitive modularity (Pinker, 1997; Montrul, 2000). It is proposed that a common modular system unites and pulls together the 4 components of discourse transfer phenomena produced by the 4 Chinese learners. Each of these four components, even though distinct from each other, mutually influenced the others.

The theoretical model of cognitive modularity is flexible enough to accommodate these different components to form a tight system of communication that is controlled by the Chinese learner. The data analysis showed that L1 discourse knowledge was transferred to the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech in which they (a) organized their arguments, (b) made connections between their sentences, (c) manifested their social identity, and (d) performed rituals of face. This modular system is specialized: One module might deal only with organizing propositional information, another module might deal with metadiscourse strategies, a third with manifesting social identity, and the fourth with rituals of face. Because the 4 Chinese participants already have a native language, these modules function as cognitive pegs on which they hang new information about the L2.

A modular view to transfer was supported by the findings of a recent study (Montrul, 2000).
2000) on the transfer of L1 grammatical categories. Montrul (2000) stated, “These findings suggest that L1 influence does not affect all linguistic domains in the same way and that it is subject to modularity in interlanguage grammars” (p. 231). According to a modular view of discourse transfer, the learner’s production of discourse transfer is an outcome of the process of assigning different discourse patterns to different cognitive modules in the learner’s mind.

According to the modular hypothesis, a language learner’s L2 performance does not reflect a single system but a battery of quite different systems each obeying different principles. For example, learning how to assemble a complex syntactic structure like “topic comment” is driven by one system, while learning how to perform rituals of face is driven by another quite different system. Treating the language learner’s L2 performance as a collection of sometimes quite independent systems is called the modular approach. Many linguists and cognitive scientists believe that the mind is equipped with innate intuitive modules for the major ways of making sense of the world (e.g., Fodor, 1983; Pinker, 1997; Sharwood Smith, 1993; White, 1989). According to Pinker (1997), for example, “The mind is a system of modules or mental organs, each with a specialized design that makes it an expert in one arena of interaction with the world” (p. 21). While the modular hypothesis on discourse transfer postulates an innate capacity for using language, it also accommodates the fact that information about how the second language works mainly comes from within the ambient linguistic environment surrounding the individual learner. It is the interaction of innate factors (L1) with the second language that produces discourse transfer phenomena.
Learning requires connecting new knowledge with already existing knowledge so that they generalize in useful ways. This means that there is a dynamic interplay between the linguistic, social, and cultural aspects of the L1 and the learner’s L2 performance. The fully developed L1 competence of the language learner is surrounded by less developed marginal areas, that is, peripheral and transitional competence in the L2. L1 competence is in constant interaction with the linguistic, social, and cultural aspects of the learner’s L2. That modularity is the mechanism through which the underlying modules of L1 competence are continually appearing through the language learner’s performance in the L2. The learner’s production of discourse transfer is the outcome of a combination of different L1-L2 knowledge sources interacting to produce the L2. In conclusion, a modular view accounts for L1 influence in a learner’s performance by focusing on what the learner does when compelled to express meaning with an IL system that is not sufficiently well developed to cope with the task, and needs to be boosted from the L1 system to fulfill the desired communicative goal.
CHAPTER 5

DISCOURSE TRANSFER AND THE INTERACTIONAL CONTEXT

Introduction

The previous chapter analyzed how the 4 Chinese participants managed their discourse behavior with respect to their native language and cultural background. The present chapter is devoted to the task of analyzing the nature of the relationship between the phenomenon of discourse transfer and the interactional context. Data analysis focused on the 4 Chinese participants' interactive goals during their social interactions with the 3 native speakers of the target language. The interactional context is defined as the familiar kind of talk in which two participants, one Chinese ESL student and another a native speaker of English, freely alternate in speaking in English, which occurs in a setting that was designated by the researcher for the purpose of data collection.

It is not difficult to see why one should look to the interactional context for gaining insight into discourse transfer phenomena. The interactional context is the site where the patterns of language use frame both the production and interpretation of messages between the two participants. Various categories of discourse transfer were organized around their use in casual conversation. For example, the category of "topic-comment word order" (TC), explored in Chapter 4, is based on an assumption of
co-present conversational participants. The Chinese topic-comment word order served to highlight the 4 Chinese participants' use of grammatical features of discourse organization that were embedded in the interactional context.

The empirical evidence used in this chapter was collected from careful inductive work which was based on observation of transcribed data. The interrelationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context was demonstrated by data from the transcribed interactions that highlight the Chinese and English speakers' interactive goals during their social interactions in English. The categories, embedded in the interactional context, lent themselves to two types of discourse analysis. The first type of the analysis was one in which the researcher analyzed the interactional consequences of producing discourse transfer in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants. This type of analysis investigated the native speakers' management of conversational problems such as unintended interruptions made by the 4 Chinese participants. The second type of discourse analysis focused on the Chinese speakers' answers to native speakers' questions which resulted in the production of discourse transfer in their L2 speech. While the first type of the analysis attended mostly to the native speakers' interactional modifications that resulted from discourse transfer, the second type attended mostly to the Chinese speakers' production of discourse transfer categories in the interactional context. The data analysis combined the two types of discourse analysis, analyzing how the regular occurrence of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech during interaction was influenced not only by the patterns of their first language, but also by the patterns of
second language use by the NS participants in the interactional context in terms of posing questions which lead to the appearance of some discourse transfer categories.

Nearly all the categories of discourse transfer presented so far in this study tie in closely with the interactional context as the basic kind of language use which gives rise to discourse transfer. However, the two types of discourse analysis of the interrelationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context focused on a limited number of categories of discourse transfer for which there was found demonstrable evidence of interactive work by the participants from the data of the interactions. Examples that demonstrate the interrelationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context were drawn from the following categories: (a) topic-comment, (b) answering with an unrelated point, (c) free association, (d) revisiting, (e) qualifiers, (f) miscues, and (g) rituals of face including the two subgroups: (a) respect for others, and (b) self-denial.

A. Topic-Comment Word Order

On the relationship between native language, cognition, and rhetorical style, Slobin (1991) proposed that when a child acquires the grammar of the native language, “the child acquires more than a system of grammatical forms and semantic/communicative functions” (p. 1). According to Slobin (1991), “In acquiring the grammar of a particular language, the child comes to adopt a particular framework for schematizing experience” (p. 1). The present study provides support for Slobin’s (1991) proposal, at least in the area of the different word orders that Chinese and English speakers usually follow in sentence organization. The data sets revealed that the grammatical specification of a topic-comment sentence in Chinese has provided a particular framework for how the 4 Chinese
speakers organized lexical content in a topic-comment word order. In commenting on Slobin’s proposal, Kellerman (1995) stated that “when it comes to verbalizing events in a second language, learners may not look for the perspective, peculiar to that language; instead, they may seek the linguistic tools which will permit them to maintain their L1 perspective” (p. 141). This was the case with the 4 Chinese speakers when they unintentionally interrupted their native-speaking interlocutors due to differences in their perception of ordering linguistic information. The data analysis revealed that the 4 Chinese participants transferred the topic-comment word order of Chinese to English both in terms of the production of discourse transfer in their L2 speech and the comprehension of native speakers’ utterances in the interactional context.

The presentation of information in Chinese is distributed according to the “new-given” order of presentation (i.e., the topic-comment word order). In English, however, the presentation of information is distributed according to the “given-new” order of presentation (i.e., the subject-predicate word order). By looking at how the Chinese participants sometimes unintentionally interrupted their English native-speaking interlocutors, the analyst concluded that there existed a relationship between those interruptions and the 4 Chinese participants’ transfer of the Chinese topic-comment word order to their L2 speech. Meisel (1981) observed that second language learners “are using the underlying canonical word order of their L1s as a starting point in L2 acquisition and speech processing in the second language” (p. 47). The data analysis focused on whether the transfer of topic-comment word order influenced both the utterances and perceptions of the 4 Chinese speakers. The analysis revealed that it was not only in the area of the
production of messages that the evidence pointed to the L1 influence of topic-comment word order in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech, but also in the area of the interpretation of messages. This may account for the fact that the perceptions of L2 learners, in terms of the ordering of information had something to do with their unintended interruptions of their English native-speaking interlocutors. For example, Linda interrupted Fiona twice before the latter could finish her utterance about the unfairness of a test that Linda had taken:

(5.1)

L: Part C of the test is very difficult to me because their test, the supervisor will read an article or a long story, and I cannot catch all the information. Uhm, for example, at first, at the beginning, I can hear what the supervisor say very clear, but after when he finish the article, I forgot the beginning, ha....

F: Well, I would’ve too. I am a native speaker, but if it’s too long =

L: Uhm, uhm.

F: = Could you take notes?

L: No, you can’t. It’s not allowed. So, it’s very difficult. You should remember all the information.

F: → That doesn’t seem fair because –

L: Yeah, because when we, when we go to here, uhn, lecture, everybody do, do, take the notes.

F: → Yeah, that doesn’t seem fair because you –

L: Remember the lecture.

F: = You listen and you write things down to remember, to remind you.

Linda’s two unintended and seemingly innocuous interruptions are systematic and recurrent organizational problems that frequently characterized the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants. The way information was processed by the 4 Chinese participants during listening and the demands of rapid on-line processing of the interactional context frequently resulted in this pattern of relying on the L1 and erroneously assuming that the native speaker has finished his/her sentence, and that it was time to talk.
The pattern of interruptions which were based on a topic-comment word order were found in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants in several interactions. For example, Julia’s unfamiliarity with the English organization of propositional content into “given” vs. “new” information led her to think that Jim was making a declarative statement while, in fact, he was going to ask a question. Jim’s question relied heavily on the first part of his utterance in a given-new pattern of ordering of information.

(5.2)

JM: But there have been banks in Taiwan for a long time. —
J: → Yeah, we, we have.
JM: = So, how about these recent years?

Julia thought that Jim had finished his statement, so she unintentionally interrupted Jim. From a grammatical point of view, Jim’s statement is a complete sentence. Julia thought that was all Jim wanted to say because she comes from a topic-comment word order language background in which Jim’s sentence constitutes a complete topic-comment order of presentation:

\[
\text{But there have been banks in Taiwan for a long time.} \\
\text{[Topic]} \quad \text{[Comment]}
\]

Jim, on the other hand, was planning to use this statement as a springboard from which he could establish the question about “recent years” which was the information he was interested in.

The same pattern of unintended interruption happened when Peng interrupted Fiona’s statement in the middle:
(5.3)

F: → There are trade-offs –
P:   Yeah, trade-off.
F:   = There are trade-offs when we make choices.
P:   Yeah.

Again, Peng thought that Fiona had finished her statement. Because Fiona saw Peng’s interruption in the middle of her sentence as a violation of her turn to speak, she repeated what she said at the beginning only this time adding the new information to her statement:

There are trade offs when we make choices.
[Given Information] [New Information]

Peng comes from a language background where topic-comment is the canonical form of organizing information. From an input-processing perspective, Peng was influenced by the Chinese word order in processing the discourse that was uttered by Fiona, the English native-speaking interlocutor. In this way, at least some cases of unintended interruption in the middle of a native speaker’s statement can be explained according to each individual Chinese speaker’s degree of being influenced by the Chinese topic-comment word order.

By looking at how, sometimes, English native speakers attempt to manage Chinese speakers’ utterances, one can conclude that the given (old) - new information pattern is equally influential on English native speakers’ perceptions.

(5.4)

H:   Karl Wolf, uhm, Karl Wolf has some education about, about the child.
J:   And?
H:   And I think, uhm. Do you know Glasnov?

In this example, Huang thought that as far as he was concerned, he already said what he wanted to say. The topic-comment structure of his utterance was as follows:
Jim, however, thought that Huang’s statement is a first statement that carries given/old information. So, he prompted Huang to continue by saying, “And...?” But Huang felt at a loss. He already finished what he wanted to say about Karl Wolf. So, in a split second, Huang decided to change the subject to another musician, this time Glasnov. It was clear from this analysis that Jim perceived a conversational problem (e.g., something is missing from Huang’s statement) that needed to be managed by him to assist Huang to finish his sentence. But Huang’s reaction indicated that he was through with the topic from his first statement.

**B. Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point**

Chinese speakers often begin their answers with a statement or idea that is only globally related to the topic of the question, and then gradually approach the question. As the data analysis had shown in chapter 4, this discourse strategy characterized the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech while they were interacting with their English native-speaking interlocutors. The interrelationship between this category of discourse transfer and the interactional context is that it prompts the native speaker to insist on an answer for his/her question thereby producing several additional turns at talk. For example, in the following transcript, Jim asked Linda about how music teachers can help students improve their techniques through the use of Chi-Gong as a potential teaching method for music students in Taiwan. When, at first, she answered his question with an unrelated point (It’s not helpful to her if the music teacher doesn’t tell her how to improve her
techniques), he perceived Linda's answer as a conversational problem. In other words, Linda's answer with an unrelated point led Jim to conclude that she did not answer his question. Subsequent to Linda's first answer, Jim tried to pose the same question in four different ways so that he could get her to answer his original question. Jim's question was only held in abeyance until Linda's "unrelated points" got sorted out. For Jim as a native speaker of English, there was an expectation that his question would eventually be answered, even though Linda may have responded with an unrelated point during the interaction.

(5.5)

L: If my professor they, he don't help me.
J: Uhm.
L: He don't tell me how to, how to improve my technique, it is not helpful to me.
J: But the, uhn, teachers have improved their techniques, so how did they improve their techniques? Just by reflecting on their excellent skills? Or by reading, or talking to someone who is better than they are? See my question?
L: Not very.
J: Alright. The, the, the teachers are good. How do they become good? Do they become good by thinking about how they do what they do so well or do they demonstrate their excellent skills and say, "Can you tell me how I did that so well?"
L: → Oh, I know your question. You know, some, some pianists they are very excellent, and we can say they are born pianists, and if you ask him, "How can he do this, how can he play this, how can he play this skill so fast?" I think he cannot answer your question. He will say, "I don't know. I just play it. I can do this so fast, and then everyone can do it." It's one kind style, it's born pianist. They have no any frustration of, in their, during their learning experience. And another style, another teacher style is they, they are not perfect pianist, they also have some technique, some performance problem, and they, and they, and they, uhn, continue to their, they always continue their education, although they already, uhn, got the, the professors, uhn, position. And then, they can, if they, they continue to research how to, how to solve the performance problem, I think this one is, is better to teach students.
J: → Yeah. My question is “What research do they actually do?” Do they think about their physical activity, or do they ask someone? For example, uhn, physiologists, or nutritionists, or athletic coach? Say, how does my hand move?

L: Uhm?

J: How does my hand move (He screamed)? And how can I control it better? How can I make more gradation of touch, for example, how can I move it faster? How can I stretch it? You know the story of Shumac, right? That’s just an example.

→ So, my question is, do they think about, do they think alone about what they do, and try to tell their students their own conclusions to this research they do? How do I play it? Maybe they make up exercise, or do they play something for someone, for an analyst, and say, “How did I do that?” And then, the response of the analysts, they give to their students, for they assimilated in their teaching.

→ You see what I am saying.

L: I know, but I am not sure about this idea about my professor. But he say, you know, this quarter, he give me, uhn, Chopin’s edit, edited piece. He, he tell me, why he give me this piece, is because he know, he know my problem, my performance problem. And, he say, uhn, five years ago, he practice this piece, and he got a lot of improvement because his hand is not, is bigger than mine, but his finger is longer, but his hand is narrow, you know. So, his, his hand approach a big interval.

J: I see what you mean.

The above data set showed that Jim kept repeating his question because he perceived that there was a problem related to Linda’s comprehension of his question. Jim made that assessment based on Linda’s feedback in the form of her replies to his repeated question. Jim systematically approached this problem by publically restating his question in different ways until he was sure that Linda understood it. Jim’s strategy of restating his question to Linda in this way was part of his ongoing management of her “answering with a seemingly unrelated point” to his questions. In this way, the occurrence of the discourse transfer category of “answering with an unrelated point” resulted in additional turns at talk in the form of Jim’s repeated conversational management procedures and Linda’s repeated use of what Jim perceived to be unrelated points.
In the following interaction between Peng and Fiona, Peng did not address Fiona’s question head on. While she asked him about Los Angeles, he replied with “I like here, I like here” meaning Columbus, Ohio, where the interaction occurred:

(5.6)

F: What was your impression of Los Angeles?
P: I like here, I like here.
F: You like it?
P: → Yeah, I feel, in Los Angeles, too many Taiwanese people, uhn-ha....
F: Really?
P: Yeah, in the hotel, I live in the Monterey Park. Do you know?
F: Where is that again?
P: Monterey Park, Monterey Park.
F: I know I’m not sure where that is, anyway, so go on.
P: It’s in near Los Angeles. Los Angeles, and in that place, all are Taiwanese people. And in the, in that hotel, you can buy Chinese newspapers.
F: WOW!
P: Yeah. And you go to, go supermarket, the service men are Chinese people or Hong Kong’s people, uhn-ha.... You can give him, you can talk to him with Chinese, with Mandarin, and, uhn-ha..., all are, it looks like not, not America. It looks like a small county in Taiwan. They all speak, speak Chinese, so I don’t like that place.
F: So, you like it here better than Los Angeles, did you say?
P: Yeah.
F: Ok.
P: I like here. The, I feel Los Angeles is very, I don’t know, I feel this place is more comfortable. Los Angeles is like just a big city.

Fiona misinterpreted Peng’s reply because her repetition of what she thought he said was clearly in reference to Los Angeles. Peng’s reply in the fourth line with a “Yes” when in fact what he meant to say was “No” had probably complicated the situation even further.

As part of her conversational management efforts, Fiona conducted a comprehension check “Really?” to make sure that she understood what Peng was saying. In the sixth line, Peng replied with “Yes” when he should have said “No” because he did not really agree
with Fiona’s comprehension check. Only after elaborating at length about his experience in L.A. and putting his position at the end “So, I don’t like that place” did Fiona inquire: “So you like it here better than L.A., did you say?” to which Peng finally responded: “Yeah,” and then Fiona said, “Ok.”

This short episode of mutual misunderstanding would not have happened if Peng had addressed Fiona’s question more directly like “I like it here better than Los Angeles.” Unfortunately, Peng transferred the Chinese discourse strategy of answering with an unrelated point thereby causing Fiona’s initial misunderstanding. At the end of this brief episode, Fiona rephrased Peng’s answer in a way that a native speaker would, and only after getting confirmation from Peng that this is in fact what he wanted to say did the misunderstanding on her part get resolved: Peng did not like Los Angeles very much. He meant to say that he liked it in Columbus more than he did in Los Angeles.

As part of her conversational management strategies, Fiona made an effort at holding the focus of the interaction until enough has been said about a particular point to move on to the next. As a reaction to the 4 Chinese participants’ transfer of the strategy of answering with an unrelated point in their L2 speech, Fiona employed the management procedure of restating some of her questions that were answered with an unrelated point. For example, in the following interaction between Fiona and Linda, Fiona asked whether Linda and her roommate needed to find another place to live. In her response, Linda initially did not say anything about moving out or looking for a new apartment. She, instead, attempted to invoke the point in the past in which she got herself into the apartment in the first place (from the second day she arrived in America) up to the reasons
why she now wanted to move out (present problem) all the while not addressing Fiona’s original question of whether she was looking for another place at the present time. Fiona fully accommodated Linda’s story about her present apartment by showing solidarity with her about how uncomfortable the current place was. Only after Linda said that her roommate did not want to continue living there, and that she wanted to move out, did Fiona employ her management procedure of restating her original question 25 lines later in the transcript:

(5.7)

F: → Well, you and your roommate have to find another place to live now?
L: Yeah, uhn, we, uhn, when the second day after I go to American, after I came to American, my friend, she, she took me to rent a efficient apartment, but now I change my mind, I want to find another one, because, uhn, the apartment is behind High Street, and the building seems very old, yeah. It’s, it’s the same style as now where I live. And the old building, every, every day, every day, when you go back to your apartment, you can see, uhn, there are, too, too many rocks.
F: Rats?
L: Can you understand? Rocks, the, the small insects, rock, rock. Uhn, I think R-O-A-C-H-E-S
F: Roaches.
L: Oh, roaches, yeah, uhn, it’s very uncomfortable to me. Yeah, you know, sometimes, when I, when I eat something, eat some food, or drink something, one time, uhn, when, when I eat some food, then somebody call me, and I go to catch the phone. After I hang up the phone, some roaches is behind my food, oh, I really =
F: Oh, no.
L: = Oh, it’s really disgusting, and I throw it away, and I went to sleep, you know. I, I really don’t like this situation.
F: That doesn’t sound very good.
L: Uhn, you know, every day, I should, I should live with roaches.
F: That’s, that’s not a very comfortable way to do.
L: Yeah, so, I, I don’t like the same kind style, old building. It’s too old, and my friend, she also, she don’t like there. She, I, I ask her, why you choose here to, to live? She say, because last year, she came to American at September, and it’s too late to, to rent a apartment, she had no, she had no choice. At the time, she had no car. She need to live close to campus.
F: Right.
L: Yeah, and she say, the apartment near campus is old, you just can find this kind, this kind style, it's very old. And, she don't want to continue to stay there, and she will move out.
F: — Have you found another place to live?

Linda was cooperative and did not intentionally ignore Fiona’s question, for example, by saying that she was not going to answer this question. She produced a verbal response in which the category of “answering with an unrelated point” was transferred from Chinese to English. Fiona followed a conversational management strategy of accommodating Linda’s departure from the question, while at the same time maintaining her focus on getting an answer that was relevant to her question.

In the two categories discussed so far, the analysis revealed how the regular occurrence of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech was influenced not only by the discourse patterns in their first language, but also by the patterns of language use which the native speakers employed in the interactional context. First, in the category of topic-comment word order, the analysis showed how the Chinese and English speakers followed different frameworks dictated by their respective languages for ordering information. English utterances followed a subject-predicate word order in which “given” information (e.g., what is already known to the hearer) was followed by new information (e.g., what the speaker really wanted to convey to the hearer as his/her point). In Chinese utterances, however, new information was presented first in the topic part of a topic-comment structure, while old information came in the comment to support the topic. Second, in the category of “answering with an unrelated point,” both the Chinese and English speakers had different expectations about what is relevant. While English
speakers expected other parties to the talk to “speak to the point” especially in response to a question, Chinese speakers exhibited the Chinese discourse pattern of holding back and delaying their answers until enough support has been offered to back up the answers. The use of this discourse pattern by the Chinese speakers led the English native-speaking interlocutors to employ a particular conversational management procedure to solve what they perceived as a conversational problem. This pattern included repeating the question directed by the native speakers in the first place. The two discourse transfer categories of topic-comment word order and answering with an unrelated point influenced the interactional context in that they caused additional turns at talk by the native speakers in which they attempted to solve the conversational problem each category generated. In the course of those additional turns at talk, English native-speaking interlocutors attempted to resolve the interruptions and/or violations of turn-taking in the numbered 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7 transcript. The outcome of these conversational management procedures was that both parties to the talk managed to reach mutual understanding.

Robinson (1988) mentioned that among the things that cause English native speakers’ irritation in talking to Chinese speakers is the Chinese speaker’s persistently interrupting the native speaker in the middle of his/her sentence. Robinson (1988) interpreted the reason behind this Chinese tendency to be the wrong use of turn-taking. After analyzing the influence of the underlying structure of topic-comment word order on the Chinese participants’ unintended interruptions of their English native-speaking interlocutors, evidence from the transcribed interactions suggested that what causes, at least, some cases of interruption may not be merely a case of taking a wrong turn at talk.
This interpretation relied on the influence of the native language on both Chinese and English speakers. Because English speakers generally order information according to a given (old) - new information pattern, and Chinese speakers according to a topic-comment pattern, these different deep structures regularly contributed to the interruptions that were analyzed in this section. The evidence from the present study on the L1 influence of topic-comment in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech suggests that the underlying structures of the L1 were responsible for cases of unintended interruptions between the 4 Chinese participants and their native-speaking interlocutors.

C. Free Association

This category of discourse transfer was invariably viewed by the English native speakers as a digression. The occurrence of “free association” in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech frequently created what these native speakers perceived as a conversational problem that needed to be managed so that the conversation could resume on the right track. In most interactions, interlocutors agree to move a conversation towards some mutually-defined goal. Data analysis reveals that the goal was seen by the native speaker as whatever the conversation was dealing with before the outbreak of a free association. For example,

(5.8)

J: You must practice to drive in the snow. It’s, it’s a little harder, I think, in general. It’s, it’s uhn-
H: → My friend last week have a car accident.
J: Here or somewhere where there is snow?
H: Uhm, on the way to Cleveland.
J: I see.
Jim was talking to Huang about the topic of driving in the snow when the latter free associated with "My friend last week have a car accident." This was seen by Jim as a new topic that needed to be managed by giving it due attention until it gets resolved. The fact that Huang brought a new topic to the conversation that carries its own momentum influenced the interactional context. The first additional turn at talk that free association was able to generate was the clarification request by Jim: "Here or somewhere where there is snow?" In effect, Jim was trying to find anything in common between what he was talking about, for example, "driving in the snow," and the newly established topic of "traffic accident." Of course, Jim was concerned about Huang's friend having a car accident, but he did not lose his focus on the original topic of driving in the snow. Huang's introduction of the topic of a car accident created what Jim perceived as a conversational problem that needed to be managed. Almost ten lines later in the transcript, Jim tried to establish some commonality between the two topics. In the first part of Jim's utterance, he confirmed his original point about the need to practice to be able to drive in the snow. In the second part, he continued with his management effort of Huang's free association: "Was she driving in the highway?" This example demonstrated that Jim, as an educated native speaker of English, placed a higher value on relevance than
on digression. However, his sense of civility made him accommodate Huang by finding common ground between his topic and the topic that was introduced by Huang.

In the following interaction between Linda and Marianne, Linda’s use of free association saved what looked like an awkward opening to their conversation. It was one week before Thanksgiving Day, but already in Columbus, in the morning of November 21, 1996, there was snow everywhere. After the researcher introduced Marianne and Linda to each other, they were left alone in the living room with the tape recorder running. The following sequence ensued:

\[(5.9)\]

M: How are you today?
L: → Yeah. Today I look better than yesterday.
L: Uhm-ha....
L: Because this week I have a lot of homework need to do, yeah.
M: Well, uhn, do you think you’ll get it all finished? Uhm-ha....
L: No, I just finished this week, and I have another homework for the following week.
M: Yes! Yes!
L: Yes, next week.
M: Do you ever get caught-up? Do you ever get finished? Completely finished?
L: No.
M: Not yet?
L: It is impossible.
M: Wait for when your studies are over, you will have time to relax and to, to, to do other things. I think. I hope. I hope.
L: You hope?
M: Yeah, I hope.
L: → You hope, he-ha.... And this morning I went out 9 o’clock.
L: Uhm, uhm.
L: When I open the door, I see, wow, outside walk is snow.
M: Isn’t it beautiful?
L: Yeah, I think, oh. It’s true because I never see this thing before in Taiwan.
Marianne's initial greeting “How are you?” did not get the usual return she was expecting: "I am fine, thank you!” Instead Linda said, “I feel better than yesterday” which is quite acceptable in Chinese. Suddenly Linda shifted the focus of the conversation to the speech act of complaining about her homework. Marianne went along with Linda asking her questions about when she might finish. Then in an act of solidarity with Linda, Marianne said that she hoped that one day Linda would be done with her studies, and then she will have time to relax. Linda then repeated Marianne's statement “You hope” but she was not sure whether she offended Marianne. As part of her strategic competence, Linda's use of “free association” worked to break an awkward moment at this early stage of the conversation. By shifting the focus of the conversation again from homework to the weather, Linda found something nice to talk about with Marianne. Data analysis revealed that Linda wanted Marianne to talk to her about snow because she never saw snow before in Taiwan.

In the following interaction, Julia used the strategy of free association with Fiona. Like Jim, Fiona perceived Julia’s free association as a complete digression from the topic which was being discussed (e.g., Is there something that you hope to gain from this experience?). Julia started by saying that she did not think that she would end up talking about a private matter with Fiona. But then Julia made the decision to recount an anecdote that happened to her the day before. It was as if Julia felt so comfortable with Fiona as a conversation partner that she was willing to share her secrets with Fiona on tape.
What, uhn, what do you hope to, to gain during the time you are here? Is there something, like a finance, uhn, when you leave, before you leave here, is there something that you hope to, to gain from this experience?

From here?

Yeah. Is there something that you like to bring from this experience?

Uhn. I never think, talk about this, uhn-ha. Uhn, ok, ha.... Before, when I in Taiwan, my roommate tell, talk to me that when you go, go there, maybe you have the chance to have a boyfriend, uhn-ha....

WOW!

Uhn, but, uhn, uhn, maybe I can say, in Taiwan I never dress like this. We all long, long-hand, =

Long-hand.

= and I never like this.

Looks like a short-sleeve top?

Uhn, uhn. So, but, my cousin and my aunt say if you want live here and somebody, the other people will not feel you are strange. You have to wear like this, ha.... So, now, I used to be like, it's very comfortable. And sometimes, uhn, maybe, uhn, the day before yesterday, I walk in the high street, and I have wait the, uhn, traffic light, and I want to cross the road. I see, uhn, some guys turn to me, (whistle), yeah-ha....

Ha... They're looking at you.

Yeah, but in Taiwan, I never, ha..., I never have the, this experience.

How's, how did you feel when they do that?

Ha..., just very exciting, ha... (Both laughed). It's very funny.

Yes, it's nice. Isn't it? Ha.... It's wonderful.

While Julia was waiting at the traffic light to cross the street, three young American men whistled at her from their pick-up truck. Julia commented to Fiona that her dress had something to do with it because back in Taiwan she never had this experience.

The only thing that changed from Taiwan to Columbus was the way she dressed because in Taiwan she dressed more conservatively. When she came to America, however, her aunt told her that everyone in America dresses in short skirts and that if she wanted people “not to feel strange, you have to wear like this.” Fiona asked Julia how she felt when she was whistled at by the men in the pick-up truck. Even though this whole anecdote was in
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free association and had no relationship to the topic at hand, Fiona’s management of this conversational problem was not to repeat the original question as she did with Linda. In this context, the subject of Julia’s conversation was too delicate for Fiona to repeat her original point. Fiona’s decision was that, since Julia trusted her enough to talk about this anecdote with her, she showed her solidarity with Julia by asking how Julia felt when the boys whistled to her.

Even though “free association” as a metadiscourse strategy is not as readily available as an option in English as it is in Chinese, the discourse analysis of the interactions showed that this category of discourse transfer had a negative effect on the interactional context in that it generated additional turns at talk between the Chinese participants and their NS counterparts. Moreover, the analysis showed that depending on the interactional context in which it is used, free association was employed by the 4 Chinese participants to perform a variety of functions. For example, free association functioned as a digression and therefore as a conversational problem that the native speakers sought to manage by reminding the Chinese speaker of the original point that was being discussed prior to the occurrence of free association. In the interaction between Marianne and Linda, free association functioned as a strategy to break the ice between interactants and bring fun and excitement to an otherwise awkward moment in the conversation. In another context, free association functioned as a strategy of friendship and confidence-building between Julia and Fiona who were trying to make conversation.
Revisiting is a metadiscourse strategy that was employed by the 4 Chinese participants in their L2 speech during their interactions with their NS interlocutors. What “revisiting” has in common with “free association” is that they are both Chinese-based strategies that are available as options to Chinese speakers. The main function that revisiting can perform is that its use can highlight a topic that the Chinese speaker wants to talk about. The use of revisiting becomes viable when a Chinese speaker wants to arouse a listener’s interest about a point that was not given its due share of attention by the listener when the point was first introduced. The following two examples demonstrate the use of revisiting for the fulfillment of this role.

In the first example, Peng wanted Jim to listen to his views regarding democracy in Taiwan. According to Peng, the media’s depiction of the fights on the floor of the Taiwanese congress was too sensationalised to reveal the truth behind what was really going on there. On the one hand, Peng saw the real cause of those fights as bribery and corruption. The media, on the other hand, seemed to emphasize the fact that the Taiwanese congressmen had demonstrated their own ways of democratic action by beating up on each other. But Jim was preoccupied with talking about a story he had recently seen on TV about a fire in a Taiwanese shop that killed five people. Peng reacted to Jim’s interest by trivializing his story. He stated that “five people are not too many.” What Peng really wanted to talk about was the media’s stereotyping of the fights that take place on the floor of the Taiwanese parliament. So, after Peng felt he had dealt with the
preliminaries of Jim’s story about the five people who died in a fire, he revisited his
original point which was first mentioned in line 2:

(5.11)

J: Taiwan was in the news itself, –
P: Yeah, yeah.
J: = and there's a fire?
P: Yeah, another, and congressman fight on the congress.
J: Oh, that was in the news, too?
P: Uhn-ha, no other news.
J: Oh, I didn't see that. What I saw was just this fire. Did you see that too?
P: Fire?
J: In Taipei.
P: Oh, yesterday?
J: Oh, Wednesday night, Thursday morning, something like that.
P: A building or?
J: Yeah, it was a store.
P: Oh, I did not know.
J: A store burn down, five people die.
P: Five people die? Oh, five people is not too many.
J: No, it's not too many.
P: Uha.... You know, in Taiwan we can say, a total of twenty is many, ha... (Both
laughed). When I came to the Columbus, the first news I got from Taiwan is
congressmen fight on congress, uhn-ha....
J: Oh, I think I saw something like that.
P: Uhn, and the second news I got is also, uhn-ha..., congressmen =
J: It's still fighting?
P: = fight in congress. Yesterday I talk to you that bribery is a very serious problem.
I think, I think, maybe you will agree. People fight, congressmen fight on the
congress. They, they just not for peoples. They for, they are for their personal
benefits.
J: Uhn. But so, but what are they fighting about when we-? Sometimes is on TV,
somebody is fighting, two, two people are fighting, you know, it actually hitting
each other.
P: Yeah, yeah.
J: So, why are they doing that? I mean what is it that they are fighting about?

What revisiting managed to do for Peng was that it highlighted his topic about
fights in congress until Jim really got interested in it. The fact that Jim posed his question
“So, what is it that they are fighting about?” indicated that Jim finally acknowledged that Peng had something to say about this topic.

In the second example, Huang wanted to get Jim’s opinion on a specific question: “How can he tell good coffee from bad coffee?” Subsequent to its first mention by Huang, and over the course of several turns-at-talk, this question was revisited three times by Huang until it got Jim’s attention.

(5.12)

H: → Do you know how to, how to tell the coffee is good or not good? Coffee?

J: Before I taste it, or when I taste it?

H: Before or when you taste it.

J: That’s it.

H: Uhn-ha....

J: Alright. I can tell you whether it will be strong if by looking.

H: By looking?

J: Well, looking and smelling, too. Uhn, the look, the darker, in general, if it’s more dark, it’s more sharp. And, uhn, that’s one basic thing. The amount of acid or some other things, I can’t tell by looking. I must taste it. I am not so sensitive. If I smell it, I can know something but not so many things about acid or if it is bitter.

H: Some of them is acid.

J: Uhm, uhm. There is a nice coffee, there is another, the bus, the bus goes past another place, and has a coffee shop. In the bookstore, they are separate, but, uhn, the coffee shop sells many different coffees. Actually, I was, I think there are two coffee shops. There is different, Lane Avenue shopping center, and uhn, there is-

H: Oh, Lane avenue shopping center in the opposite, that have one bookstore?

J: Well, the 84 bus goes past Lane Avenue center. If you want to get off and it stops, I think two times. And it goes along and it goes to the Kings-, Kingsdale, and it comes back and goes past Lane Avenue shopping center. Lane Avenue shopping center is, I think, two coffee shops and one restaurant, oh, one bookstore, many restaurants, two coffee shops. And the Kingsdale has the bookstore with the coffee shop and it has separate coffee shop that’s very nice. Coffee shop and restaurant. Uhn, you could go by bus to both of them. It’s convenient during the day. But in the, after, after 5, it’s not, it’s not nice.

H: Uhm, from Monday to Friday, everyday I have the class, and uhn-ha..., if I go there, go there, and I just sit down and want to enjoy the coffee, and the time is up. That must bad.

J: Yeah. I think you don’t feel so happy, so I don’t know.
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H: Uhm-ha....
J: Yeah. Downtown, I think there are no coffee shop, no bookstores that have a coffee shop.
H: Downtown?
J: Oh, no, no. Downtown, no. But I think, before downtown, there is one or two maybe.
H: The right?
J: Yeah. I think I am right. Who knows it's an art gallery. I am sorry. It's not, it's not a bookstore.
H: I know. It's outside the glass.
J: No, no, not that one. That's, I know what you mean. In the 3rd Avenue. No, it's not outside. That one is not so bad. It's not great. The other one is art gallery, but the owner made it bigger, and now he has a small coffee bar, and I think he has another store attached. It's really very nice. Uhn, but it's not, it's not a really bookstore. Those are the ones I found. What I've mentioned are the ones I found. This one, if you go far, very far north on High Street, 8800, something like that. You go to the, almost the end. There is another shopping center, which is also very nice. And they have a bookstore there. I think it has a coffee shop. I am not sure. The book store is pretty good. They do have some restaurants there, and uhn, one coffee shop I guess. Yeah. Do you like coffee?
H: — » Yeah. But I, I am not really know how to taste that, uhn-ha.... I just drink that. If too bad, of course, I know. But if just not so bad or not so good, I can't tell that.
J: Well, partly what is good or bad depends on you.
H: On?
J: You, what you like. If the coffee is made fresh, at, at the these places, then you must decide whether you like it. You can assume that it is good. Then you have a, it's good time to decide it, whether you like that type. Uhn, there's a very good coffee shop at the corner of, uhn, Neil Avenue, King. They also sell many teas. I think they have 60 teas. It's a restaurant, but they have coffee and many teas. But the coffee there is good.
H: I know there is a coffee shop on the High Street.
J: Yeah. Two of them, three of them.
H: Yes, yes, three.
J: Did you go to them?
H: Yeah. I -
J: But you seem disappointed.
H: — » But I don't know how to order the coffee. Which one is good, which one-
J: Oh, oh.
H: = Blue Mountain and I guess I don't know why?
J: That's very expensive coffee and, I think, it costs $65 dollars a kilo.
H: Oh, I just buy a cup of coffee, uhm-ha.... They just one or two dollars.
J: That's very special coffee.
In the first instance of Huang’s posing the question to Jim, the discussion got off to specifics such as Jim’s question to Huang: “Before I taste it or when I taste it?” After that turn, Jim started talking about a nice coffee shop that he knew, and how to get there by bus. Huang in the meantime did not feel that he wanted to know about nice shops that sell good coffee. What he really wanted to know was, after one goes to a nice coffee shop, how one can tell good from bad coffee, and whether Jim could be of assistance on this topic. So, when Jim asked Huang, “Do you like coffee?” Huang revisited his earlier point: “Yeah, but I don’t really know how to taste it.” Jim subsequently talked about the fact that it depends on multiple factors such as how fresh the coffee was, but then he decided that the best way to get good coffee was to go to a good coffee shop. So, when Jim asked Huang, “Did you go to them?” Huang revisited his original point by saying, “Yeah, but I do not know how to order the coffee. Which one is good?” After the third time, Jim began to notice Huang’s frustration. It is remarkable here that Jim told Huang “You seem disappointed.” Huang publicly displayed his sense of frustration at his lack of knowledge of how to tell good from bad coffee hoping that Jim could help him on this issue. Finally, Jim began to provide what looked like a rational solution to Huang’s problem.

The discourse analysis that was just conducted on the above transcript clearly showed the negative effect “revisiting” can have on the interaction context. It is true that Huang employed revisiting to solve what he saw as a conversational problem, namely that his question was not answered adequately from the beginning. As a result of Huang’s use of revisiting, Jim began to realize that there was some kind of problem in the interaction that was evident from Huang’s repeated attempts to get his question answered. In a
sense, Huang’s transfer and use of revisiting was a successful metadiscourse strategy because it helped him draw Jim’s attention to his query. It helped Huang through his participation in the talk to construct a systematic solution to what he perceived as a conversational problem by the recurrent use of a simple question. Nevertheless, there are other ways of getting a listener’s attention without the need to sound repetitive and boring. Jim’s realization that there was a problem prompted him to respond to Huang’s repeated question in a variety of ways until that question received what looked for Huang like a satisfactory answer.

E. Qualifiers

(a) Overusing “Maybe” in a Declarative Statement

Qualifiers were defined in this study as interpretive markers which signal a speaker’s feelings or attitude about what he/she is saying. Following Connor’s (1991) definition, the category of qualifiers was classified in this study as a metadiscourse strategy of overusing “maybe.” The data analysis of overusing “maybe” in the L2 speech of the 4 Chinese participants revealed that qualifiers were used to perform two functions. The two main sub-groups of overusing “maybe” were either in declarative sentences or in response to questions posed by the NS interlocutors. When used in a declarative statement, its immediate influence on the interactional context is that it conveys a sense of uncertainty about what the native speaker is saying. The use of “maybe” in this sense prompts native speakers to realize that the Chinese speaker is either not totally certain or not totally knowledgeable about the utterance that he/she just made. Upon realizing that
the use of "maybe" is due to uncertainty, the native speaker may feel the need to hear the  

Chinese speaker's point of view. For example,  

(5.13)  

M: When we look at the map in China, and the different names of the towns, and the  
city. It's just different.  
J: Yeah, very different.  
M: Confusing Ha... (Both laughed).  
J: → Maybe.  
M: To me it is.  
J: The map in Columbus is confusing me, too, ha.... Because long words, and I don't  
understand the meaning of the words. So, it's difficult for me to memorize the  
words, uhm, uhm.  
M: I can see how that would be, sure.  
J: Uhm, uhm. Ha....  

In this interaction, Marianne said that looking at a map of China can be confusing to her.  

Julia's use of the uncertainty marker "maybe" indicated that she wanted to express a  
different perspective on Marianne's statement. Julia then explained that the map in  
Columbus was equally confusing to her because of the long names that she did not  
understand and could not memorize. Marianne then responded with "I can see how that  
would be, sure." Julia, by using "maybe," managed to express her uncertainty about  
Marianne's statement, and got her to listen to her point of view.  

In another example of the use of "maybe" to express uncertainty about what a  
native speaker said, Huang asked Jim whether he liked turkey meat.  

(5.14)  

H: Do you like turkey meat?  
J: Yeah. I like it if it's cooked properly, uhm, uhm.  
H: I must stuff something into the turkey?  
J: You don't have to. Many people do, and it does taste good, because of the liquid
from the turkey goes into the cavity, and that mixes. Many people put the, uhn, there is a mixture of things, but base is bread. They mix some, mix some fruit with the bread or some fish with the bread or some nuts, or instant spices. So, it’s basically some bread with whatever you like to eat. And then you add some species, you put it inside in the turkey.

H: → Maybe I will try to cook, but, but maybe I will buy a chicken. Turkey is really big.
J: It’s really big.

Jim was responding to Huang’s question about turkey and how best to prepare it.

However, by expressing his uncertainty, Huang managed to leave enough room for himself not to get really committed to trying turkey meat. His point of view was that turkey is really big and that he will be satisfied with chicken instead of experimenting with turkey.

By employing “maybe” as an interpretive marker, Huang managed to convey to Jim his feeling of uncertainty about eating turkey meat, and also the possibility that he might opt instead for the more familiar chicken meat.

(b) Answering with “Maybe” to Questions

The relationship that this category had with the interactional context in the data set was that its use communicated a violation of the native speaker’s expectation that a straight answer was given to his/her question. This created a conversational problem that could be resolved only when an answer is produced in the course of the conversation. In relation to the use of “maybe” in answers to questions by the 4 Chinese speakers, it is important to observe that native speakers of English have a certain level of expectancy that their questions will be eventually answered. However, by constantly overusing “maybe” in their responses, the Chinese speakers created an atmosphere of uncertainty that, in some cases, led native speakers to abandon the topic of their questions. This procedure was due to the native speaker’s interpretation of the use of “maybe” on the part
of the Chinese speaker as a sign of lack of knowledge on the topic of the question. In this way, overusing “maybe” in response to questions was more problematic from a discourse point of view than overusing “maybe” in declarative statements. The following examples from the data of interactions illustrate that the use of “maybe” in response to a variety of question types was transferred from Chinese as a native language to English as a second language.

When native speakers are confronted with the Chinese speaker’s sense of uncertainty in answering a question, they usually respond by asking a different question. This is so because saying “maybe” in answering a question was interpreted by the native speakers as a lack of knowledge on the Chinese speaker’s part. As a Chinese discourse strategy, the Chinese speaker, by using “maybe” in an answer, was qualifying his/her response. Most of the time, the use of “maybe” in answering questions in the data did not necessarily indicate a lack of knowledge. Rather, it indicated that the Chinese speaker knew enough about the topic of the question to qualify his/her response because he/she wanted to talk more about this topic. The following examples demonstrate the interactional consequences of the use of “maybe” in answers to a series of questions in a single interaction.

The following set of examples focused on the pattern of answering with “maybe” to a series of questions that were posed by the native speaker Marianne to Julia in a single interaction. The analysis revealed that Marianne, the native speaker, upon hearing “maybe” in an answer to a question she posed to Julia, routinely chose to change the subject, thereby abandoning the topic of his/her question. The conversational problem
created by Julia's use of "maybe" in response to Marianne's questions was that what Julia intended to communicate as a sense of uncertainty, Marianne interpreted as a lack of knowledge. As will be explained soon, Julia's expression of a sense of uncertainty, however, did not necessarily have to mean lack of knowledge. As the analysis of using "maybe" in declarative statements has already established, Chinese speakers used "maybe" to qualify their remarks and wait for elaboration of their points in the course of their conversations. The following examples of this pattern in the interaction that took place between Julia and Marianne demonstrated that Marianne interpreted this pattern not as a sense of uncertainty, but rather as a lack of knowledge on Julia's part about the topic of the question:

Example 1 (5.15)

M: Is there a better school for you field?
J: — > Maybe another school I can choose. This one of my choice.
M: — > Well, tell me about your family?

Example 2 (5.16)

M: When you were younger, did you think about coming here? Did you have a dream about coming here?
J: — > Ah, maybe, ha, ha, ha....
M: — > Maybe! Ok, did you get movies? American movies?
J: Yeah, some soap, soap opera.
M: Soap operas! You get soap operas?

Example 3 (5.17)

M: Does your mother cook like that?
J: — > Like that? Maybe. Maybe. Put the vegetables and some sauce, do, do, do like this (mimicking stir frying movement).
M: Yeah. That's it.
J: Yeah. That's it.
M: — > Well, I took some Chinese cooking lessons and so I cook like that sometimes.
Example 4  (5.18)

M: Have you see snow?
J: — Maybe I can say I have not seen snow before, not yet.
M: Oh, we had snow last winter. Oh, you can’t imagine all of this is white. Everything is white.
J: Beautiful, right?
M: — But, so are the tropics.
J: Tropics?

Example 5  (5.19)

M: Do you have atomic bombs?
J: — Maybe, I don’t know that.
M: Ok.
J: — I am not sure if we have or not.
M: — I don’t imagine you do. I don’t know who does have it.
— Are you free in your country?

In the interaction between Julia and Marianne, the above 5 examples demonstrated a regular pattern that was followed by Marianne in which, after hearing Julia’s answer to a question with “maybe,” Marianne abandoned her original question and introduced a new topic to the interaction. The pattern followed by Julia in answering with “maybe” to Marianne’s question was that Julia did not elaborate on her sense of uncertainty, leaving Marianne to construe it as a lack of knowledge on the topic. This analysis revealed that a Chinese speaker’s overuse of “maybe” in response to questions posed by a native speaker of English without adequate specification of what it was that the Chinese speaker was uncertain about, could lead the native speaker to assume that the overuse of “maybe” in this way indicated a lack of knowledge on the part of Chinese speaker.

A different pattern of answering with “maybe” was employed in the following set of examples from the interactions between Marianne and Huang. When Huang qualified
his answers with “maybe,” he routinely elaborated on his sense of uncertainty (e.g., on whether or not he agreed totally with Marianne’s question). This specification led Marianne to ask Huang more questions about the same topic of her first question. This pattern was different from the one Marianne used with Julia. When Marianne interpreted Julia’s use of “maybe” as lack of knowledge, she decided to ask a new question about a different topic. When Marianne, however, recognized Huang’s use of “maybe” as uncertainty and not lack of knowledge, she was willing to ask more questions about the same topic. The following are 5 examples from interactions between Marianne and Huang:

**Example 1 (5.20)**

M: How long have you been in Ohio?
H: Two months.
M: Tell me how you like it?
H: Uhn, I, maybe, I like it very much, but you must see which part it is. Like Olentangy Commons, here. I like here. When I just arrive here, I live in my friend’s house, just near. Maybe three minutes walk. Yes, very good.
M: Do you live in Olentangy Commons now?
H: No. Now I live in Lane Avenue.
M: Lane Avenue, yes.
H: Near the campus area.

**Example 2 (5.21)**

M: Would you ultimately want to play in a symphony orchestra, or what will you do?
H: Maybe I want to be a good teacher, ha.... I like to teach child.
M: You were a teacher?
H: Yeah.
M: Will you teach in the United States?
H: No.
M: [You will teach in =
H: [Maybe not -
M: = in Taiwan?
H: Yeah.
M: Oh.
H: Uhm-ha... I like to do the, because I like to with my student and play better and better, just progress, I like it.
M: → Uhm, Uhm. That’s wonderful.

Example 3  (5.22)

M: → Did you ever, did you ever, did you ever have any health problems?
H: Uhm.
M: Did you break any bones?
H: Uhm, no.
M: Good.
H: → But I, I have, have some, maybe not very serious about my hands. I have hurt before. Now, not, still not very good. It’s my left hand.
M: → Well, that’s not good with playing a cello.

Example 4  (5.23)

M: → Would your parents ever want to come to the Untied States?
H: No, they never come to the Untied States.
M: Never?
H: Maybe next year they will come here.
M: Oh.
H: Yes, to see me, yeah.
M: → That will be nice.
H: Yes. Maybe they will like here.

Example 5  (5.24)

M: → Do you have time for fun?
H: Yes.
M: Good.
H: But I don’t know what to do. Maybe just sometimes, I, I bus tour to the city center.
M: → Do you?
H: Yes.
M: Ok.
H: Or, sometimes my friends will take me to the theater.
M: → Good. That’s good.
H: Yes. Sometimes I will go to the music concert. Yeah, sometimes.
M: → That’s good.
The above 5 examples from the interactions between Marianne and Huang demonstrated that when the Chinese speaker expressed his/her sense of uncertainty about a certain question, Marianne stayed on the same topic until that sense of uncertainty was finally resolved. This pattern is at variance with the pattern that was observed in the interactions between Julia and Marianne. In that interaction, Julia used "maybe" in her answers, but she did not specify on her sense of uncertainty enough to arouse Marianne's interest to stay on the same topic. Instead, Julia stopped short of this required specification to the extent that Marianne construed her sense of uncertainty as a lack of knowledge. Marianne then employed the strategy of asking Julia about something else that was not related to her original question. In the interaction with Huang, however, Marianne stayed on the same topic even after Huang expressed his sense of uncertainty by using "maybe" in his answers. The reason behind Marianne's sustained interest in what Huang was saying was his ability to convey to Marianne where he thought he was uncertain. As the examples from the interactions have demonstrated, Marianne did not abandon the questions after Huang's expression of uncertainty. She rather allowed him to talk more about what he thought the uncertainty occurred. In a sense, Huang's qualifications were more specific than Julia's because she did not manage to show Marianne where her specific areas of uncertainty were. Julia's patterns of language use in using "maybe" in her answers led Marianne to change the subject because she thought that Julia either lacked knowledge or did not want to stay on the same topic. Finally, Marianne's sense of civility might have led her to try to save face for Julia, knowing that she lacked the language ability to engage in extended conversational sessions in English.
In this case, Marianne’s civility was publicly demonstrated in her change of topic until she could find something that Julia really wanted to talk about.

To demonstrate the observation that when a native speaker concludes that a Chinese speaker’s use of “maybe” reflects a sense of uncertainty that prompts asking more questions on the same topic, the following set of examples from the interactions between Jim and Julia are used as counter examples to the ones found in Julia and Marianne’s interactions. These counter examples are provided for the purpose of shedding more light on the “use of maybe” among the 4 Chinese participants.

Example 1 (5.25)

M: Are you going to be traveling in the United States before you go home?
J: -> Maybe or maybe not. I am not sure. I really want to go home.
M: -> Is there any place that you would like to go?

Example 2 (5.26)

M: Alright. You’re working in a bank?
M: -> Don’t the banks offer some services, investment services?
J: Yeah, but not everyone can enter the department.

Example 3 (5.27)

M: You know where you want to work?
J: Yes.
M: You say in some private company, right?
J: Yeah, my uncle always wait me, wait me, uha.
M: Oh, really?
J: -> Yeah. So, maybe I will work in his company.
M: -> He has a company?
J: Yeah.
M: -> What kind of company?
Example 4 (5.28)

M: What did your cousin study in school?
J: About the natural resources, about the oil, something like that.
M: Is there oil in Taiwan a lot?
J: I don’t know. Maybe, maybe we have, but just very few.
M: Do you think many people worry about the future?

In the interaction with Jim, Julia’s use of “maybe” to answer a question was more successful at conveying her sense of uncertainty than in the interaction with Marianne. Because Marianne thought that Julia’s answer indicated lack of knowledge, she consistently changed the subject. In Jim’s interaction however, Julia was more successful in communicating her sense of uncertainty because she elaborated more specifically about the area of her uncertainty. Jim’s reaction was to ask Julia for more information that was related to the original point of his question. This pattern was consistent for Jim except when he realized that Julia’s use of “maybe” was the result of lack of knowledge (e.g., in the fourth example). Upon realizing this, Jim abandoned the subject of oil in Taiwan and shifted the flow of his questions to a different new topic.

Analysis of the discourse transfer category of using “maybe” in answers to questions and in declarative statements revealed that the interrelationship between this category of discourse transfer and the interactional context was not a static relationship in which action was directed from one party to another. On the contrary, the interrelationship was a dynamic relationship in which there was an on-going constant tension between the quality of what a Chinese speaker was saying and the native speaker’s response. In the category of “answering with maybe to questions,” there was a sense of tentativeness in which the conversation could go one way or another depending on the
Chinese speaker’s success or failure in conveying a sense of uncertainty as opposed to a lack of knowledge in his/her answer. Both of these were the subject of constant analysis by the native speaker with two different interactional consequences. First, when the native speaker interpreted the Chinese speaker’s use of “maybe” as a lack of knowledge or even a lack of ability to talk in detail about a certain question, the native speaker routinely changed the subject and shifted gears to another topic that may be more agreeable to the Chinese speaker. Second, when the native speaker interpreted the Chinese speaker’s use of “maybe” as a sense of uncertainty that was publicly displayed in the latter’s response, the native speaker stayed on the same topic asking more questions until the Chinese speaker’s sense of uncertainty was resolved. In both cases, the native speaker’s reaction was prompted by his/her desire to accommodate the Chinese speaker and to keep the flow of communication smooth and orderly.
F. Miscues: Saying “Yes” When Meaning “No”

The data analysis methods that were used in this section relied on a combination of transfer analysis and discourse analysis. Transfer analysis helped the researcher to trace these miscues to the native language of the 4 Chinese participants. Furthermore, discourse analysis was used on the data of miscues to contextualize them in terms of preceding and succeeding utterances. No manipulation of the data was performed by the researcher. These miscues emerged naturally as part of the ongoing interactions between the native speakers and the 4 Chinese participants. No example questions were given to the native speakers by the researcher to elicit responses from the learners.

Miscues by the 4 Chinese participants in the form of “saying yes when meaning no” were found to be related to the interactional context in which they were produced. From a linguistic perspective, the category of “saying yes when meaning no” was the result of differences in the grammatical systems of negation between Chinese and English. In Chinese, the system of negation differs from that of English when the purpose of the speaker is to disagree with a negatively formulated or indirect question. Examples from the transcribed interactions showed that the 4 Chinese participants were transferring this grammatical rule from Chinese to English when they answered positively to indirect or negatively formulated questions in English by saying “Yes” at the beginning of their answers. Analysis of surface-level data showed that the Chinese speakers committed errors in the negation rules of English. However, from a cognitive point of view, further transfer analysis of these miscues revealed that the 4 Chinese participants were, in fact, transferring a commonly-shared pattern of language use from Chinese to English.
Because this Chinese pattern was at variance with English patterns of negation, it violated the 3 native speakers' expectations about how best to answer a negative question. From a social perspective, these miscues caused the native speakers to request further clarification from the Chinese speakers who made them. In this way, these miscues had a transient influence on the ways in which the English native-speaking participants attempted to achieve their interactional goals. The data analysis revealed that there were two groups of questions posed by the English native-speaking participants that caused the 4 Chinese participants to commit miscues of saying "yes" when actually meaning "no:" (a) negatively formulated questions, and (b) indirect statements and questions. The following are examples from the first group of miscues:

(a) Negatively Posed Questions

In the first group of questions that were posed by the native speakers, what seemed to cause the miscue was the fact that the native speakers, in their authentic use of everyday language, regularly posed negative questions as a common pattern of language use. The 4 Chinese speakers were apparently not used to this particular pattern of English questions from the L2 input that was available to them in the EFL language classroom. For example, in the interaction between Fiona and Julia, the latter was talking disapprovingly about a male classmate who had recently attempted to become her friend:

(5.29)

F: You don't feel attracted to him?
J: → Uhn, uhn, yeah. So, maybe that's the reason. Maybe I can say he is not the style, style I want.
What Julia meant was “No, I don’t feel attracted to him.” However, because her native language allowed her to express agreement with the totality of Fiona’s utterance as if it were a statement and not a question, Julia said “Yeah.” This might have sounded like a minor detail in the quick flow of the conversation. However, the miscue of answering negatively formulated questions with “Yes” when one does not mean to agree is potentially confusing to native speakers of English. Furthermore, it was a consistent pattern found among the 4 Chinese participants’ answers. For example, in the interaction between Linda and Marianne, the following sequence took place:

(5.30)

M: Your campus sounds a lot different than Ohio Sate.
L: Yeah, a lot of difference.
M: Not, not pretty, is it?
L: → Yeah, it is not pretty.

Further analysis of the conversation revealed that Linda meant to say “No, it is not pretty.” Additionally, the affirmative tag question at the end of Marianne’s negative clause required a negative response according to English negation rules. Linda was very happy about being at OSU, and was comparing her undergraduate school campus with that of OSU. Like Julia, Linda’s purpose of saying “Yes” was to express that she agreed with the total premise of what Marianne was saying. So, after she used “Yes” at the beginning of her statement, she repeated what Marianne said. In the third example, Peng and Marianne were talking about English education in Taiwan. Peng was trying to explain to Marianne why he thought that many Taiwanese students did not enjoy a high level of
proficiency in English. One of the reasons he mentioned was the lack of standard American English in the Taiwanese classroom. Marianne concluded:

(5.31)

M: So, you think although you have studied English for a long time in Taiwan, you have not been exposed, you have not been taught standard American English?
P: Uhn-ha..., yeah, yeah, yeah.

Even though they may last for a brief moment, miscues like these are very important for this study on discourse transfer. As the analysis showed, miscues are the result of the confluence of three distinct processes: linguistic, cognitive, and social. These can be seen as the effect of the L1 and the demands of interaction in the L2. On the one hand, the genesis of the miscue starts from a negatively formulated question that was posed by the native speaker during interaction in English with a Chinese speaker. On the other hand, the influence of the patterns of the Chinese speaker's native language came into focus due to the demands of the interaction, and possibly the lack of authentic language input in the EFL classroom.

(b) Indirect Questions and Statements

The category of indirect questions and statements was responsible for triggering the occurrence of miscues "saying yes when meaning no." Indirect questions are very hard to follow by L2 learners in general. For Chinese speakers, however, another source of difficulty with this type of question was the influence of the native language. Chinese rules of negation allow its speakers to show agreement with the totality of what their interlocutor said by saying "yes," regardless of the construction of the question. In the following example, Marianne attempted to confirm what Peng had just said, but instead of
confirmation coming from Peng, he miscued the use of “yes” when he was supposed to reply with a “no.”

(5.32)

P: I have two roommates, and if we three people talk together, and the other people they talk, I can’t understand. They speak, too fast.
M: So, if they speak together =
P: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
M: = You cannot follow what they say.
P: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
M: But if they speak to you, you can.
P: Yeah, they, if they talk to me, they can speak slower, and I can understand.
M: Right.

Marianne used two comprehension checks that were interrupted twice by Peng saying “Yeah, yeah, yeah.” Even though the question was a re-cap of what Peng was saying, it seemed to have caused Peng some comprehension problems because it was lengthy.

It might very well be the case that Peng did not construe Marianne’s question as a question because it was long-winded. Marianne divided the two components of the question into smaller units. However, the conditional construction of the question gave rise to a miscue by Peng.

In Jim’s interaction with Peng, he posed the following indirect statement:

(5.33)

J: I thought they were fighting because somebody thought it wasn’t fair.
P: Yeah.

Earlier in the transcript, Peng expressed a contrary version in which members of the Taiwanese congress fought for personal benefit: “They want to get any benefit at the congress, so even fight, even they fight.” However, when Jim asked him what he thought
the fight was about, Peng appeared to agree with him, while in the transcript, Peng stuck to his earlier version of the story that congressmen fought for personal benefit. Another indirect statement caused Huang to miscue his answer with "yes" when in fact he most likely meant to say "no:"

(5.34)

M: You probably have parking problems, too.
H: Yeah, very serious.
M: We have parking problems here, and we –
H: Here is much better =
M: But not, not like your country, I think.
H: = Yeah.
M: No.

The indirectness that characterized Marianne's statement confused Huang and led him to finally say "yes" when in reality he meant to say "no" as Marianne realized in Huang's next utterances.

The above two groups of miscues represent good examples of the confluence of three factors on the 4 Chinese speakers' L2 output: (a) the social patterns of language use in the interactional context, (b) the cognitive processes involved in discourse transfer, and (c) the linguistic patterns of both the native and the target languages. Thus, the interrelationship between this category of discourse transfer and the interactional context could best be described as social, cognitive, and linguistic. It was social because it happened so fast in real conversation time, and the potential for causing miscommunication was minimized by both interactants' efforts to confirm each other's statements. It was cognitive because the Chinese speakers had to process L2 input so rapidly that their native language became a foundation from which they frequently used
L1-based ways of responding (erroneously) to negatively posed questions, and indirect questions and statements. Finally, it was linguistic because the differences between the two languages in terms of negation rules gave rise to the miscues in the first place.

On Robinson's (1988) list of things that may “confuse” Chinese speakers in English spoken by native speakers, she listed “indirect questions and statements” (p. 58). The data collected for this study provided support for Robinson’s observation. This study, however, offered further evidence on this category that showed that it was not only the L2 patterns of language use in the interactional context that were responsible for miscues, but also the patterns of the native language whose knowledge the 4 Chinese participants brought with them to the interactions. This section not only provided examples of miscues among Chinese students, but also added a new category that was called, for lack of a better name, negatively posed questions. Both L2-based categories were shown to confuse the 4 Chinese speakers into saying “yes” when meaning “no.” This analysis did not stop at these purely linguistic differences: It further explored the cognitive and social processes involved when these miscues were produced in the interactional context. The analysis addressed the difficulties faced by the Chinese speakers in trying to engage in face-to-face interaction which led them to transfer from the common patterns of their native language to the target language interactional context. The analysis also described how, when these miscues were produced, both parties to the talk cooperated to reach the goal of common understanding.

Being Chinese herself, the researcher was able first to reflect on these patterns and the way they were employed in her native language. Second, the researcher documented
the frequency of use of these examples among the 4 Chinese participants. This was done
to make sure that the category of miscues was displayed, not by an individual learner, but
by the 4 Chinese participants as a group. In other words, the data analysis established that
transfer has taken place among a group of learners who shared the same native language
background and who were at the same time struggling to learn the same target language.
In addition to the examples of miscues provided in this section, further examples and
description of this category were included in Chapter 4 in the section entitled miscues
under metadiscourse strategies.

G. Performing Rituals of Face

The data analysis revealed that the interrelationship between rituals of face and the
interactional context can best be described as cognitive and social. From a cognitive point
of view, the six categories of rituals of face were transferred from Chinese to English by
the 4 Chinese participants in their interactions with English native-speaking interlocutors.
The first three categories, included rituals which were performed as a function of respect
for others: (a) convergence, (b) deference, and (c) avoiding conflict. The second group of
categories included rituals which were performed as a function of self-denial: (a) putting
self down, (b) refusing a compliment, and (c) turning down an invitation to talk. The
following section explores the first group of “respect for others.”

(A) Respect for Others

The categories of “convergence,” “deference,” and “avoiding conflict” showed
how face considerations influenced the flow of the conversations between the 4 Chinese
speakers and their English native-speaking interlocutors. From a social perspective, the 4 Chinese participants transferred their concepts of face rituals whenever they made pragmatic inferences about how best to give face to their hearers during the interaction. As the names of the 3 categories suggest, each category carried its own specific relationship to the interactional context. Convergence entailed claiming common ground with the native speaker. The Chinese speaker expressed convergence with the native speaker’s viewpoints, opinions, or attitudes toward a variety of issues that were presented in the interaction. Convergence additionally meant the Chinese speaker’s ritualistic attempts to communicate his/her admiration and interest in the native speaker. Performing the ritual of deference meant for the Chinese speaker the verbal expression of respect for the authority of the native speaker. This authority came from the superior status the native speaker had in terms of age, knowledge, or experience. In order to give credit to what the native speaker had accomplished in his/her life, the Chinese speakers ritualistically performed deference as a sign of interest in and approval of those accomplishments. The 4 Chinese speakers performed the ritual of avoiding conflict with the native speaker whenever he/she expressed a different opinion from what they said. In this case, it did not really matter much for the Chinese speaker whose point was the right one. What mattered in the ritual of avoiding conflict was to maintain a good rapport with the native speaker. The relationships of the first 3 rituals to the interactional context explored in further detail below:
(a) Convergence

In trying to claim common ground with Marianne, Julia said that when she gets married, she will ask her husband to take her to Europe just as Marianne had already done with her husband. Marianne was talking to Julia about the time she was in Europe when she relied on her husband for all matters related to money:

(5.35)

M: I always, I have always found the changing of money, the equivalence very difficult. So, my husband, when we will be in a foreign country, my husband will handle the money.

Fifteen minutes later, Julia emulated Marianne:

(5.36)

M: Have you traveled in Europe?
J: Europe. No, no, no. I have not yet. But, uhn, I think, when I get married, I will ask my husband to take me to Europe. I very hope I can go to Europe.
M: You want to get married?
J: I will get married, I think, if I find a good man.
M: That, that’s good.
J: I think Europe is very, very nice place.
M: It’s very interesting.

In order to claim common ground with Marianne, Julia expressed her desire that she not only wanted to go to Europe, but that she also wanted to get married. Marianne was somewhat startled by Julia’s announcement that she wanted to get married, and that when she gets married, she will ask her husband to take her to Europe. Marianne made a clarification request about Julia’s desire to someday get married. So, when Julia said again that she will get married to a good husband, Marianne complimented Julia by saying “That’s good.” Julia did not stop to think about this point. She went back to the topic of
Europe and how interesting a place it was. Julia made the pragmatic inference that in order to express her admiration of Marianne, she had to claim common ground with her. One of the things she picked from her interaction with Marianne was that the latter was married and that she once went to Europe with her husband. When the time came for Marianne to ask whether Julia had visited Europe, Julia responded by saying that when she gets married, she will ask her husband to take her to Europe.

Julia's convergence with Marianne influenced the interactional context in that she produced a sequence of talk that was almost identical to what Marianne said earlier. In order to give Marianne face by saying how much she admired her, Julia transferred the ritual of convergence from Chinese to English. What Julia was trying to communicate through her convergence to Marianne was the fact that although they (Julia and Marianne) both came from different cultures and age groups, their gender as women was a common ground they both shared. Because women in paternalistic societies like China and America have traditionally depended on men, Julia signaled the continuity of this tradition with Marianne: Both women have depended on men in the past, and will depend on men in the future. When two interactants manage to find something in common between them, their social relationship is enhanced in as much as they belong to a group with shared values and traditions.

Huang managed to find another way of sharing common ground with Marianne. Instead of using Julia's method of comparing between Marianne and herself, Huang transformed his father into an alter ego who has common ground with Marianne and her husband. For example,
M: I should probably wear glasses all the time because I can’t see close-up.
H: Yes. My father use that too. I know that.

When Marianne said that she needed to wear glasses all the time, Huang gave her face by saying that he can understand because his father needed to wear glasses all the time.

In another example, Huang converged with Marianne:

M: Oh, tennis, he watches tennis all the time.
H: My father like this a lot.
M: Really?
H: Yes, my father play tennis.
M: Oh.
H: Uhm, uhm. So, yeah, one year maybe have four big open, right? Like Wimbledon, American.
M: Uhm, uhm.
H: Yeah. My father always like this.

Huang was using his father as a surrogate for himself to make Marianne feel better about her poor eyesight and her husband who watched tennis all the time. Because the figure of the father is one of the most revered in Chinese culture, Huang was transforming his regard for his father to Marianne’s figure and to her husband.

Linda attempted to give face to Marianne in a totally different way. When Marianne requested some paper tissue, the researcher recorded the following exchange:

M: Cold outside makes my nose =
L: Yeah, a little bit.
M: = Just wet, a little wet.
L: Yeah, me too.
It was a cold day. Linda was already in the researcher’s home when Marianne rang the
doorbell. Because she felt she was a little late, Marianne wanted to start recording as
soon as she was introduced to Linda for the first time. When she started, she felt the need
to pause for a while to ask for some tissue. Linda thought that this may be a little
embarrassing to Marianne. So, when Marianne explained to Linda that the cold outside
made her nose run, Linda chimed in saying exactly the same thing so that Marianne did not
feel embarrassed.

This section focused on one native speaker and how the 4 Chinese participants
transferred the ritual of convergence to her from Chinese to English. It is not surprising
that they felt a great deal of respect for Marianne. Marianne’s character radiated a
combination of gracefulness and wisdom that made it easy for the Chinese participants to
want to converge with her.

(b) Deference

In order to put the native speaker at ease and make him/her feel socially
comfortable, the 4 Chinese participants performed the face ritual of deference by showing
interest in what the native speaker said. The Chinese participants deferred to whatever
authority the native speaker had in terms of age (wisdom) and knowledge. The following
examples demonstrate the Chinese participants’ deference to the native speaker’s superior
knowledge.

Even though the Chinese participants shared the pattern of uncritical acceptance of
the authority of their teachers, Linda, who always thought that her teachers were all
excellent, was willing to go along with Jim’s critical discussion of pedagogy. For Jim,
a music teacher who did not know how to communicate to his/her students how he/she became excellent was not really teaching. Because this idea ran counter to Linda’s beliefs about teachers, she found support for Jim’s critique, not from her own analysis, but from another teacher who was talking along the same lines:

(5.40)

L: .... So when I study with her, she can’t give me her practice experience because she have no problem to practice the technique. And she sometimes, she just tell me play, practice this more, and then your technique will naturally get mature.
J: Well, I know but I mean =
L: But I can’t get away by myself if anyone don’t give the best ideas and techniques. 
J: = I understand, yeah, I see what you mean. → She is not teaching. She is not teaching.
L: And you know, this week, I heard a very good sentence from my piano pedagogy teacher. My pedagogy class teacher went to Chicago to join a pedagogy conference. And she tell me. She tell all of our classmates. She say she always learn a very good concept from the conference. She say that telling is not teaching. Telling is not teaching. When you are a teacher, you can’t teach your students just by telling them. Yeah, it’s not enough to just tell them how to do.
J: Alright. I agree with you.
L: Uhm.
J: I agree with you.

Linda deferred to Jim’s opinions on pedagogy because she was aware that he was on his way to earn a Ph.D. in education. For a Chinese student who has just been admitted to the M.A. program, Jim’s qualifications gave him the authority that Linda respected.

Fiona, another Ph.D. candidate who was a TA of English as a second language, was also perceived by the 4 Chinese participants to be in a superior position of authority. For example, in the following interaction, Peng showed his deference to Fiona by showing his interest in her class:
So, in your class, do you teach the foreign students or native?
F: They are foreign students. And the majority of them are, uhn, Asians.
P: Asians?
F: I have one Taiwanese, he's studied in the United States about 4 years now.
P: Oh, four years now.
F: Yeah, and the others are Chinese, and, then I have one Turkish woman, uhm, uhm.

Finally, Linda performed the ritual of deference with Jim by communicating to him that

even though he was not a teacher of English, he was qualified to teach English. Linda told

Jim that she had a question she always asked of her teacher but for which she did not

receive a satisfying answer. By asking Jim about her question, Linda was communicating
to Jim that she trusted and respected his authority on English even if he was not working

as an English teacher at the time:

P: Is that because, do you think because of English, or you think is because of your
level of development? (Both laughed)
F: You know, uhn, every time, uhn, now, uhn, when, when I study in the English
class, I always ask my teacher, uhn, the, that this, this question. For example,
when I, when I read the word, the voc-, vocabulary, uhn, hungry, and famish, and
starve, I, I ask my teacher tell me, uhn, what, what word is more serious. It, uhn,
how do you say that? This is bigger than this, or is larger than here? Yeah,
because in, in, I think not just Chinese, may-, maybe on other kind language had
the same situation, the same, the same meaning but have the different degree.
Maybe this is more serious, more heavier. But sometimes if we, we are, we are
not very clearly their degree. Maybe, uhn-ha, it is your, your explain-, explanation
is not clear. Maybe other people they don’t understand what you mean.

In the Chinese world view, age and wisdom are connected. So, when Marianne

complained about her age almost to the degree of apologizing for her advanced years,
the 4 Chinese participants performed the ritual of deference to give her face and to reassure her that they respected the kind of authority that comes with age. For example, Peng reacted to Marianne’s remarks about her age with his attempts to reassure her. He was trying to tell Marianne that she was not that old:

(5.43)

M: I feel like I’m losing though not that it matters too much because I’m pretty old. I am really old.
P: No, no, no.

Huang also tried to reassure Marianne that it all depended on how one felt. He told Marianne that the fact that a person felt young could make their life more beautiful:

(5.44)

M: I’m, I’m still relatively young with my daughters. I think young.
H: Yeah. That’s very important. You’re always 24, Uhm-ha..., yes. =
M: Yeah. Uhm-ha..., yeah.
H: = That’s more important. If you thought that, I think your life will be more beautiful.
M: Sure.

(c) Avoiding Conflict

The ritual of avoiding conflict was a common pattern used by the 4 Chinese participants during their interactions with their English native-speaking interlocutors. The 4 Chinese participants transferred what they already knew about avoiding conflict to their L2 speech on numerous occasions in the data. They went through the ritual of avoiding conflict whenever they perceived that something they said might sound discourteous or offensive to their English native-speaking interlocutors. The overriding wish of the 4 Chinese participants was not to prove a point or to convince their listeners...
with a solid argument. Rather, the main purpose of participating in interaction was to strengthen the social ties they had with their interlocutors. For this reason, the 4 Chinese participants wanted to avoid any potential conflict with their interlocutors even if this conflict was a conflict of opinion that might threaten their social goals of participating in the interactions.

When Peng felt that Jim was somehow implying that he was exaggerating his remarks about American corn and his claim that it was not fit for human consumption, Peng quickly retracted his claim and professed that his ignorance was the result of receiving faulty or inaccurate information during his undergraduate studies in Taiwan. Jim confronted Peng by saying that if he knew that the corn was not fit for human consumption, then why would he eat it?

(5.45)

J: So, why did you eat it?
P: Uha..., because I feel, I feel interested.
J: Oh.
P: A lot of people buy the corn. And I like, I like to eat the corn.
J: Yeah.
P: Because in Taiwan, we have two different kinds of corn.
J: Uhm.
P: One is for we can eat, but another is for, for animals.

After Peng sensed a potential conflict with Jim over American corn, he retreated from what he was saying. The ritual began when Peng attempted to somehow absorb Jim's pointed question. Peng claimed first that he was curious about the corn. Second, he said that a lot of people were buying the corn. Third, he himself liked to eat corn. The reason for Peng's curiosity was that he wanted to make sure that the American corn was really
the type that was intended for human consumption. What the ritual of avoiding conflict did was to absorb Jim’s apparent objection to Peng’s unsubstantiated claim, and to keep the conversation going on a friendly basis.

Borrowing from the L1 to the L2 context was a second language acquisition process that was described by Tarone (1980) as a communication strategy. Julia used borrowing in her interaction with Marianne to communicate the verb “to sue.” However, Marianne’s reaction to Julia’s borrowing was to stop the conversation, and to seek the help of the researcher, who was not present in the room, to explain what the Chinese word was. The researcher came to the room and explained to Marianne what the word meant. Seeing all the inconvenience that she caused, Julia was extremely ashamed of her “borrowing” attempt. After this incident, and in order to avoid the potential for another conflict with Marianne, Julia never borrowed from Chinese again in her interactions.

(5.46)

M: Connie, we need an interpreter here.
R: She said that if the students are beaten by the teacher, the parents will go to court to sue.
M: To sue, S-U-E.
J: Sue, oh, sue.
M: Ah, don’t they? Yes, there is a real problem there.
J: Sorry. (Covers her mouth with her hands.)
M: That’s alright, that, that’s why we are doing this, I think, to understand each other.

Avoiding conflict was a diplomatic way of expressing oneself without offending others. It showed a lot of sensitivity to others’ likes and dislikes. Rather than shock interlocutors with cultural differences, the Chinese speaker’s intentions were to maintain good social relations with the English native speakers. For example, in Huang and Marianne’s
interaction, Huang took care not to sound discourteous to Marianne by stating his negative assessment of American food:

(5.47)

M: Do you like American food though?
H: Uhn.
M: No?
H: Because I cook by myself.
M: Oh, do you?
H: = Yes, not that I think, maybe that's not delicious but I like it because they are Chinese kind of food.
M: Oh, I got, I think that's wonderful.

Rather than offend Marianne by saying that he did not like American food, Huang said that “maybe it is delicious.” Huang could have chosen to be more frank about his negative views on American food. These views were expressed to the researcher by Huang on several occasions. In order to avoid a potential conflict with Marianne over food, and because he was keen to develop a strong social bond with Marianne, Huang qualified his assessment by using “maybe” to express his uncertainty about American food. For example, there could be other American food varieties that he has not had the chance yet to try. In the meantime, he had to eat, and because he was most familiar with the Chinese cuisine, he exclusively cooked Chinese food.

Avoiding conflict was a pattern that was reflected in the 4 Chinese participants’ data. In an anecdote that Linda recounted for Fiona, it was clear that Linda avoided a conflict with her classmates over a roller coaster ride. What happened was that some of her classmates told her that it will be perfectly alright to take a ride. When she took the ride, however, she banged her head on the back of the seat in front of her:
How did you like it?

Oh, their roller coaster is too heavy to me, ha.... You know, uhn, at Taiwan, uhn, I never try the big roller coaster as, as this one, yeah, and before, before we stand on line to wait for, for the program, the roller coaster, my friend, my classmate, they tell me, oh, it's very, it's very interesting, it's not dangerous, don't worry, don't worry, because I tell them I will be afraid (afraid), I will afraid. I, uhn, I tell them, can I, can I just stay here, don't go with you. You go, you go yourself, uha. They say, don't be, don't be afraid, and it's very interesting. It's not dangerous, just try, ok, ok, I try it. And when I sit in the roller coaster, they say it's starting. Oh, my God, I really like to stop it, ha.... Yes, and yeah, the roller coaster is moving, is very heavy, and very strong, and, and I, when it's moving very strong, I hit my face to the chair bar, ha. Yeah, but after we finish it, uhn, they tell, they ask me, how's, what do you feel it? Uhm, not bad, ha... (Both laughed).

Rather than lash out at her classmates for putting her in this position, Linda told them that she felt fine. Again, rather than win an argument, or settle scores, Linda performed the ritual of avoiding conflict to keep her social relationship with her classmates going on a friendly basis.

**Self-Denial**

The categories of respect for others originated from the interactional context due to the fact that they were reactions by the 4 Chinese participants to utterances made by the native speakers. On the other side of the coin of respect for others, the 4 Chinese participants performed another group of face rituals that were placed under the title of self-denial. Self-denial in face rituals was shaped by the 4 Chinese participants' perception of their inferior role in the social setting of the interaction in comparison with the superior role of the English native-speaking interlocutors. These face rituals reflected the Chinese speaker’s reluctance to impose him/herself on the native speaker’s superiority in the interaction compared to that of the Chinese speaker. In relation to their English native-
speaking interlocutors, the 4 Chinese participants engaged in self-denial in the face rituals of "putting self down," "refusing a compliment," and "turning down an invitation to talk."

"Putting self down" was a face ritual in which the Chinese speaker deliberately sought to belittle and debase him/herself enough so as not to threaten the face of the English native-speaking interlocutor. This ritual was performed by the Chinese speakers whenever there was a chance to accept credit for what they have done in terms of accomplishments in their lives. When the Chinese speakers were asked to elaborate and/or accept praise for their accomplishments, they spoke reluctantly showing humbleness in the presence of their interlocutors. Rather than putting self down by giving reasons why the Chinese speaker did not deserve the praise of the English native-speaking interlocutors, he/she performed a second face ritual in which a compliment that was offered by the native speaker was refused. The 4 Chinese speakers were fully socialized members of their society who were trained to be humble on social occasions to the extent that they were reluctant to accept and acknowledge a compliment. The usual reaction from the English native-speaking interlocutors to refusing a compliment was to attempt to offer more praise to the Chinese speaker. This reaction was even more embarrassing to the Chinese speaker. In the third ritual of self-denial, the Chinese speakers performed a ritual of "turning down an invitation to talk" on topics about which they knew a great deal. As an act of self-denial, this ritual functioned to show the Chinese speaker as unworthy of the honor just assigned to him/her by the English native-speaking interlocutor. "Self-denial" meant that the Chinese speaker communicated a sense of unworthiness in regard to the responsibility given by the native speaker, and an unpretentious attitude to speak and
express opinions in the presence of a superior person like the native speaker. The relationships of these three face rituals of self-denial to the interactional context are discussed below:

(a) Putting Self Down

The ritual of putting self down had a relationship to the interactional context that resembled the effect of refusing a compliment. That is, a Chinese speaker’s ritual of “putting self down” resulted frequently in sympathy and/or solidarity by the native speaker. So, the effect on the interactional context was frequently another stretch of talk by the native speaker in which he/she expressed support and solidarity with the Chinese speaker. For example, in the interaction between Peng and Fiona, after Fiona asked Peng whether he wanted to go for the Master’s or Ph.D. degrees, Peng put himself down about his ability to go on all the way for the Ph.D. degree. Although his stated purpose of coming to the States was to pursue a Ph.D. in Economics, Peng’s ritual of “putting self down” may have shown him to be lacking in self-confidence about his abilities, especially in front of Fiona, a Ph.D. student at the same university:

(5.49)

F: What program did you apply for? What’re, where’re you thinking about studying at the graduate level?
P: I, I want to apply for Department of Economics.
F: Wow!
P: Uhm-ha. Yeah, it’s my undergraduate major.
F: Ok. So, would this be your master’s degree that you will be going that for or your Ph.D. if you go back to school?
P: Eh, master degree.
F: For your master’s degree.
P: Yeah, I’m, I don’t know whether I can, uhm, continue to study Ph.D., uhm-ha.... (Both laughed). They are long road.
F: It is a long road, uhm-ha..., a very long one.
P: So, master degree must be my first step. Sometimes it, it's take time, uhn-ha..., to study.
F: It does takes a lot of time, a lot of time. Are you, uhn, taking, where are you taking courses in English?

Fiona reacted to Peng’s expression of humility, and his uncertainty about his abilities by expressing support for his words. This ritual also served to keep Fiona’s face without any threat to her higher educational status. The self doubt expressed by Peng’s ritual of putting self down thus served to direct the flow of the conversation into a new area in which both speakers shared a common interest, and may even have had similar doubts. The overall effect of this ritual of “putting self down” was social in nature in that it let the participants know each other more intimately through knowing each others’ fears and insecurities.

In the interaction between Huang and Marianne, Huang put himself down after Marianne complimented him on his glasses. Even though Huang was willing to accept Marianne’s compliment, he still expressed his unhappiness about his poor eyesight. This prompted Marianne’s expression of solidarity with him. While she wanted to compliment Huang on his glasses, Marianne found herself sympathizing with him because of his poor eyesight:

(5.50)

M: I like your glasses.
H: Thank you.
M: Oh, yes, I do. They’re nice.
H: Uha..., yes. But eyes, sometimes, sometimes, eyes are not very convenient.
M: I know it. =
H: Yes.
M: = I know.
In the following extract from the interaction between Julia and Marianne, Julia, who is single, deliberately debased herself:

(5.51)

J: Sometimes I think I will not be a good mother or a good wife because I want to find a husband who can understand and who will help me when I need his help. He will give me his hand. I know maybe I cannot be a good mother because I want to be a career woman and I have to spend a lot of time at work. Maybe I will have a little time to take care of my children. And maybe I will feel sorry for them.

M: I think you put a lot of thinking in this. You think very seriously about marriage.

J: Because it's a lifetime decision.

By expressing her doubles about her potential success as a mother and a wife, Julia induced Marianne to see her not as a failure, but as a thoughtful person who does not take her future lightly. Julia’s ritual of “putting herself down” influenced the interactional context in an indirect manner. After Julia put herself down, Marianne expressed solidarity and support for Julia in her future role as a wife and a mother.

In the interaction between Linda and Jim, Linda put herself down as a pianist because of what she considered as her physical limitations. Linda said that when compared to western people, “My hand is too small.”

(5.52)

L: Because you see, uhn, I, uhn, obviously my body is, is very small, especially compare to western people, yes, and my, my hand is very small. Most time I, I can’t handle the very comp-, complex rhythm, music, for example, Rachmaninov =

J: That’s what I’m thinking.

L: = or Lis, or Brahms, or Bartok, some of Bartok, some of Bartok is, is impossible to me.

J: They are concertos that have lots of pair roles.

L: Yeah, yeah. It’s impossible to me. And, and sometimes, some place, maybe in Chopin or Beethoven, I al-, also have problem because my, my hand is too small to approach the music position, and my professor, he, he is, uhm, he is very flexible. He, he, will help, he will teach me to change my finger position, and my hand
position, and to find the, the best way to me, and then, I can play it as other
students, who has, who has big hands.

J: /A’Wish Thova Rocha’s/ hands have about your size up.
L: Uhn, uhn
J: /A’Wish Thova Rocha./ (incomprehensible words)
L: Oh, /A’Wish./ Oh, she is =
J: She has very small hands.
L: = I didn’t, yeah. I think, yeah, he always give me this example.
J: That way she’s got small hands.
L: Yeah, he say, she also has a small hand, but she can arrange, arrange the, the
performance technique, like to, to arrange the finger position, and some peda-
(pedagogical) technique to help us. He say, uhm, if we really, uhn, if we really try
to, to overcome our problem, it’s not, it’s not, uhn, really impossible to this.

Linda explained that most of the time, she was unable to handle complex rhythm
music because of her small hands on the keyboard. Jim reacted to Linda’s putting herself
down by mentioning the name of a famous female pianist who apparently had small hands.
Linda reacted to Jim’s expression of solidarity by saying that her teacher always
mentioned this example to her in order to motivate her to control those complex rhythms
on the piano. Linda’s reply to Jim’s support was revealing. Apparently, Linda had also
put herself down in front of her teacher who has responded by mentioning the same artist
as Jim did. As an act of self-denial, Linda’s ritual of “putting self down” provoked the
sympathy not only of her friend, but also of her teacher. More importantly, within the
interactional context, this ritual frequently resulted in a pattern in which a show of support
by the native speaker was used to increase the Chinese speaker’s self-regard.

(b) Refusing a Compliment

A Chinese speaker’s reluctance to accept a compliment may provoke the native
speaker to repeat the compliment so that it eventually gets accepted. The influence of the
ritual of “refusing a compliment” on the interactional context may thus be characterized as
an utterance in which the native speaker insists on offering the compliment to the Chinese speaker. For example, in the interaction between Marianne and Huang, Marianne complimented Huang on his hair:

(5.53)

M: Your hair has a good curl.
H: Oh, my hair is curl. Oh, really?
M: It is.
H: A little, just a little, naturally, uhm-ha....

Huang repetition of Marianne’s compliment and his question (“Oh, really?”) betrayed that he was uncomfortable with the compliment just given to him by Marianne. Her confirmation (“It is.”) was the utterance in which Marianne insisted on offering the compliment to Huang about his hair. In order to show that he was reluctantly accepting the compliment, after Marianne’s insistence, Huang did not forget to debase his hair (“A little, just a little”). This same pattern was found in the interaction introduced earlier between Marianne and Huang. Marianne complimented Huang about his glasses, and although he initially accepted the compliment, his complaint about his poor eyesight betrayed his reluctance to accept the compliment whole-heartedly:

(5.54)

M: I like your glasses.
H: Thank you.
M: Oh, yes, I do. They’re nice.
H: Uha..., yes. But eyes, sometimes, sometimes, eyes are not very convenient.
M: I know it. =
H: Yes.
M: = I know.
The ritual of “refusing a compliment was performed when Huang diverted the compliment about his glasses to debase his eyesight. This was the main reason why this example was used to demonstrate both of these rituals.

When Peng was talking to Fiona about Taiwan, he said that many Taiwanese people liked to go to Friday’s restaurant in Taiwan to be able to listen to rock and roll music. Fiona was pleasantly surprised to learn about this. So, she became interested in Peng’s musical tastes. Peng refused to be complimented by debasing his listening ability. In other words, Peng did not listen to rock and roll music because his listening ability in English was not high enough for him to be able to understand the songs. As a result, Peng listened to country music:

(5.55)

P: Some kind of places like Friday’s is a symbol of American culture. So, young people like to get there. Maybe just have a sip, or drink beer.
F: → Wow! Do you listen to American music?
P: Yes.
F: Ok, what kind of music do you like?
P: → I, my listening is still very poor. So, I like to listen to the countryside.
F: Is there a, is there a country radio station?
P: Yeah.
F: There is a, there is a country station at Columbus.

By debasing his listening ability in English, Peng had effectively set himself apart from those who listened to rock and roll music even if they did not understand it. Instead, he opted for listening to country music which was much easier for him to follow and understand. Peng next used this occasion to talk to Fiona about something that caused him a great deal of frustration:
P: But I am a little wonder why the undergraduate students: They all like to listen to the rock and roll music!
F: I don’t. I wonder that, too.
P: You wonder that, too?
F: Yeah. It’s like, why do they listen to that loud stuff?
P: It’s very crowd. It’s very noisy everyday in the dormitory. I can, I can accept, but sometimes they put a very loud, yeah. And you can say in the same floor, you can hear even from the distant rooms. So, everybody can share their music. It’s very noisy.
F: It is very noisy. That’s why I live far from campus.
P: Oh, you don’t like that.
F: I don’t like all that kind of noise. I don’t, I don’t even like that kind of music. Oh, no.

What started as a simple pattern of refusing a compliment by debasing his listening ability, developed into something about which both interlocutors had similar feelings. Fiona expressed her solidarity with Peng’s complaint. He not only did not have the listening ability to listen to rock and roll, but he also had to listen to it continuously from his neighbors in the dorm.

In conclusion, the ritual of “refusing a compliment” affected the interactional context in the way the native speakers reacted by repeating their compliments and expressing solidarity and support for the Chinese speaker.

(c) Turning Down an Invitation to Talk

Even though a Chinese speaker would initially turn down an invitation to talk on a certain subject, he/she frequently winds up talking about it after a little prodding from the native speaker. From a cultural perspective, the Chinese speaker’s reluctance to take up an invitation to talk should be considered as a sign of humbleness. The Chinese speakers did not want to be perceived by the native speakers as presumptuous and/or talkative.
persons. The Chinese speakers' ritual of "turning down an invitation to talk" thus influenced the interactional context in the additional turns at talk in which the Chinese speakers ended up talking about the same topics anyway. This face ritual served as a caveat that what the Chinese speaker was going to say might not be authoritative but it had to be understood as such in case the Chinese speaker's reply might sound incomplete or not up to the native speaker's standards or expectations. For example, in the interaction between Marianne and Peng, Marianne asked Peng if he had formed an opinion on the healthcare system as he saw it in the United States. Peng first said that he did not have any opinion on this matter. This was the beginning of Peng's ritual of turning down an invitation to talk because after he listened to Marianne's opinion, Peng articulated his own fully formed opinion on the U.S. healthcare system. Moreover, he went on to compare between what he saw in the U.S. and the healthcare system in his country:

(5.57)

M: Did you form any opinion on it?
P: I have no opinion.
M: Ok.
P: Yeah.

After Marianne expressed her opinion on the U.S. healthcare system, Peng had this to say:

(5.58)

P: My friend told me that one month ago he had a disease and he wanted to go to see the doctor.
M: Yes.
P: And he say the doctor say, the hospital says that he must give him 200 dollars. Oh, it's a big money for students.
M: That's right.
P: Because we have student insurance, but we must, still must pay 200, just for small disease.
M: I know.
P: So it’s not a big problem. It’s not a big disease, but he must pay 200.
M: Oh, you should see what it costs if you have a big disease.

After Marianne talked about how she managed to get healthcare as a senior citizen,
Peng started comparing between the American and the Taiwanese healthcare systems:

(5.59)
P: In Taiwan, when we go to the hospital, we don’t pay too much money.
M: You don’t?
P: Yeah, maybe just one time, you just have to pay 6 dollars.
M: Oh.
P: We also have public health insurance. Everyone must give money to our government if you have jobs, and you must pay money too, every month. But every time you go to the hospital, you just have to pay 6 dollars. So, first time I came here, my friend told me 200 dollars. Wow! I was surprised.
M: Don’t get sick. Stay healthy.

It turned out, after all, that Peng did have an opinion on the U.S. healthcare system, but when Marianne invited him to talk about it, he refused by denying that he had an opinion on it. Peng did not intend to criticize the American healthcare system in front of Marianne. But when he listened to Marianne’s highly critical view that the American healthcare system was not the best Americans could have, he was encouraged to express his opinion more openly.

In another example, Julia refused an invitation to talk about the Taiwanese wedding party, but after a little prodding from Marianne, Julia talked in detail about the same topic:

(5.60)
J: I know in Taiwan, the wedding ceremony is usually held in the groom’s house. I didn’t see their ceremony, just eat dinner with them. So, there are lots of custom. We just talk about this, this week in our class.
M: Oh, ok. What are some of these customs? Can you tell me some of these customs?
J: Oh, no, ha....
M: Because you just talked about it in class. So, that's interesting.
J: At the beginning of the day, the groom has to go to the bride's house to take her to his house....

In the remainder of her utterance, Julia managed to explain a significant number of customs that accompany the traditional day of the wedding in Taiwan. What was important about this example was that it resembled the previous example in that Marianne tried to prod the Chinese speaker into talking about something he/she refused to talk about when first asked. After the second attempt, however, the Chinese speaker overcame his/her reluctance and expressed him/herself eloquently on the topic that he/she refused to talk about in the first place.

The face ritual of "turning down an invitation to talk" was routinely performed by the 4 Chinese participants. They all displayed their familiarity with this essentially Chinese face ritual and transferred it to their L2 speech during their interaction with the English native-speaking interlocutors. For example, Linda refused to talk to Jim about the theft of her bicycle because as she put it, "It is not a good story."

(5.61)

J: Do you want to talk about the crisis?
L: My bicycle?
J: Right.
L: Ah, it's not a good story, ha....

Linda, however, went on to talk to Jim in detail about the accident of the theft of her bicycle. This episode almost took the first fifteen minutes of the interaction. In another
example of this ritual, Peng refused at first to talk to the researcher about marriage, but after some pressure, Peng talked at length about the same topic:

(5.62)

R: What is the major criteria for you to choose a wife? What do you think is the most important thing?

P: I am, I am very young.

It could very well be the case that Peng felt shy to talk about this topic in front of the researcher, but when she left the room, Peng began talking about marriage to Jim, the male native-speaking interlocutor in this interaction. This ritual was employed by other participants. For example, at the beginning of their interaction, Huang refused to talk to Jim about anything:

(5.63)

J: Is there something you would like to talk about? Some pretty good items?
H: I don't know. I have nothing.

Huang’s refusal to talk about anything could be interpreted as shyness which is a personality trait. By looking at the prevalence of this ritual among the 4 Chinese participants, the data analysis pointed to the possibility that it could be a result of the interaction between the learners’ personality factors and the patterns of their native language that were transferred to the L2 interactional context.
Summary and Conclusions

The findings from this study provide some evidence that may pose a challenge to the validity of the current SLA assumption that discourse transfer plays a causal role in miscommunication between L2 learners and native speakers of the target language. The interaction between discourse transfer and miscommunication witnessed in the conversations points to a bidirectional relationship in the interactional context in which both the Chinese and English speakers took equal roles in contributing to and finally settling communication difficulties that stemmed from the production of discourse transfer categories. Analysis of some of the categories of discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech showed that they were produced as a result of native speakers' utterances. Some categories, when subjected to discourse analysis, were triggered by questions posed by the native speakers. For example, the category of "answering with a seemingly unrelated point" was triggered in many cases by a question posed by the English native-speaking interlocutor. In turn, the production of the category of "answering with a seemingly unrelated point" has prompted the native speakers occasionally to restate their questions until they got a satisfactory answer from the Chinese speaker. When that was not possible, the native speakers were prompted, in some cases, to abandon their questions altogether and pose new questions to the Chinese speaker. Alternatively, the occurrence of some other discourse transfer categories in the 4 Chinese learners' speech caused communication difficulties with the English native speakers. For example, the category of topic-comment was responsible for some unintended interruptions to the flow of the conversation when the Chinese speaker erroneously thought that the native speaker...
had finished his/her utterance. Additionally, the category of “free association” in the 4 Chinese participants’ speech was seen by some English native speakers as digressions from the smooth flow of the conversation. Thus, the evidence shows that there is no direct causal relationship between discourse transfer categories and miscommunication. Rather, there may be a bidirectional relationship between some categories of discourse transfer and the speech of native speakers within the interactional context.

The examples from the transcribed data sets used in this chapter demonstrated the complexity of the processes involved when the 4 Chinese participants produced discourse transfer phenomena within the interactional context. Three different processes shaped the nature of the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context. The first component of the relationship was social: The procedures and strategies by which the 4 Chinese participants and the 3 English native speakers jointly constructed social contexts or situations in which communication in the target language was possible. The second component of the relationship was linguistic: How knowledge of a first language figured in second language use. Discourse transfer involved the interaction between the first and second languages to produce the learners’ performance in the interactional context. The third process at work in the relationship was cognitive: The unseen processes of discourse transfer, or what went on in the heads of the Chinese participants when they interacted with language data on which they based their utterances. These processes were at work either simultaneously or separately whenever discourse transfer was produced in the interactional context.
The Complexity Hypothesis

The hypothesis generated by the researcher regarding the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context was called the complexity hypothesis. It is stated as follows:

Hypothesis II. There may be a bidirectional relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context in which both the Chinese speakers and their English-speaking interlocutors drew on their social, cognitive, and linguistic knowledge to carry on their conversations when discourse transfer was produced within the interactional context.

The complexity hypothesis is consistent with the other two hypotheses on the modular nature of discourse transfer, and on the idiosyncracy among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of the production of discourse transfer. The present study generated the three hypotheses to account for discourse transfer phenomena in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. They enable the reader to see how individual differences among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of cognitive processing, linguistic knowledge, and social skills may have an impact on their production of discourse transfer within the interactional context. According to the modularity hypothesis, specialized modules that emerged during first language acquisition formed cognitive pegs on which to attach new information about the L2 through gradual and repeated exposure to L2 input in the language classroom and beyond. The second hypothesis was based on the complexity of the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context which involved the linguistic, social, and cognitive processes in the production of discourse transfer. The third hypothesis on individual variability was based on evidence from the data that the 4 Chinese participants
produced discourse transfer as distinct persons according to the quantitative measures of
frequency of use, percentages, and rankings.

The relationship between discourse transfer phenomena and the interactional
context was mediated through the simultaneous occurrence of cognitive, social, and
linguistic processes. In second language studies on discourse transfer, researchers have
traditionally approached data from a purely linguistic perspective, examining areas of
linguistic difference between the L1 and the L2 while neglecting the social and cognitive
factors that have contributed to the production of language data. In the rationale in the
methodology chapter, it was pointed out that a language per se approach to the study of
discourse transfer phenomena may lead to potential errors in interpretation. Data analysis
in this study further demonstrated that it was not only misleading to carry out one-sided
research on linguistic forms without considering the potential errors in judgement that this
focus might cause, but that it was misleading to carry out research on linguistic forms
alone without considering the cognitive and social processes that also accompany the
occurrence of discourse transfer phenomena within an interactional context. This position
has its own implications for determining the scope of the research. As researchers on
language learning focus their attention on analyzing surface-level linguistic data produced
by L2 learners in interactions, they must keep in mind that the data are part of a much
larger system of social, cognitive, and linguistic knowledge. SLA researchers’
interpretations of the data may begin with claims about the isolated pieces of linguistic
data, but must eventually include considerations of the pivotal roles played by the social
and cognitive processes that are at work in the production of discourse transfer within
interactional contexts. To further elaborate on the complexity behind these processes, the following three sections describe in further detail what is meant by the role of each process within the interactional context when discourse transfer phenomena are produced.

**Social Processes**

The interactional sessions organized by the researcher were primarily social encounters designed to encourage frequent and continuing contact between the 3 native speakers and the 4 Chinese participants. This research design allowed the native speakers and the Chinese participants to develop social bonds, which in turn provided the motivation needed to keep both parties talking despite the difficulties that come from not sharing a common language. Examples of these social relations were ethnographically documented by the researcher. They include invitations for restaurants (either dinner or lunch) by Huang to Fiona, and Linda and Peng to Jim, where both parties shared Chinese food. Another means of strengthening social relations included letters and postcards. These were sent by Julia to Marianne and the researcher, Peng, Linda, and Huang to Marianne, Fiona and Jim. Other social activities included phone calls, rides to Cleveland and COSI, and so on. The social nature of these bonds entailed that during the interactional sessions, the parties created social contexts that allowed communication to be conducted in English, a language that only one of them knew well. Each party was willing and interested in interacting with the other, and each party played a part in maintaining the contact between them. The interactional sessions provided the Chinese speakers with opportunities to observe the language as it was used by native speakers in authentic communication. Such opportunities were appreciated by the Chinese
participants because they provided them with evidence on how the target language worked, and how native speakers used it to accomplish their communicative goals. The Chinese speakers participated in these interactions at many levels. What they said and did also served as feedback to the native speakers, revealing whether or not they understood what was being said. The following example demonstrates how much both Linda and Marianne appreciated the value of the interactional sessions:

(5.64)

L: Every time she always say I am so appreciate to you. You help me a lot. But I don’t think so, I help him, her anything.
M: I know.
L: Because I think, I just, I just come to school or her, her house and sit down to talk with her friends and her neighbors, and it, I think it’s, uhn, I think it improve my English, spoke, spoking ability, and =
M: Speaking ability.
L: = Yeah, and I also very appreciate her advice. She always very polite to me, uhn-ha..., to say, ah, yeah. Uhn, so, it, uhm, I think it’s better to say we help each other, uha....
M: That’s, that’s very good. Yes, you’re right. Well, she tells me that, too, that, that I am helpful. I am just having a nice experience. I would never get to meet you and what’s his name? Guo-Shenq?

The key to understanding the social processes that figure within the interactional context is that they are mutual. There is no single consistent path in which action flows from one party to the other. It is not enough for those who know the language to manage the conversation for the Chinese participants’ sake. The Chinese participants were also receptive and responsive to the communication that was taking place. The data analysis revealed that the native speakers’ use of the patterns of the second language and the Chinese participants’ transfer of the patterns from their native language each contributed to the appearance of discourse transfer phenomena in the interactional context. The
intricacy of the links between different interactional situations and the ways in which they contributed to the appearance of discourse transfer, the highly idiosyncratic nature of the use of different L1 patterns in L2 contexts among the 4 Chinese speakers, and the use of different conversational management procedures by the 3 native speakers all provided support for the vital role played by social processes in the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context.

**Linguistic Processes**

Linguistic processes refer to ways in which the 4 Chinese speakers’ prior linguistic knowledge was transferred to the linguistic data that was used in the interactional context. The data analysis demonstrated how the Chinese participants were aided in comprehending and producing the L2 by having prior linguistic knowledge of their own native language. They searched the L2 linguistic data made available to them by the native speakers during the interactions to find equivalent properties in the target language. Rituals of face are a good example of the 4 Chinese participants’ responsiveness to what was being said to them by the native speakers. The 4 Chinese speakers knew the speech functions that can be expressed linguistically. The knew, for example, all about compliments and how to refuse or accept them, and they understood the situations that called for such usages. This prior linguistic knowledge gave the 4 Chinese speakers an advantage, because it made them ready to look for ways to accomplish the same communicative functions in the target language. Thus, the linguistic knowledge they brought with them to the interactions motivated them to look for labels from the available L2 input more efficiently.
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At the same time, however, prior linguistic knowledge can put the Chinese participants at a disadvantage. Generally speaking, the 4 Chinese participants did well when they assumed that the forms and words that were available in the L2 input were only functionally equivalent to those in their first language. They ran into trouble when they went beyond and assumed that the L2 input was functionally and formally identical to ones they already had. There is abundant evidence of this kind of trouble in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. Thus, Linda who said to Jim “I very like” was assuming that the English intensifier “very” can be placed in front of the verb just as it is used in Chinese. It is similar, but not identical. Additionally, when Julia used the verb “to sue” in its Chinese form as a borrowing, she was assuming that, somehow, Marianne was going to understand. Julia learned that this strategy does not work well with English native-speaking interlocutors. In sum, linguistic processes played an undeniable role in the production of discourse transfer within the interactional context. On the one hand, these processes formulated an advantage for the 4 Chinese participants in trying to cope with the demands of the rapid interactive processing in an interactional context. On the other hand, the linguistic processes of literal or identical transfer put the 4 Chinese participants at a disadvantage because English did not have the same linguistic or functional equivalents to what was transferred to the L2 interactional context. Literally translated output did not always achieve the communicative goals intended by the Chinese speakers in this study because literal translations were not always understood by the 3 English native-speaking interlocutors.
Cognitive Processes

From the Chinese speaker's perspective, interactive processing of L2 speech begins with having to make sense of what the native speakers are talking about in the target language. In part, listening comprehension is accomplished by being attentive to the word meaning and the grammar of native speakers' utterances, and observing what is happening as they talk. The Chinese speaker assumes that there is a relationship between what the native speakers do and what they say. The key strategy is to make use of contextual information and to guess at meanings based on observations of how the target language is being used. It is an extremely difficult task to understand every word the native speaker uses especially in view of the Chinese participants' less than perfect competence in the target language. The data analysis showed that in some utterances native speakers made, a new word or an unfamiliar rule of grammar led to miscues on the part of the Chinese participants.

Cognitive processes are thus central to listening comprehension in the rapid interactive processing of L2 input in the interactional context. They are different in an important respect from those involved in first language acquisition. Whereas first language acquisition is handled through the child's interaction with its world with no deliberate effort at learning, or even the existence of another language, second language acquisition involves exerting a conscious effort at learning the second language, by an adult learner, after the native language has already been in place. The processes of second language acquisition include the analytical procedures and operations by which learners sort out and classify the linguistic data available to them, making it possible for them to
eventually learn the second language. This process involves general cognitive strategies and skills. The Chinese speakers used whatever analytical skills and information they had to work out word meaning, formal aspects of language, and functions in the second language. These cognitive processes comprised a significant part of the overall task of figuring out how the second language works.

The L2 data the 4 Chinese participants had to work with were speech samples and observations of social situations in which these samples were produced. By observing the social situations, the participants identified the variable contexts in which the second language is used. What the participants did was to discover the rules and patterns employed by the native speakers in using the second language, and then do what the native speakers do. Peng acknowledged the importance of the interactional context in learning English as a second language.

(5.65)

P: Sometimes if what I say maybe you don’t understand, I just see your expression. I know what I say, you cannot understand. When I feel so, I use another words to explain what I mean. So, if I think you don’t understand, so I think that maybe you will tell me again, and use the exact expression. So, sometimes, maybe I just don’t have to plan in my mind when I talk to you the first time. I just speak in a normal way. So, but next time, the second time I will plan again in my mind. Maybe use some very simple words or different words. But I think it works.

Ultimately, new L2 knowledge gained from the interactional context is synthesized by L2 learners into a language system that is known within the SLA discipline as interlanguage. The present study has provided ample evidence that the learner’s L1 worked as one of the sources of information that the 4 Chinese participants used when interacting in the L2.
CHAPTER 6

INDIVIDUAL VARIATION IN DISCOURSE TRANSFER

Introduction

The focus of the third research question was on the possible relationship between individual variation and discourse transfer. This chapter addresses this question by analyzing the individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of their discourse transfer performance. The units of analysis were the categories of discourse transfer generated from the first research question. Two types of descriptive displays are used in succession to explore individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants. The first type is a within-case display that focuses on a set of categories in order to give the reader a profile of each participant according to the measures of frequency of use, ranking, and percentage of use of that set of categories. The second type is a cross-case display that facilitates comparisons between the performance of the 4 participants in single categories of discourse.

The two types of graphic display that are used in this chapter are intended to achieve different but related objectives. The objectives of the first type are to assess if the patterns of use of the 4 participants were consistent for a certain set of categories, to determine if relationships exist between the patterns of use of the categories, and to see if...
there were intervening variables. The second type of display is a further step in category-specific analysis where the prime objective is to follow the patterns of variation where they can lead to tentative conclusions about individual variation in the production of discourse transfer. For example, in the set of categories of “organizing propositional information,” the first type of display (Table 6.1 & Figure 6.1) revealed that the 4 participants were consistent in the measure of ranking the use of each category as follows: “putting one’s position at the end” (POPE) ranked first, followed by “invoking a point from the past” (IPP). The category of “answering with a seemingly unrelated point” (AUP) came third, and “topic-comment word order” (TC) came fourth. This step in the analysis showed that, even though there were minor differences in the measures of frequency of use and percentages, there was no variability among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of ranking the set of categories of “organizing propositional information.”

Upon further examination of the second type of display (Table 6.2 & Figure 6.2), cross-case analysis revealed, however, that the 4 Chinese participants varied in the frequency with which they relied on individual categories to organize propositional information. For example, Peng was the most frequent user of the two categories of: “putting one’s position at the end” (POPE), and “invoking a point from the past” (IPP) while Linda was the most frequent user of the other two categories of “answering with a seemingly unrelated point” (AUP), and “topic-comment word order” (TC). Because the second type of data display focused on making comparisons across participants, the analysis was able to focus on the 2 Chinese participants’ production of individual categories to further pursue the patterns noticed earlier in the first type of display.
Both types of display yielded useful information about the patterns of individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants. Based on these patterns, a tentative conclusion could be drawn about these two participants' individual conversational styles. Even though the two participants ranked the categories in the same order, they still showed a noticeable degree of variation in their conversational styles in terms of their overall use of individual categories of organizing propositional information.

For a better understanding of the possible relationships between individual variation and discourse transfer phenomena, further analysis of the numerical data incorporated findings gained through transfer analysis and discourse analysis of the categories of discourse transfer. Such findings were beneficial to the interpretation of the data. For example, quantitative analysis determined that the variation between Peng and Linda in choosing certain categories of discourse transfer over others was probably due to the variation in their conversational styles. Both the transfer analysis and discourse analysis that were conducted for answering the first and second research questions were linked to the categories chosen by each participant to determine their effects on the interactional context and how these categories were perceived by the English native-speaking interlocutors. The analysis took into account the findings about specific categories of discourse transfer and how they may shape a Chinese speaker's conversational style. Based on these analyses, a final conclusion was drawn that individual variation resulted in positive discourse transfer in Peng's case and negative discourse transfer in Linda's case. The Chinese learner's idiosyncratic use of discourse transfer
categories had important consequences for his/her overall performance in the interactional context.

In order to be consistent in the data analysis, it was important to maintain the same set of quantitative measures for each set of categories until the full category system could be studied. The use of bar graph displays in the figures that accompany the tables was intended to give shape to the numerical data of the tables. Numbers between brackets within graphic displays stand for the ranking of each of the four participants in terms of the use of a category (e.g., [1-4]). Having all the data fit into readily surveyable tables and figures helped in creating a final matrix that summarized all the categories into a comprehensive scheme that was derived from the two types of descriptive display. The final matrix in section V was designed to give the reader an overall look at the mix of categories and their relationships to individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants.

The analysis of patterns of variation is divided into 5 sections that correspond to the number of sets of categories of discourse transfer that were generated by the first research question. Section I analyzes individual variability in the transfer of L1-based categories of organizing propositional information. Section II includes 3 parts that correspond to the 3 metadiscourse strategies of connectors, qualifiers, and miscues. Section III includes 2 parts that focus on the analysis of variation in the two sets of categories of "manifesting social identity": sense of community and cultural beliefs. Section IV focuses on the variation in performing the two sets of categories of rituals of face: respect for others, and self-denial. Section V concludes with a hypothesis about the role of the individual learner in the discourse transfer process.
Analysis of individual variation in the production of discourse transfer categories goes beyond the shared understandings and sociocultural information that the 4 Chinese participants displayed as a group in chapters 4 and 5. The in-depth analysis of individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants can increase understanding of discourse transfer phenomena from Chinese to English. Section V includes a summary of the findings and a hypothesis that is based on the analysis of individual variation among the 4 participants in the production of discourse transfer.

I. Individual Variation in “Organizing Propositional Information”

This section is devoted to the analysis of individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants within the set of categories for organizing propositional information. Four categories were subsumed under propositional information: (a) putting one’s position at the end (POPE), (b) topic-comment word order (TC), (c) invoking a point in the past (IPP), and (d) answering with an unrelated point (AUP). Table 6.1 depicts numerical data on the performance of each Chinese learner within this set of categories. Figure 6.1 on the same page offers a graphic display of the same patterns in Table 6.1. From this first type of display, it was concluded that, for this set of categories, the patterns of use by the 4 Chinese participants were consistent. In term of group performance, the 4 Chinese participants consistently showed the same ranking order with (POPE) coming first as the most frequently used category, (IPP) coming in second place, (AUP) in third place, and (TC) in fourth place. In other words, the 4 Chinese participants collectively followed a common pattern of ranking this set of categories within their L2 speech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Putting One's Position at the End (POPE)</strong></td>
<td>60 (54.55%)</td>
<td>27 (33.33%)</td>
<td>45 (56.25%)</td>
<td>37 (40.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic-Comment Word Order (TC)</strong></td>
<td>3 (2.73%)</td>
<td>10 (12.35%)</td>
<td>10 (12.5%)</td>
<td>9 (9.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP)</strong></td>
<td>31 (28.19%)</td>
<td>23 (28.40%)</td>
<td>14 (17.5%)</td>
<td>28 (30.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP)</strong></td>
<td>16 (14.55%)</td>
<td>21 (25.93%)</td>
<td>11 (13.75%)</td>
<td>18 (19.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Within-Group Matrix of “Organizing Propositional Information”

![Figure 6.1: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Organizing Propositional Information”](image)

Figure 6.1: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Organizing Propositional Information”
Variation appeared, however, in the measures of frequency of use and percentage which deal with the number of times each category was used by each participant. Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2 quantitatively show the number of times each single category was used by the 4 Chinese participants. Both displays report the rankings, frequency of use, and percentage of use for each of the four categories of “organizing propositional information.” For example, Peng used (POPE) 60 times out of 169 occurrences of use which gave him 35.50% of the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance within this category. Julia utilized (POPE) 45 times or 26.63% of the total use of this category, while Huang used the same category 37 times or 21.89% of the overall performance. Linda came last using (POPE) for 27 times or 15.98% of the total use of this category. These patterns of use showed variability among the 4 participants, given the fact that they were all allowed equal time during data collection to engage in face-to-face interaction with the 3 English native-speaking interlocutors. In sum, the two types of display showed that while the 4 Chinese participants followed a similar pattern of ranking (POPE) highest, they showed variability in the measures of frequency of use and percentage of employing the same category in their L2 speech. Evidence of individual variability among the 4 participants in terms of organizing propositional information points to the interaction between L1 influence and personality factors. In other words, the lack of consistency in transfer effects can be interpreted by viewing the participants as separate individuals each making his/her own decision about what and what not to transfer to the L2.

Another analysis was done to determine if a relationship existed between the patterns of use of the four categories of propositional information. By looking at these
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Putting One's Position at the End (POPE)</th>
<th>Topic-Comment Word Order (TC)</th>
<th>Invoking a Point from the Past (IPP)</th>
<th>Answering with a Seemingly Unrelated Point (AUP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENG</td>
<td>60 (35.50%) [1]</td>
<td>3 (9.34%) [3]</td>
<td>31 (32.29%) [1]</td>
<td>16 (24.24%) [3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Cross-Case Matrix of "Organizing Propositional Information"
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Figure 6.2: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of "Organizing Propositional Information"
patterns in Table 6.2, the ranking revealed that Peng utilized the two categories of (POPE) and (IPP) more than any other Chinese participant, while Linda utilized the two categories of (TC) and (AUP) more than any other participant. Peng and Linda ranked first among the 4 Chinese participants in the use of two different categories. The same measure of ranking significantly revealed that Linda ranked fourth in her use of (POPE), and third in (IPP), while Peng ranked third in the use of both (TC) and (AUP). The two participants’ heavy reliance on different categories of propositional information to organize their arguments, make their points, and respond to English native-speaking interlocutors’ questions can be interpreted simply as a difference in conversational style.

Because the focus of the research question was on the possible relationship between individual variation and discourse transfer, ad hoc analysis was pursued further to determine the interactional consequences of Linda and Peng’s preference for using one set of categories over another. Data analysis in Chapter 4 revealed that the organizing principle of the two categories of (POPE) and (IPP) depended on providing sufficient backgrounding and orientation, followed by the speaker’s main point. The possible interactional consequences of the use of these categories was NS interpretations of Chinese people as indirect. This was made clear by referring to Jim’s remarks that “Chinese speakers are indirect,” although this reaction was not consistently felt by the other two native speakers. Data analysis determined Jim’s interpretation was the result of the English speaker’s preference for a different organizing principle in which the speaker’s main point is mentioned at the outset usually followed by background information and support.
The interactional consequences of using (TC) and (AUP) are a different matter. Data analysis in chapter 5 revealed that over-reliance on the topic-comment category was responsible for abrupt interruptions in the middle of the native speaker's utterances. The same analysis pointed to a different interactional consequence for using (AUP). "Answering with a seemingly unrelated point" was seen by the native speakers as a failure in addressing their questions which occasionally prompted them to conduct the conversational management procedure of restating their original questions to the Chinese participants.

The conclusion drawn from this analysis was that individual variation can result in either positive or negative discourse transfer. In Peng's case, the transfer of the categories of (POPE) and (IPP) was positive because his prior discourse knowledge in Chinese gave him an advantage. He searched for ways to accomplish the same communicative functions in English that are available in Chinese. Peng knew what patterns to transfer to the L2 context. At the same time, Linda's prior discourse knowledge of Chinese put her at a disadvantage. She assumed that the L2 context was identical to the one she already knew. Such assumptions were not correct, and it resulted in negative discourse transfer. While the two types of graphic display provided the numerical evidence about both participants' patterns, discourse analysis revealed that Linda's reliance on (TC) and (AUP) had the negative impact of possibly causing interruptions to the smooth flow of her interactions with the English native-speaking interlocutors. Discourse analysis also showed that Peng's reliance on the two categories of (POPE) and (IPP) seemed to have had a benign effect on the interactional context. In conclusion, individual variation in the decisions
were made by individual learners resulted in either positive or negative discourse transfer. These decisions were made by each individual learner about the transferability of certain categories of Chinese discourse over others to the L2 context.

An understanding of the individual learner’s idiosyncratic role in making these decisions can increase our understanding of discourse transfer phenomena. This role could be seen as the 4 Chinese participants’ treatment of the categories of discourse transfer as a matrix of possibilities from which they chose some categories over others to transfer to the L2 context. This analysis revealed that individual variation was not simply a variation in conversational style. Rather, by looking at the consequences of employing these categories in the L2 interactional context, idiosyncracy can mean the difference between either positive or negative discourse transfer.

II. Individual Variation in “Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies”

For the purpose of analyzing the individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants in the use of metadiscourse strategies, this section is divided into three parts: (a) connectors, (b) qualifiers, and (c) miscues. The first set of categories concerns the use of 5 rhetorical devices by which the Chinese participants’ utterances were linked together. Transfer analysis determined the existence of 5 categories of connectors that were transferred by the 4 Chinese participants to their L2 speech: (a) conjunction with and (AND), (b) disjunction with but (BUT), (c) rhetorical questions (RQ), (d) free association (FA), and (e) revisiting (REV). The second set of categories concerns 4 categories in which the 4 Chinese participants qualified their utterances by using “maybe:” (a) overusing maybe (OM), (b) answering with maybe to a yes/no question (MYN), (c) answering with
maybe to an either/or question (MEO), and (d) answering with maybe to a wh-question (MWH). The third category of metadiscourse concerns the way in which the 4 Chinese participants miscued their answers by “saying yes when meaning no.” The analysis of the category of miscues focused on a cross-case analysis of the variation among the 4 Chinese participants in the use of this category.

A. Individual Variation in the Use of Connectors

Initial analysis started with a tabulation of the total frequency of use of each category of connectors by each of the 4 Chinese participants. These numbers were used to generate two types of displays in Tables 6.3 and 6.4 and Figures 6.3 and 6.4. First, Table 6.3 and Figure 6.3 are based on the 4 Chinese participants’ overall performance within the group of “connectors.” Table 6.3 offers a comparison of the rankings, frequency of use and percentage of use of connectors in the data set. Figure 6.3 offers a graphic display based on the frequency of use of each category within the group of connectors. Based on these displays, the category of “conjunction with and” (AND) ranked first for 3 out of the 4 participants, “disjunction with but” (BUT) ranked second for 3 out of the 4 participants, “free association” (FA) ranked third for 3 out of the 4 participants, “revisiting” (REV) ranked fourth for 3 out of the 4 participants, and “rhetorical questions” (RQ) ranked in fifth place for all 4 participants. Second, Table 6.4 and Figure 6.4 indicated a recognizable trend among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of their overall performance within the group of connectors. The two categories of “conjunction with and” (AND) (total 794) and “disjunction with but” (BUT) (total 387) were much more heavily used by all 4 participants than the other 3 categories of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunction</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong> (53.81%)</td>
<td><strong>274</strong> (67.65%)</td>
<td><strong>301</strong> (71.50%)</td>
<td><strong>100</strong> (38.76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with “AND” (AND)</td>
<td><strong>[1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[2]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunction</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong> (32.74%)</td>
<td><strong>81</strong> (20%)</td>
<td><strong>109</strong> (25.89%)</td>
<td><strong>124</strong> (48.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with “BUT” (BUT)</td>
<td><strong>[2]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[2]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[2]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[1]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical</strong></td>
<td>4 (1.79%)</td>
<td><strong>15</strong> (3.70%)</td>
<td><strong>2</strong> (0.48%)</td>
<td><strong>6</strong> (2.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions (RQ)</td>
<td><strong>[5]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[5]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[5]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[5]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free</strong></td>
<td>17 (7.62%)</td>
<td>19 (4.69%)</td>
<td>4 (0.95%)</td>
<td>17 (6.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association (FA)</td>
<td><strong>[3]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[3]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[4]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[3]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisiting</strong></td>
<td>9 (4.04%)</td>
<td>16 (3.95%)</td>
<td>5 (1.19%)</td>
<td>11 (4.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REV)</td>
<td><strong>[4]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[4]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[3]</strong></td>
<td><strong>[4]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Within-Group Matrix of “Connectors”

Figure 6.3: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Connectors”
"rhetorical questions" (RQ) (total 27), "free association" (FA) (total 157), and revisiting (REV) (total 41).

Individual variation appeared more clearly in each participants' profile of using connectors. By looking at the 4 Chinese participants' as a group, the analysis points to L1 influence in the use of connectors. L1 influence was, however, affected by the unique personality of each of the 4 participants. For example, Linda was the heaviest user of the 3 connectors of rhetorical questions (RQ), free association (FA), and revisiting (REV). The reverse was true of Julia’s performance. Compared to the other 3 participants, Julia used these three connectors very sparingly in her L2 speech. Both Linda and Julia shared the distinction of being the two most frequent users of “conjunction with and” (AND) to connect their utterances in L2 speech. The category of (AND) was utilized for a total number of 795 times by all 4 participants. Both Julia and Linda utilized (AND) much more than Peng and Huang. Julia utilized (AND) more than any other participants for a total of 301 times which amounted to 37.86% of the total use of (AND) by the 4 participants. Linda came a close second because she used (AND) for a total of 274 times to connect her utterances. Linda’s percentage of use of (AND) reached 34.47% of the 4 participants’ use of (AND). In other words, both Julia and Linda were responsible for 72.33% of the total use of (AND) by all 4 participants.

One of the limitations of the present study is the small N size, which makes it difficult to support generalizations about the observed patterns of language use. It is possible at this early stage of the research to point to evidence that suggests the existence of at least two factors in the discourse transfer of connectors. The first factor is gender,
and the second factor is the frequency of use with which connectors are used in the Chinese language. First, the Chinese female participants used (AND) more than the Chinese male participants. This pattern points to the possible role of gender as a potential factor in transfer in second language use. Second, the two categories of (AND) and (BUT) were more frequently used by all 4 Chinese participants than the other 3 connectors of rhetorical questions (RQ), free association (FA), and revisiting (REV). This feature points to L1 influence as a consistent factor that affected the 4 Chinese participants’ speech in similar, although not identical, ways.

By referring to the transfer analysis that was conducted in chapter 4 on the connectors of (AND), and (BUT), it became clear that there was a potential intervening variable that shaped the 4 participants’ use of these connectors. The 4 Chinese participants’ use of the five connectors violated Connor’s (1996) criteria for how English speakers used these connectors. The criteria were that while connectors did not add anything to the propositional content, they were useful for linking utterances together. Relating the numerical data to transfer analysis confirmed that the L1 structure of argument exerted influence on the use of (AND), and (BUT) among all 4 Chinese participants. The structure of Chinese discourse made it necessary to use connectors to provide sufficient background information before a final conclusion could be reached.

Further analysis was conducted to determine if there was any relationship between the remaining 3 connectors of rhetorical questions (RQ), free association (FA), and revisiting (REV). The patterns of use among the 4 participants were as follows: Linda was not only the second most frequent user of (AND), she was first in her use of the other
thee connectors among all 4 participants. Even though Huang and Peng used (AND) to a moderate level in comparison with both Linda and Julia, their use of the other three connectors was comparatively consistent with Linda's frequency of use. Julia, was, interestingly, a frequent user of (AND) but she used the other 3 connectors less frequently than the other 3 participants. A tentative conclusion was drawn that individual variation among the 4 participants interacted with L1 influence to prove the observed patterns of use of these connectors in their L2 speech.

The findings derived from transfer analysis and discourse analysis were utilized to determine the way these categories were related to discourse transfer. First, transfer analysis determined that the category of rhetorical questions (RQ), even though it was used by the Chinese participants in violation of Connor's criteria, was still a clever use of an L1-based discourse strategy to hold the floor and, at the same time, change the topic of the conversation. The use of rhetorical questions achieved this communicative goal by signaling to the native-speaking interlocutor that the Chinese speaker intends to change the subject by posing the rhetorical questions (RQ) and then proceeding to answer it without waiting for an answer from the native-speaking interlocutor. In other words, the use of rhetorical questions (RQ) in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech was interpreted as positive discourse transfer because they utilized what they already knew from the L1 in holding the floor and changing the topic of the conversation without any adverse interactional consequences, or the need for the native-speaking interlocutor to conduct any observable conversational management procedures to put the conversation back on track. Second, in contrast to the third category of rhetorical questions (RQ), the fourth
category of free association (FA) was determined by discourse analysis in chapter 5 to be a sign of negative discourse transfer from Chinese to English. Due to the fact that free association caused obvious violations to the interactional context, the native-speaking interlocutors saw them as digressions from the topic that was being discussed at that time. Even though Chinese discourse offers its speakers the option of free association to break awkward moments in their conversation for the purpose of enhancing social comfort according to the rituals “Li,” its use in the interactional context of English can give the negative impression that the Chinese speaker is not really interested in the conversation. Third, the fifth category of “revisiting” was determined by discourse analysis to be a sign of negative transfer from Chinese to English. It is true that it may occasionally serve the communicative goals of the Chinese speaker in giving attention to a point that was mentioned earlier in the interaction. But this goal can be reached without sounding redundant and annoying, and by repeating the same topic over and over again until the native speaker’s attention is directed to the Chinese speaker’s revisiting pattern.

The relationship between individual variation and discourse transfer was analyzed by comparing between Linda’s and Julia’s patterns of using the three connectors of rhetorical questions, free association, and revisiting. On the one hand, Linda’s indiscriminate transfer of all the 3 categories to her L2 speech revealed her tendency to treat the L2 interactional context in the same way she treated the Chinese context. In other words, Linda assumed that both contexts were equivalent. Within the category of connectors, this resulted in both negative and positive transfer. Linda could have been more communicatively effective in the L2 context by utilizing more (RQs) and less (FAs)
and (REVs). On the one hand, Linda’s transfer of these connectors could be seen as a mixed blessing. At least, she was a risk-taker who utilized her knowledge of the L1 to supplement her incomplete knowledge of the L2 for the ultimate goal of interacting with her native-speaking interlocutor. On the other hand, Julia’s performance within these 3 connectors was unbalanced. While she relied heavily on (AND) and (But), she was very economical in her use of (RQs), (FAs), and (REVs). Compared to Linda’s 15 (RQs), 19 (FAs), and 16 (REVs), Julia had 2 (RQs), 4 (FAs), and 5 (REVs). These figures reveal that Julia did not utilize her knowledge of the L1 as a foundation from which she could interact in the L2 more effectively. Even though both Linda and Julia share the same language background, it seems that each has developed her own idiosyncratic version of the utility of connectors in their L2 speech.

Another conclusion was drawn about the remaining 2 Chinese participants’ indiscriminate use of L1 connectors in L2 contexts. Both Huang and Peng utilized (RQ), (FA), and (REV) in a pattern that was almost identical to Linda’s. On the one hand, Peng’s performance revealed that he could not perform in a clearly positive manner in the set of categories of connectors. Peng used 4 (RQs), a positive category of discourse transfer, less than both Linda’s 15 (RQs) and Huang’s 6 (RQs). He also used FA, a negative category, for 17 times in a comparatively similar fashion to Linda’s 19 and identical with Huang’s 17. As a result, Peng’s pattern of indiscriminate use of connectors produced discourse transfer patterns that had mixed interactional consequences. On the other hand, Huang’s performance produced patterns that were similar to both Linda’s and Peng’s indiscriminate use of connectors. Huang produced 6 (RQs), a positive category, 17 (FAs),
a negative category, and 11 (REVs), a negative category of connectors. As a consequence, Huang’s use of connectors had the potential of producing both negative and positive interactional consequences in his interactions with the 3 native-speaking participants in the study.

Table 6.4 and Figure 6.4 show that the 4 participants had individual variation in the transfer of connectors from their first language to the L2 context. The only commonality in the use of connectors that Table 6.4 revealed was that both Peng and Huang ranked second in the use of “free association” which they used for a total of 17 times each. Linda ranked first in the categories of rhetorical questions (RQ), free association (FA), and revisiting (REV). Julia ranked first in the use of “conjunction with and” (AND) and Huang ranked first in the use of disjunction with “but” (BUT). The overall pattern of use of this group of metadiscourse strategies reveals that the 4 Chinese participants indiscriminately transferred what they already knew from the L1 in connecting their utterances in the L2. The idiosyncracy of each individual participant in employing the categories of connectors may have accounted for variation in the categories of connectors. The individual learners’ “idiosyncratic” profiles were analyzed to understand the possible relationship between individual variation and discourse transfer. Even though they share the same native language background, each of the 4 Chinese participants developed his/her own use of connectors in different patterns. Data analysis revealed that none of the participants, however, seemed to benefit from L1 influence in a totally positive manner. All 4 participants exhibited a mixed pattern of the negative and positive discourse transfer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conjunction with &quot;AND&quot; (AND)</th>
<th>Disjunction with &quot;BUT&quot; (BUT)</th>
<th>Rhetorical Questions (RQ)</th>
<th>Free Association (FA)</th>
<th>Revisiting (REV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENG</strong></td>
<td>120 (15.09%)</td>
<td>73 (18.86%)</td>
<td>4 (14.81%)</td>
<td>17 (29.82%)</td>
<td>9 (21.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINDA</strong></td>
<td>274 (34.47%)</td>
<td>81 (20.93%)</td>
<td>15 (55.56%)</td>
<td>19 (33.33%)</td>
<td>16 (39.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIA</strong></td>
<td>301 (37.86%)</td>
<td>109 (28.17%)</td>
<td>2 (7.41%)</td>
<td>4 (7.02%)</td>
<td>5 (12.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUANG</strong></td>
<td>100 (12.58%)</td>
<td>124 (32.04%)</td>
<td>6 (22.22%)</td>
<td>17 (29.82%)</td>
<td>11 (26.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Cross-Case Matrix of “Connectors”

![Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Connectors”](image)

Figure 6.4: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Connectors”
of connectors to link utterances in their L2 speech. There is a possibility that personality factors interacted with L1 influence to shape the 4 Chinese participants' use of connectors.

B. Individual Variation in the Use of Qualifiers

Since the use of qualifiers is not only allowed but also desirable in Chinese discourse, the transfer of this group of categories to the L2 context may have caused some problems for the 4 Chinese speakers. In trying to qualify their statements and responses to questions posed by their English native-speaking interlocutors, the 4 Chinese participants transferred what they already knew from the LI to the L2 context. Table 6.5 depicts an interesting pattern of variation by Julia. While the other 3 participants ranked their use of "maybe" in a certain pattern, Julia transferred "maybe" to her L2 speech in a different pattern. Julia used "maybe" much more than the other 3 participants in her responses to the 3 types of questions of yes/no, either/or, and wh-questions. Julia's deviation from the normal pattern that was witnessed in the performance of the other 3 participants deserved further investigation.

Julia's patterns of using qualifiers show that she transferred her use of "maybe" at variance with the other 3 participants. As the discourse analysis that was conducted in chapter 5 showed, using "maybe" to answer questions was a source of frustration to the English native-speaking interlocutors. Julia's misuse of qualifiers was caused by her assumption that both the L1 and L2 contexts lent themselves equally to the use of "maybe" to answer questions. Unfortunately, English native speaker reactions to the use of "maybe" were, at best, mixed. Transfer analysis revealed that while Jim stated that, for him, "maybe" meant "no," Marianne was less certain about its negative meaning in
English. When the use of “maybe” was subjected to discourse analysis, however, Marianne showed some degree of frustration in her replies to answering a question with “maybe.” On two occasions, she emphatically repeated “maybe” after Julia had answered her questions with “maybe.” This showed that, as the conversation was unfolding, Julia’s repeated patterns of using “maybe” to answer a variety of questions was not well received by her English native-speaking interlocutors.

The normal pattern that Table 6.5 and Figure 6.5 show is that the other 3 participants, Huang, Linda, and Peng, ranked “overusing maybe” (OM) in first place, followed by “answering with maybe to yes/no questions” (MYN). The category of “answering with maybe to wh-questions” (MWH) came in third, and “answering with maybe to either/or questions” (MEO) came in last place. Julia varied with the other 3 participants in 3 out of the 4 categories of qualifiers. She ranked “answering with maybe to yes/no questions” first, followed by “answering with maybe to wh-questions.” In third place, Julia ranked “overusing maybe” followed closely by “answering with maybe to either/or questions.” Julia’s deviation from the pattern followed by the other 3 participants is most clearly revealed in the category of “overusing maybe.” While Julia used “overusing maybe” for only 6 times, Huang used the same category for 36 times, Peng 29 times, and Linda 27 times.

Furthermore, Table 6.6 and Figure 6.6 reveal that Julia followed a different pattern of deviation from the other 3 participants in the use of qualifiers. Julia used the second category of “answering with maybe to yes/no questions” more than the combined use of the 3 other participants. Julia used “maybe” for 39 times to answer yes/no questions that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overusing “Maybe” (OM)</strong></td>
<td>29 (64.44%)</td>
<td>27 (72.97%)</td>
<td>6 (8.70%)</td>
<td>36 (61.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering with “Maybe” to a Yes/No Question (MYN)</strong></td>
<td>11 (24.44%)</td>
<td>6 (16.22%)</td>
<td>39 (56.52%)</td>
<td>11 (18.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question (MEO)</strong></td>
<td>1 (2.27%)</td>
<td>1 (2.70%)</td>
<td>5 (7.25%)</td>
<td>3 (4.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering with “Maybe” to a WH-Question (MWH)</strong></td>
<td>4 (8.89%)</td>
<td>3 (8.11%)</td>
<td>19 (27.54%)</td>
<td>9 (15.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Within-Group Matrix of “Qualifiers”

![Figure 6.5: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Qualifiers”](image)

Figure 6.5: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Qualifiers”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overusing “Maybe” (OM)</th>
<th>Answering with “Maybe” to a Yes/No Question (MYN)</th>
<th>Answering with “Maybe” to an Either/Or Question (MEO)</th>
<th>Answering with “Maybe” to a WH-Question (MWH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Cross-Case Matrix of “Qualifiers”

Figure 6.6: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Qualifiers”
were posed by her native-speaking interlocutors. She alone accounted for 58.21% of the use of this category while Peng and Huang used this category 11 times each, and Linda for only 6 times. This same pattern of Julia dominating the use of qualifiers in comparison to the other 3 participants characterized her performance in the remaining two categories of “answering with maybe to either/or questions” (50%) and “answering with maybe to wh-questions” (54.29%). While she ranked last among the 4 participants in “overusing maybe,” Julia ranked first in 3 out of the 4 categories of qualifiers.

Julia’s pattern of using “maybe” shows her to be an outlier who might be able to reveal something about the possible relationship between individual variation and discourse transfer such as the existence of a qualitative difference between the transfer of specific categories from L1 discourse. Specifically, some categories may positively contribute to an L2 learner’s communicative repertoire, while other categories may impede communication. The quantitative analyses that were conducted on the transfer of Chinese discourse showed that categories such as (POPE), (IPP) and (RQs) were positively transferred to the Chinese participants’ L2 speech. Other categories such as (TC), (AUP), (FA), (REV), and (MYN) were shown to have the potential of getting in the way of successful communication when they were heavily used by the 4 Chinese participants.

The conventional wisdom in SLA and Communicative Language Teaching is, however, to treat L1 influence as a negative force in L2 acquisition and use. According to Van Lier (1996), “in foreign language lessons the native language is usually either banned (in accordance with the tenets of the direct method or audiolingualism) or only grudgingly
tolerated as a last resort (in most communicative courses)” (p. 18). This negative outlook may, in fact, do harm to learners’ natural instincts of using the L1 in a variety of L2 contexts and at various levels of language. More research is needed to determine which categories of L1 discourse can be beneficial to L2 learners and which categories need to be avoided because they can lead to negative interactional consequences. This research should be based on a discourse analysis of the interactional consequences of each category as well as the English-speaking interlocutor’s perceptions of these categories in L2 learners’ speech.

C. Individual Variation in the Use of “Miscues”

Indirect statements and negatively posed questions by the English native-speaking interlocutors were determined through the use of discourse analysis to be especially problematic for the 4 Chinese participants. The L1 influenced the production of “miscues” among the 4 Chinese participants. The absence of an equivalent response in Chinese to the English response to negatively posed questions was responsible for this category in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. Table 6.7 and Figure 6.7 show that Peng miscued his answers for a total of 7 times, Julia and Linda for 4 times, and Huang for 3 times in the data sets of the interactions. The only commonality that was discerned from these patterns was the consistency between Linda and Julia in producing the same number of miscues. This consistency might have been purely incidental, however, as it may be a function of data collection procedures.

The most interesting pattern in this category was that Peng, the most proficient of the 4 participants, was responsible for producing the highest number of miscues. Out of a
Table 6.7: Within-Group Matrix of “Miscues”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saying “Yes”</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.89%)</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“NO” (YMN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.7: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Miscues”
total of 18 miscues in the data set, Peng made 7 miscues. He was responsible for 38.9% of the total use of miscues. One possibility behind this pattern was that the relation between Peng’s high proficiency level in the L2 and the amount of his production of miscues may not be a linear one. As his proficiency in the L2 increases, cases of negative transfer of miscues from the L1 increased in proportion. Another possibility behind Peng’s comparatively high number of miscues in relation to the other 3 participants can be found in Pienemann’s (1989) view to learner performance as oscillating between the two axes of fluency and accuracy. By linking the learner’s variability in shifting the focus of his/her performance between fluency and accuracy, Pienemann was able to theoretically account for the incidence of inaccurate performance among high-proficiency learners.

Peng’s motivation during his face-to-face interaction with the 4 native-speaking interlocutors was apparently focused on fluent communication rather than accurate control of grammar rules. An obvious remedy for the high occurrence of miscues in Peng’s performance would be for him to have more exposure to face-to-face interaction with native speakers of English so that he can gradually focus more on accurate performance. If this pattern persists despite increased opportunities for interaction, a final solution to this problem in Peng’s performance would be a “focus-on-form” (Lightbown, 1993) language lesson in which the area of miscues is highlighted for Peng so that he can “notice the gap” (Schmidt & Frota, 1986) between his performance and the performance of his English native-speaking interlocutors. These recommendations only relate to Peng’s performance and were not intended as a course that the rest of the participants must follow. Rather, each individual learner in the group employed unique patterns from L1
III. Individual Variation in "Manifesting Social Identity"

This section is divided into two parts that focus on the analysis of individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of manifesting their Chinese social identity in their L2 speech. Part 1 includes an analysis of the set of categories relating to sense of community: (a) group conformity (GC), (b) uncritical acceptance of authority (UAA), (c) dependence (DEP), and (d) referencing (REF). Part 2 focuses on the set of categories relating to cultural beliefs: (a) predestination ("MING"), (b) fortune and opportunity ("YUN"), and (c) spiritual masters (SM).

A. Individual Variation in the Use of "Sense of Community"

The analysis of individual variation relies primarily on the two kinds of display that are derived from counting the number of instances of use of each category by each individual learner. The quantitative measures of frequency of use, ranking, and percentages were used to compare the performance of each participant in relation to the other 3 participants. Table 6.8 and Figure 6.8 compare the performance of each learner as it relates to the other 3 participants within each category of sense of community. First, it shows that there is a consistent pattern of agreement between members of the same gender. For example, Huang and Peng ranked "referencing" (REF) as the first category, and "uncritical acceptance of authority" (UAA) as the second category. The two female participants, Julia and Linda, agreed on ranking "uncritical acceptance of authority"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Conformity (GC)</strong></td>
<td>9 (10.11%)</td>
<td>8 (8.08%)</td>
<td>16 (17.98%)</td>
<td>5 (7.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncritical Acceptance of Authority (UAA)</strong></td>
<td>33 (37.08%)</td>
<td>37 (37.37%)</td>
<td>30 (33.71%)</td>
<td>28 (40.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependence (DEP)</strong></td>
<td>2 (2.25%)</td>
<td>18 (18.18%)</td>
<td>26 (29.21%)</td>
<td>7 (10.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referencing (REF)</strong></td>
<td>45 (50.57%)</td>
<td>36 (36.36%)</td>
<td>17 (19.10%)</td>
<td>29 (42.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8: Within-Group Matrix of “Sense of Community”

Figure 6.8: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Sense of Community”
(UAA) as the first category, and "group conformity" (GC) as the fourth category in sense of community. A second interesting pattern of agreement based on gender characterized the female participants' L2 speech. The two female participants showed higher frequency of use in the category of "dependence" (DEP) than the male participants. A tentative conclusion was drawn based on the different sociocultural expectations that might have shaped the female participants' self-concept. As a result, the two female participants exhibited a stronger tendency to use the category of "dependence" in their L2 speech than the two male participants.

Table 6.9 shows how each participant performed in the same category in relation to the other categories of "sense of community." Within the category of "dependence," for example, Julia and Linda had a total of 44 occurrences between them which amounted to over 83.2% of the total use of this category by all 4 participants. Figure 6.9 offers a graphic display of the numbers found in Table 6.9 of the times that each category was used by each participant. Table 6.9 clearly shows that the numbers of the two categories of "uncritical acceptance of authority" (UAA) (128 times) and "referencing" (REF) (127 times) were higher than the two categories of "group conformity" (GC) (38 times) and "dependence" (DEP) (53 times).

The relation between individual variation and discourse transfer in the group of "sense of community" was found in the fact that the 4 participants' gender-based self-concept determined their use of the category of "dependence" (DEP). A person's socioculturally-determined sense of who he/she is may be related to the use of the category of dependence in his/her L2 speech. In comparison to the sociocultural
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group Conformity (GC)</th>
<th>Uncritical Acceptance of Authority (UAA)</th>
<th>Dependence (DEP)</th>
<th>Referencing (REF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (23.68%)</td>
<td>33 (25.78%)</td>
<td>2 (3.77%)</td>
<td>45 (35.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (21.05%)</td>
<td>37 (28.91%)</td>
<td>18 (33.96%)</td>
<td>36 (28.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (42.11%)</td>
<td>30 (23.44%)</td>
<td>26 (49.06%)</td>
<td>17 (13.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUANG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (13.16%)</td>
<td>28 (21.88%)</td>
<td>7 (13.21%)</td>
<td>29 (22.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9: Cross-Case Matrix of “Sense of Community”

![Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Sense of Community”]

Figure 6.9: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Sense of Community”
dimension of using "dependence" more frequently by the female rather than the male participants in the study, there is an idiosyncratic quality to their patterns of use in other categories. For example, Peng ranked first in the category of "referencing" (REF). His usage of "referencing" amounted to 45 times or 50.57% percent of the total use of this category by all 4 participants. Linda ranked first in the category of "uncritical acceptance of authority" (UAA). Her use of this category reached 37.37% of the total usage of the 4 participants. Julia ranked highest among the 4 participants in her use of both the categories of "group conformity" (GC) and "dependence" (DEP). In conclusion, although the 4 Chinese participants displayed common patterns of using "dependence" that were based on gender, they also displayed 4 different profiles in terms of their rankings of the categories they transferred to the L2 context.

B. Individual Variation in the Use of "Cultural Beliefs"

This section analyzes the possible relationship between individual variation and the 3 Chinese cultural beliefs in "predestination" (MING), "fortune and opportunity" (YUN), and "spiritual masters" (SM) as they were embodied in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech. The first task in the analysis was to assess if there are commonalities among the 4 participants in terms of their patterns of using the 3 Chinese beliefs in their interactions with their 3 English native-speaking interlocutors. The second task was to determine if relations exist between the patterns of use of these categories by the Chinese participants. The third task was to see if there are intervening variables that might have influenced their patterns of use of these categories. Based on these analyses, this section concludes with
an interpretation of the possible relationship between individual variation and the use of cultural beliefs in their L2 speech.

Table 6.10 was derived from a count of the occurrences of use of these 3 beliefs by the 4 Chinese participants. Figure 6.10 is also based on the same numbers and offers a graphic comparison of the overall use of the 3 categories of cultural beliefs by the 4 Chinese participants. Table 6.10 depicts the measures of rankings, frequency of use, and percentages of use within this category of discourse transfer. There are two distinctive patterns depicted in Table 6.10. First, 2 Chinese participants (Peng and Julia) attached equal weight to 2 out of the 3 categories of “cultural beliefs.” While Peng mentioned “predestination” (MING) and “spiritual masters” (SP) for 5 times each in his overall performance, Julia mentioned “predestination” (MING) and “fortune and opportunity” (YUN) for 2 times each in her overall performance of “cultural beliefs.” Second, the belief in “Yun” ranked highest for 3 out of the 4 Chinese participants. This belief was mentioned by Huang for 5 times, Linda for 4 times, and Julia for 2 times.

Table 6.11 is organized around the 3 categories of “cultural beliefs.” It shows the frequency of use, rankings, and percentages within each category. Based on this table, a comparison was conducted between the 4 Chinese participants’ treatment of each category in their L2 speech. Figure 6.11 offers a cross-case bar graph display of “cultural beliefs.” The most talked about belief is “fortune and opportunity” (14 times), while the least talked about belief is “spiritual masters” (7 times). The measure of ranking shows that Peng was the most expressive participant in the two categories of predestination (5 times) and spiritual masters (5 times). The same measure shows that Linda ranked second
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Peng</th>
<th>Linda</th>
<th>Julia</th>
<th>Huang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predestination “Ming”</td>
<td>5 (38.46%)</td>
<td>3 (33.33%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune &amp; Opportunity “Yun”</td>
<td>3 (23.08%)</td>
<td>4 (44.44%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Masters</td>
<td>5 (38.46%)</td>
<td>2 (22.22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10: Within-Group Matrix of “Cultural Beliefs”

Figure 6.10: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Cultural Beliefs”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predestination “Ming”</th>
<th>Fortune &amp; Opportunity “Yun”</th>
<th>Spiritual Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(21.43%)</td>
<td>(71.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(28.57%)</td>
<td>(14.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(14.29%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUANG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(35.71%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: Cross-Case Matrix of “Cultural Beliefs”

Figure 6.11: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Cultural Beliefs”
in all 3 categories. While Huang did not talk at all about "predestination" and "spiritual masters," he ranked first among the 4 participants in the category of "fortune and opportunity." Julia was the lowest user of cultural beliefs among the 4 participants. She also did not talk about the category of spiritual masters at all. However, Julia talked two times each about "predestination" and "fortune and opportunity."

To closely analyze the possible relationship between individual variation and cultural beliefs as a category of discourse transfer, the analysis focused on the reverse patterns that were exhibited by Peng and Huang in their use of cultural beliefs. It seems that while Peng talked about his beliefs in "predestination" and "spiritual masters," Huang did not attach equal weight to the importance of these beliefs in Chinese culture. Another interesting pattern is that Huang talked exclusively about his belief in "fortune and opportunity" whenever he had an opportunity to do so, while Peng did not attach the same weight to "fortune and opportunity."

These divergent patterns by Peng and Huang were further investigated by looking at the qualitative differences between their beliefs in the same category of "fortune and opportunity." Discourse analysis revealed that Peng's belief in "fortune and opportunity" (YUN) was restricted to Feng-Shui, meditation, and wearing a ring to prevent the loss of money. Huang’s belief in “Yun” was more practical. He believed deeply in Chinese medicine as an alternative to western medicine. He was very impressed with the way his brother's eyesight was improved after using acupuncture and that his brother no longer needed any spectacles. Marianne was so impressed by Huang’s talk about “I-Chow,” another form of acupuncture, that she wondered whether there was a clinic like that in the
United States. Overall, Huang attached importance to his belief in “Yun” rather than any other Chinese beliefs.

The relationships between the categories of Peng’s beliefs revealed that he was a firm believer in predestination and spiritual masters. While he had occasion to talk about each for an equal amount of five times, Peng talked about “fortune and opportunity” (YUN) for only three times. Taken as a whole, the different patterns of use between Huang and Peng in terms of talking about their cultural beliefs reflect two basically different world views held by the two participants. The reality of Peng’s belief system was so colored by helplessness in the face of unchangeable destiny that his main way out was to seek the insight of spiritual masters. Huang’s world view is different from Peng’s in that he strongly believes in human beings’ ability to change their destiny if they wish to do so through the proactive application of non-western, but proven remedies. Because Huang did not attach much importance to predestination, he did not think that there was a real need for the services and advice of spiritual masters.

As an intervening variable in the possible relation between individual variation and discourse transfer, world view may not be thought of as a “generic” label that anyone can attach to a whole group of people. The fact that there are qualitative differences in the world views of Peng and Huang who are members of the same culture indicated that a person’s idiosyncracy might influence the quality of discourse transfer categories that each produces in the L2. It seems that not all members attach the same degree of weight to all the cultural beliefs that their culture has to offer. Rather, some members place all their conviction on a limited number of beliefs to which they attach a great deal of significance.
Each participant's world view seems to be shaped by a unique set of influences such as family background, socialization patterns, and personal experience. These patterns of variation point to how individual members of a culture construct their own understandings of events, and their consequences. It is a person's activity of making sense of the world that shapes his/her world view. In conclusion, the possible relationship between individual variation and cultural beliefs as a category of discourse transfer is shaped by each individual learner's idiosyncratic world view.

IV. Individual Variation in "Performing Rituals of Face"

This section focuses on analyzing the individual variation among the 4 Chinese participants in performing rituals of face within the categories of "respect for others," and "self-denial." The categories of "respect for others" include (a) convergence (CON), (b) deference (DEF), and (c) avoiding conflict (AC). The categories of self-denial include (a) putting self down (PSD), (b) refusing a compliment (RAC), and (c) turning down an invitation to talk (TDIT). The data analysis is focused on the possible relationship between individual variation and the production of these categories in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech. The analysis combines between quantitative and qualitative methods. Tables and figures which apply the quantitative measures of rankings, frequency of use and percentages of the six categories of rituals of face are followed by qualitative analysis that rely on transfer and discourse analyses of the same categories to analyze the patterns of individual variation among the 4 participants within each category of rituals of face. The section is organized in two parts. Part 1 focuses on analyzing individual variation in the production of rituals of "respect for others" among the 4 Chinese
participants. Part 2 focuses on the analysis of the patterns of individual variation among
the 4 participants in the production of the rituals of “self-denial.”

A. Individual Variation in the Rituals of “Respect for Others”

Table 6.12 and Figure 6.12 depict the rankings, frequency of use, and percentages
according to the number of times each individual participant performed the 3 rituals of
“respect for others.” Within this set of categories, Table 6.12 shows that Huang and Julia
ranked the rituals of “convergence” in first place, and the rituals of “deference” in second
place. A reverse pattern was followed by Peng and Linda who ranked “deference” in first
place, and “convergence” in second place. All 4 participants ranked “avoiding conflict” in
third place. Another pattern shows that Peng and Huang transferred the same number of
rituals of “respect for others” (24 times) while Linda performed these rituals 19 times.
Julia was the participant who utilized the least amount of the face rituals of “respect for
others” for a total of 9 times.

Table 6.13 and Figure 6.13 document individual variation across the 4 participants
within each single category of “respect for others.” A comparison of the total use of each
category shows that Peng and Huang, the male participants, performed the ritual of
“convergence” for a total of 11 times each while Julia and Linda, the female participants,
performed the same ritual for a total of 6 times each. In other words, the 2 male
participants were responsible for 64.70% of the total use of this ritual by the 4
participants. The ritual of “avoiding conflict” was the least used by the 4 participants
(only 10 times). This is probably due to the interactional environment in which the
Table 6.12: Within-Group Matrix of “Respect for Others”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convergence</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CON)</td>
<td>(45.83%)</td>
<td>(31.58%)</td>
<td>(66.67%)</td>
<td>(45.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deference</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEF)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(52.63%)</td>
<td>(22.22%)</td>
<td>(33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoiding</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict (AC)</td>
<td>(4.17%)</td>
<td>(15.79%)</td>
<td>(11.11%)</td>
<td>(20.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.12: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Respect for Others”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Convergence (CON)</th>
<th>Deference (DEF)</th>
<th>Avoiding Conflict (AC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENG</td>
<td>11 (32.35%) [1]</td>
<td>12 (37.5%) [1]</td>
<td>1 (10%) [3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUANG</td>
<td>11 (32.35%) [1]</td>
<td>8 (25%) [3]</td>
<td>5 (50%) [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13: Cross-Case Matrix of “Respect for Others”

Figure 6.13: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Respect for Others”
volunteers in the study were asked to participate. Understandably, the incidence of face-threatening acts in such a friendly environment was kept to a minimum.

B. **Individual Variation in the Rituals of “Self-Denial”**

Table 6.14 and Figure 6.14 are drawn from the number of times each participant used the rituals of self-denial. A common pattern that emerges from Table 6.14 is that the 4 participants ranked the ritual of “putting self down” (PSD) first in their performance of the rituals of self-denial. Another tendency among the participants is that 3 out of 4 participants placed the rituals of “refusing a compliment” in second place. Moreover, 3 out of 4 participants also shared in placing “turning down an invitation to talk” (TDIT) in second place. While Peng was the most frequent user of the rituals of self-denial with a total of 16 times, Huang was the least frequent users of these rituals for a total of 5 times only.

Within each single category of “self-denial,” Table 6.15 and Figure 6.15 show that the most frequently used ritual was “putting self down” for a combined total of 23 times, and the least frequently used ritual was ‘refusing a compliment” (RAC) for a combined total of 5 times only. “Turning down an invitation to talk” (TDIT) was used by the 4 participants for a total of 11 times. While all three rituals were classified under the category of “self-denial,” it is important to recognize that there still are some significant qualitative differences between them. For example, “putting self down” does not have to be performed in response to an invitation by the native speaker. This ritual is usually performed within the Chinese participants’ extended discourse. Julia’s putting herself down in comparison to her classmates, and Peng and Linda’s putting themselves down
Table 6.14: Within-Group Matrix of “Self-Denial”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Putting Self Down (PSD)</strong></td>
<td>9 (56.25%)</td>
<td>4 (44.44%)</td>
<td>7 (77.78%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refusing A Compliment (RAC)</strong></td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turning Down an Invitation to Talk (TDIT)</strong></td>
<td>5 (31.25%)</td>
<td>4 (44.44%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.14: Within-Group Bar Graph Display of “Self-Denial”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Putting Self Down (PSD)</th>
<th>Refusing A Compliment (RAC)</th>
<th>Turning Down an Invitation to Talk (TDIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENG</td>
<td>9 (39.13%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (45.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA</td>
<td>4 (17.39%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (36.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIA</td>
<td>7 (30.43%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (9.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUANG</td>
<td>3 (13.04%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (9.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.15: Cross-Case Matrix of “Self-Denial”

Figure 6.15: Cross-Case Bar Graph Display of “Self-Denial”
while they were talking about their teachers, all took place in the context of talking about other people who were very important to the participants. It is equally important to recognize that this ritual does not really threaten the face of the Chinese speakers as may the rituals of “refusing a compliment” or “turning down an invitation to talk.” There is an added degree of imposition by the native speaker when he/she pays a compliment in good faith only to find out that it has been refused by the Chinese speaker, in good faith too. The ritual of “turning down an invitation to talk” can also be interpreted not as a sign of “self-denial,” but as a lack of proficiency in the L2. Discourse analysis showed that when Marianne, a native speaker, invited Peng, a Chinese speaker, to talk on a specific issue such as the “American health system,” Peng’s reluctance to talk about this issue was interpreted by Marianne as lack of experience and not as a sign of Peng’s humbleness in front of an older native speaker of American English. It was remarkable that Peng started to talk about the American healthcare system only after he allowed Marianne to talk about her perspective on this issue.

Because rituals of face in general are a sign of sophistication and social grace among Chinese speakers, the social experience of each participant can be an intervening variable in their individual variation in performing rituals of face. The transfer of rituals of respect for others to the L2 interactional context can reveal the social experience each participants had in the Taiwanese context. Mastering the rituals of respect for others for social interaction is an important component of the Taiwanese Chinese character. The fact that Peng, Huang, and Linda had more contact with other members of their society can potentially account for the relatively higher number of rituals that they were able to
perform compared to Julia. In addition to being the youngest participants, Julia had little social experience beyond her campus life. At the time of the study, Julia was still a junior in the process of gaining her B.A. in Finance from a university in Taiwan. The other 3 participants have all earned their undergraduate degrees three years prior to the beginning of the study. It would be safe to predict that Julia, after graduating and working in a business environment will sharpen her skills in performing the rituals of “respect for others” as her fully socialized colleagues have done in the study. But even as each participant gradually becomes a fully socialized member of Chinese society, they each have their own versions of performing face rituals. Linda’s close numbers with the 2 male participants reveal that experience with the social world might have an effect on her performance of face rituals. Her profile as well as the profiles of the other participants, however, indicate that there is a highly personal dimension that makes each one of the 4 Chinese participants a unique individual in the performance of rituals of face.

V. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter was devoted to documenting and analyzing the individual variation between the 4 Chinese participants in terms of their production of discourse transfer in L2 speech. The data analysis showed how the 4 Chinese participants varied as individuals in the amount and quality of discourse transfer they produced during their interactions with NS interlocutors. The analysis was organized around the four sets of categories of (a) organizing propositional information, (b) overusing metadiscourse strategies, (c) manifesting social identity, and (d) performing rituals of face. In addition to quantitative measures such as rankings, frequency of use, and percentages, the data
analysis incorporated evidence from the qualitative analysis of the same categories in chapters 4 and 5.

Table 6.16 offers a comprehensive summary of the variation between the 4 Chinese participants according to the four sets of categories of discourse transfer. By using the measures of frequency of use, rankings, and percentages, Table 6.16 shows that out of a total of 363 occurrences in the first subgroups of “organizing propositional information,” Peng ranked first with 110 times which amounted to 30.30% of the 4 participants’ overall performance. Huang ranked second and used propositional information 92 times. With a total of 1535 occurrences of the categories of “overusing metadiscourse strategies,” Julia ranked first with 494 times occupying 32.18% of the 4 participants’ overall performance. Linda ranked second with a total of 446 times which amounted to 29.06% of the 4 participants’ overall performance. In the third set of categories of “manifesting social identity,” Linda ranked first with 108 times occupying 28.65% of the overall 377 occurrences. Peng ranked second with 102 times or 27.06% of the total occurrences of the 4 participants. In the fourth set of categories of “performing rituals of face,” Peng ranked first with 40 times or 34.78% of the overall 115 occurrences of the 4 participants. Huang ranked second and amounted to 29 times or 25.22% of the 4 participants overall performance. Except for Huang, the other 3 participants (Peng, Julia, and Linda) all managed to rank first in one set of discourse transfer categories, with Peng as the only participant ranking first in the two sets of categories of “organizing propositional information” and “performing rituals of face.” In conclusion, analysis showed that the 4 Chinese participants differed in the quality and quantity of their production of discourse transfer.
### Table 6.16: Cross-Case Matrix of the Four Participants’ Use of Discourse Transfer Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Peng</th>
<th>Linda</th>
<th>Julia</th>
<th>Huang</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Organizing Propositional Information</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
<td>22.04%</td>
<td>25.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.92%</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>32.18%</td>
<td>20.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Language Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Manifesting Social Identity</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.06%</td>
<td>28.65%</td>
<td>24.67%</td>
<td>19.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Performing Rituals of Face</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>24.35%</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>25.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Social Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Idiosyncracy Hypothesis on Discourse Transfer

| Hypothesis III. | Above and beyond the shared understandings and common sociocultural background that the 4 Chinese participants have, there remains an idiosyncratic quality to the production of discourse transfer that sets each one of them apart as unique individuals. |

The analysis of the individual variability in discourse transfer among the 4 Chinese participants consistently points to the fact that the main source of this variability is to be found in the idiosyncracy of each participant in their production of discourse transfer in L2 speech. Since the 4 Chinese participants share almost the same understandings that come from having a common sociocultural background, the variation that the data analysis revealed must be due to how each individual participant internally processed information to produce L2 speech.

A learners' processing of information in discourse transfer involves manipulating L1-L2 knowledge during face-to-face interaction. The production of discourse transfer entails access to L1-L2 information which varies from individual to individual. The cognitive demands of this rapid interactive processing are considerable and are ultimately the outcome of each individual participant's unique language repertoire. Gaining access to one's knowledge and actualizing that knowledge in unfolding speech during face-to-face interaction means that each learner's unique way of internal information-processing produced the variability that was documented among the 4 Chinese participants in the production of discourse transfer.
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The idiosyncratic nature of individual variation was accounted for by extending the modular hypothesis to include a consideration of the L2 learner as a person who is the final decision-maker in his/her discourse transfer production. The dynamic interplay between the L1 and L2 to produce L2 performance does not have to be viewed as a mechanical processes that takes place in a computer. On the contrary, individual learners are to be viewed as persons who are in ultimate control of what and how often they transfer the different aspects of their L1 discourse to their L2 speech. The idiosyncracy hypothesis is not only consistent with the modular hypothesis of discourse transfer, but furthers our understanding of discourse transfer phenomena in L2 speech. Far from being a helpless participant in the discourse transfer process, the learner is actively engaged in the decision-making process as to the quality and frequency of what aspects of L1 knowledge to use in L2 speech. The 4 Chinese participants' different profiles of discourse transfer can only be accounted for by the "idiosyncratic quality" of the learner as a major source of variation among the 4 Chinese participants. The different categories of discourse transfer represent a matrix of possibilities for the 4 Chinese participants from which they can make individual choices that reveal them as persons in command of their own discourse transfer behavior. In conclusion, positing a role for the learner's idiosyncracy as a source of individual variability in the production of discourse transfer reinforces the notion that beyond the shared understandings and common sociocultural background that the 4 Chinese participants had as a group, there still remains an idiosyncratic quality about the production of discourse transfer that sets each one of them apart as unique individuals.
CHAPTER 7

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The orientation and training of researchers working on discourse transfer research are based on a negative outlook to the role of the L1 in L2 learning. SLA theory accounted for this negative outlook to the L1 through the concept of fossilization in the learner's L2 competence. The methodology they used was called “error analysis,” an approach that analyzes the “errors” made by L2 learners according to native speakers’ norms of appropriateness. These studies have not tried to explain errors as evidence of the language learning process. Moreover, the few available studies that were conducted on discourse transfer focused on the question of how the L2 learners’ previous knowledge of the native language “interfered” with the appropriateness of their discourse performance during interaction with native speakers of the target language. Researchers who contributed to discourse transfer research considered themselves applied linguists who worked within the sub-field of transfer research and whose purpose was to improve language teaching. Thus, our current understanding of discourse transfer is based on a language per se approach in which teachers are supposed to bolster L2 learners’ discourse competence in the L2 by focusing on the discourse aspects of the L2 and avoiding the role
of the students’ native language in learning the L2 in the language classroom. These implications were consistent with a communicative approach to language teaching, and reminded teachers and syllabus designers alike that it was not enough to focus on the teaching of the grammatical aspects of the second language without incorporating discourse and pragmatic functions as well in the second language syllabus and instruction. However, they were based on the assumption that teachers should focus on developing their students’ discourse competence in the L2. Van Lier (1996) indicated that “in foreign language lessons, the native language is usually either banned (in accordance with the tenets of the direct method or audiolingualism) or only grudgingly tolerated as a last resort (in most communicative courses)” (p. 18).

The pedagogical implications derived from the findings of this study are based on an understanding of the vital role of the learners’ native language and culture in learning and using the second language. Ellis (1992) cited Corder (1976) as follows:

Efficient foreign language teaching must work with rather than against natural processes, facilitate rather than impede learning. Teachers and teaching materials must adapt to the learner rather than vice-versa. (p. 171)

As a consequence of conducting this study, the researcher has found that discourse transfer in the 4 Chinese learners’ L2 speech is not a unitary phenomenon that can be restricted to linguistic differences between the Chinese and English languages, but instead is a dynamic process that also includes cognitive and social differences. The researcher’s view of foreign language pedagogy is that it is a series of interventions embedded in primarily communicative activities that are designed to facilitate the processes of second language acquisition. For example, findings from the present study suggest that
highlighting L1 and L2 relations productively in the classroom may have a positive influence on interlanguage development. This perspective sees the classroom as a place where opportunities for the learning of various kinds are provided through the input and the interactions that take place between the students and the teachers. The aim of this chapter is to communicate a set of implications intended to serve a heuristic function to engage teachers' thinking on how best to serve this objective within the confines of the foreign language classroom. These implications can empower teachers by increasing their awareness of the ways in which they work with, rather than against, the linguistic, cognitive, and social processes of discourse transfer to promote language teaching.

This chapter is organized into three sections. The first section offers a summary of the findings. The second section proposes a pedagogical framework of principles and practices based on the findings. The chapter concludes with a section that contains recommendations for further research on the discourse transfer phenomena.

**Summary of Findings**

The data analysis generated three major findings in this study of discourse transfer among the 4 Chinese university-level ESL students. The first major finding of the study was that Chinese discourse contains nuances and that the transfer phenomena from Chinese as a native language to English as a second language was extensive, and covering up to 11 major categories and 27 subcategories. Four major categories related to discourse transfer of language organization and social interaction were found. Discourse transfer was found in the 4 Chinese speaker's L2 speech during interactions with the 3 native speakers of English in numerous naturalistic conversations. As a group, the 4
Chinese participants were well versed in the norms and patterns of interaction in their native language. They were found to have regularly transferred Chinese interactional routines and regular patterns of communication to English as a second language.

Table 7.1 provides a summary of the major categories of discourse transfer found in the 4 Chinese participants' L2 speech. On the right hand column of Table 7.1, the frequency of use of each category is given for the group as a whole. Each instance was established based on analysis of transcripts of interactions between the participants of the study. The measures for frequency of use in Table 7.1 represent the grand total of use in the whole data set of the interactional sessions (approximately 30 hours of interactions).

The modular hypothesis was the first major finding of the study. The modular hypothesis highlighted the dynamic interplay between LI and L2 knowledge in the learner's production of L2 speech. In this construct, the adult learner's fully developed LI knowledge was surrounded by their less developed and fragmentary L2 knowledge. The analysis of the data of discourse transfer offered tangible evidence to the interaction between both language systems in the learner's language. The modular hypothesis accounts for the fact that the 4 Chinese participants drew on a variety of knowledge sources simultaneously in their production of discourse transfer during interactions with the 3 English native speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Organizing Propositional Information</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Connectors</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Qualifiers</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Miscues</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Language Organization</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Manifesting Social Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sense of Community</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Cultural Beliefs</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Performing Rituals of Face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Respect for Others</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Self-denial</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Social Interaction</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: The Four Chinese Participants' Overall Frequency of Use of Discourse Transfer Categories

The second major finding in the study was that there may be a complex relationship between discourse transfer phenomena and the interactional context in which discourse transfer both influenced and was influenced by the interactional context. The data analysis revealed that there are at least three processes underlying this relationship. The first was linguistic - the variation among learners in their choice of certain L1-based discourse patterns to be transferred to the L2. The linguistic process includes the interaction between knowledge of the second language possessed by persons who provide input for the learners, and the knowledge of a first language possessed by the
learners. The second process was cognitive - the mental operations that go on in the heads of the learners when they interact with data on which they base their production of discourse transfer. This includes the cognitive process in which the learner engages in making judgements consciously or unconsciously about the transferability of certain L1 discourse patterns to the L2 context while paying attention to the demands of the rapid interactive processing of native speakers' speech in the L2 interactional context. The third process was social - the steps by which L2 learners and native speakers jointly construct social contexts or situations in which communication in the second language is facilitated. This process shapes the native speakers' procedures for conversational management and L2 learners' performance and face rituals.

The third major finding of the study was that different learners approached discourse transfer differently. While the 4 Chinese participants shared between them the production of discourse transfer in their L2 speech, each one of them developed an idiosyncratic way of employing certain categories of discourse transfer over others in their interactions. Table 7.2 depicts the rankings and frequency of use of discourse transfer categories produced by each individual Chinese participant within each module of discourse transfer. These frequency counts were tallied from the overall data set of transcribed interactions. The idiosyncracy hypothesis provides strong support for the modularity hypothesis because it helps to explain individual variability among the 4 Chinese participants in terms of the selection and production of certain discourse transfer categories over others within the interactional contexts of the study.
### Table 7.2: Cross-Case Matrix of the Four Participants’ Profiles of Discourse Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENG</th>
<th>LINDA</th>
<th>JULIA</th>
<th>HUANG</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Overusing Metadiscourse Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Connectors</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Qualifiers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Miscues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Manifesting Social Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sense of Community</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Cultural Beliefs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Performing Rituals of Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Respect for Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Self-denial</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Language Organization</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Numbers between brackets within graphic displays stand for the ranking of each of the four participants in terms of the use of a category.
The 4 Chinese learners used the four discourse transfer modules as a matrix of possibilities from which they chose to employ some categories but not others in their L2 speech. The learners’ individual judgement of what to transfer and what not to transfer had an impact on their production of discourse transfer phenomena from Chinese to English.

Implications for Pedagogy

The cornerstone of the implications provided by this study is a recognition of the potential for the learner’s native language to play a role in the learning and use of the second language. The use of the L1 in learning the L2 should not to be understood merely as the translation of lexical items from the L2 to the L1. Rather, it should be based on the idea that discourse transfer may contribute positively to L2 learning and use. It is an attempt to link the transfer of relevant discourse features of the native language to second language acquisition. Van Lier (1996) advocated a similar approach to incorporating the native language into the L2 lesson, but expressed the following reservation: “I do not wish to suggest that the LI should be used in any L2 lesson whenever learners and teachers might find it convenient” (p. 19). Instead, Van Lier (1996) suggested that “innovative ways can be found of playing L1 and L2 off against one another productively” (p. 19). The language classroom can be an environment that facilitates the recognition by learners of negative, positive, or even neutral transfer through a series of pedagogical interventions. In this way, the processes of discourse transfer from the learner’s L1 can be part of a learning process in which awareness of transfer errors becomes a strategy for learners to promote their acquisition of the second language.
In addition to a recognition of the role played by the learner’s native language in acquiring the second language, the analysis revealed that the interactional sessions from this study provided an environment in which a broad range of discourse transfer categories appeared in the 4 Chinese participants’ L2 speech. Moreover, the 4 Chinese learners consciously or unconsciously used their L1 experiences and the experiences provided by participating in face-to-face interaction with native speakers to communicate in the L2. The classroom can replicate these natural learning experiences. As Hatch (1986) put it, “For both the teacher and the teacher trainer, the task is to find those experiences that contribute most to learning and to work out ways to bring reasonable copies of those experiences, and the ways of dealing with them” (p. 20). For the purpose of making the second language learnable by surrounding learners with a language-rich environment, including the learner’s native language, the following implications are intended for teachers to help them ultimately reach the goal of increasing their students’ ability to interact successfully with native speakers of the target language. This chapter contains a set of implications for L2 teaching consisting of (a) providing authentic input, (b) strengthening L1-L2 relations, (c) developing effective strategies for communication and social interaction, and (d) accommodating learner idiosyncracy.

A. Providing Authentic Input

Teachers can best make language learnable by engaging their students with a language-rich environment, as early educators have long argued. Corder (1967), for example, stated that “we cannot really teach language, we can only create conditions in which it develops spontaneously in the mind in its own way” (p. 12). In order to create
these favorable conditions in the language classroom, the goal of language teaching has shifted in recent years from the learning of a second language as a grammatical system to a greater emphasis on language learning for communication and social interaction. Auerbach (1995), for example, stated that “grammar-based curricula have increasingly been superseded by situational, survival-oriented models focusing on language skills or competencies deemed necessary to function in a range of interactional contexts” (p. 13). Part of the communicative support that teachers can offer learners in the course of the language lesson is to create a classroom environment that is conducive to learning.

Teachers can intervene to facilitate the learning of the L2 by explicitly raising the students' awareness of authentic L2 discourse patterns as they are used by speakers of the target language. In addition to using materials that contain authentic input, teachers need a database that provides examples of authentic language use between native and nonnative speakers. Both types of data can formulate an essential part of the input component in the language lessons. Observation studies of the interactional routines followed by native speakers and nonnative speakers who share the same language background with the students can provide appropriate examples of authentic language use. The database can thus function as part of the teaching and learning of English to Chinese students both in Taiwan and elsewhere.

Authentic materials can play a vital role in the learning process if they are fully integrated in the syllabus. The use of authentic materials has the potential of exposing the students to the actual patterns of discourse that native speakers use in their daily interactions. Second language acquisition researchers (e.g., Lightbown & Spada, 1990;
Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1988) have empirically determined that there is a crucial relationship between the language the learners are exposed to and the development of their proficiency in the L2. Other SLA researchers (e.g., Ellis, 1992; Lightbown, 1986; Wong-Fillmore, 1985) have argued that students who are exposed to only a distorted classroom version of the target language cannot learn the authentic language that native speakers use in their daily activities. According to Lightbown (1985), “When the classroom variety is very different from the ‘real’ target language, learners’ interlanguage will reflect this difference” (p. 266). Lightbown’s remark expressed the position that the use of authentic input as a teaching strategy can trigger the necessary mechanisms in learners’ interlanguage to develop in the second language.

The problem faced by many language teachers is one of giving their students access to the target language. In an ideal classroom situation, teachers’ use of the target language will consist of segments of connected authentic discourse in English so that the students can have the opportunity to interact with the regular patterns of communication that native speakers use in their daily interactions. In a sense, the classroom as an “acquisition-rich” or an “acquisition-poor” environment can determine whether a second language will be learned or not (Ellis, 1992). Teachers, through their use of the target language for instruction, can determine whether or not the language that learners hear is usable for input. It seems that what teachers have to do is provide students with a rich and varied exposure to authentic input so individual learners are able to find in that input help for learning whatever they are ready to learn. The problem is to know how to design a syllabus, in a principled manner, that provides access to language that can be used to
function in a broad range of contexts, so learners, no matter what their individual differences are, will find what they need. What is still missing in many EFL contexts is a classroom in which stretches of authentic English discourse form the basis for activities that expose the students directly to the target language.

B. Strengthening L1-L2 Relations

Even though Cummins' (1981) "interdependence hypothesis" has suggested that the interaction between the L1 and L2 within the learners' mind can improve the learning of foreign language, Van Lier (1996) has recently stated that "the artificial separation [between the L1 and the L2] is partly due to a very stubborn but entirely unfounded popular belief that two languages necessarily compete with each other in a learner's mind" (p. 18). A second approach is to create a learning environment in the language classroom, in which connections are established between specific L1-L2 discourse patterns. Teachers can play a crucial role in the learners' development of L1-L2 discourse competence. As Van Lier (1996) put it, "It is often said by L2 learners that there is no better way to raise awareness of one's own language than by learning a second language" (p. 18). Teachers can achieve this objective by allowing students to play an active role in discussing and researching L1-L2 relations. For example, the students may be asked to compare between the Chinese and English ways of organizing propositional information in spoken as well as written discourse. The teacher may also ask her/his students to reflect on these differences and similarities in class or in a homework assignment.

To promote this interaction, learners should have the opportunity to investigate and report on a particular aspect of L2 discourse as well as to make specific comparisons.
between their own and the discourse patterns of the target language. The notions of investigating, reporting and comparison suggest a link with the ethnographic methods which have served anthropologists in this task of understanding another culture and seeing its relation to one’s own. Students’ use of ethnography as a method of promoting cross-cultural understanding was proposed by a number of language learning specialists (e.g., Robinson, 1988; Byram & Fleming, 1998). According to these researchers, learning a language as it is spoken by a particular group is learning the shared meanings, interactional patterns, and social practices of that group as they are embodied in the language. These proposals are consistent with the goal of increasing language learners’ awareness of L1-L2 discourse relations. They also suggest that the findings of the present study may have relevance for the EFL classroom setting.

Another way EFL students can develop their L2 discourse knowledge is for the teacher to introduce a “reflective” component in the language syllabus. Based on authentic materials that address interactional routines followed by native and nonnative speakers, students are asked to reflect on the patterns of interaction available in their language in relation to those of the target language. In this way, students’ attention is reflected on themselves and the patterns of interaction that they take for granted. An example of a reflective component that strengthens L1-L2 relations was offered by the 1995 American National Standards for Foreign Language Teaching (ACTFL) objective:

To recognize that different languages use different patterns to communicate and can apply that knowledge to their own language; and, to recognize that cultures use different patterns of interaction and can apply this knowledge to their own culture. (The Ohio Model Competency-Based Foreign Language Program, 1995, p. 15)
This standard is consistent with predictions derived from the "interdependence hypothesis" (Cummins, 1981). According to ACTFL standards, teachers need, therefore, to sensitize their students to areas of divergence and convergence between the L2 and the L1. It is the comparison of their own and other discourse which begins to help learners to raise their awareness of not only the second language but also their own native language. Cummins (1999) concluded,

The trend in much of the data is that programs that aspire to promote bilingualism and biliteracy (Enriched Education programs) show much better outcomes than English-only or quick-exit transitional bilingual programs that do not aspire to develop bilingualism and biliteracy. (p. 31)

Strengthening L1-L2 relations can be part of an efficient pedagogy that provides L2 learners with a strong basis for successful acquisition of the target language. Without this component, basic Chinese-English pattern equivalents as taught in EFL classrooms, as in the Grammar-Translation Method, usually have the same linguistic conventions and communicative functions. As a result, this teaching method might suggest, perhaps incorrectly, that any L1 discourse pattern can be transferred to L2 contexts. The interaction between teaching method and learners’ lack of awareness of L1-L2 relations partly explains Chinese learners’ excessive reliance on L1 discourse patterns in their English speech. Alternatively, instruction aimed at strengthening L1-L2 discourse relationships can raise the Chinese learner’s awareness by alerting him/her, for example, that a constant show of respect to recognized symbols of authority (e.g., father, mother, teacher, etc.) does not usually have the same cultural connotations in English as in Chinese. Such literal translations of L1 discourse patterns onto corresponding L2
interactional contexts as a result of the learners’ erroneous judgement of differences in “illocutionary force” (Searle, 1967) were found in the 4 Chinese participants’ English speech.

C. Developing Strategies for Communication and Social Interaction

While it is important to provide students with authentic input, and to ask them to reflect on their L1-L2 discourse relationships, it is equally important to educate them about communication and social interaction. According to Ellis (1992),

An acquisition-rich classroom, therefore, is best characterized as one that provides both those experiences associated with communication in natural discourse and those experiences derived from cognitive activities designed to raise the learner’s consciousness about the formal properties of the L2 and their function in language use. (p. 182)

The third implication of the study was to encourage students to develop strategies for communication and social interaction. In order to simulate the conditions that the students may confront in real life, the match-up between discourse patterns, interactional contexts, and coping strategies may be introduced in the language classroom in the form of group activities or pair work.

In developing a syllabus that incorporates the role of the native language in L2 acquisition and use, consideration must be given to the expected proficiency levels of the students. The proficiency levels of different classrooms may determine how the teacher creates different activities that suit each level of proficiency. A useful criterion adopted from Van Pattern (1991) to distinguish between the different linguistic and cognitive demands of different classroom activities is (a) exposure to L1-L2 discourse patterns for low proficiency, (b) reaction to L1-L2 discourse patterns for middle proficiency, and
production of L2 discourse patterns for high proficiency students. A variety of teaching techniques can be developed for the introduction of strategies for communication and social interaction for each level of proficiency. For beginners in a second or foreign language course of study, a teacher may want to limit his/her lesson objectives to exposure to the new language. At a middle level of proficiency, language learners need to be aware of the variety of possibilities that the new language offers so that they can react properly as hearers in an interaction. It may be sufficient for students to master one or two major strategies and limit themselves to those for production purposes. At a more advanced stage of proficiency, learners need to become aware of the subtle ways used by native speakers to achieve a variety of interactional outcomes by using their repertoire of discourse skills. In order to help students become aware of such variation in language use, they need to be given the chance to compare strategies in a variety of target language contexts.

What all the different teaching techniques should have in common is the specification of situational and discourse factors combined with the most feasible strategies. Good classroom instruction should be able to increase the students' awareness of the relationships between the strategies, the interactional patterns, and the contexts in which the strategies are used. For example, in a role-play technique that is related to the production of discourse strategies for high proficiency students, they may role play strategies in small groups following applications and guidance from the teacher. As a pre-activity, the teacher models aloud how to use strategies such as questioning, drawing conclusions, and accepting a compliment within an interactional context. The activity
begins when the teacher asks the students to take turns using the same strategies in a new set of authentic materials. As a post-activity, the teacher can ask the student to exchange their roles in the interactions so they can learn to be on both sides of the interaction as listeners and hearers.

Developing these strategies should be an on-going sustained part of the syllabus. Only through the continuity in using these activities can students gradually discover what those strategies are and eventually become able to use them in face-to-face interaction.

By matching strategy with interactional context students can figure out which strategies work best for which contexts and at what degree of imposition. The gradual, non-linear nature of the SLA process means that developing strategies for communication and social interaction in the L2 should not be viewed by teachers as a one-shot effort. It is gradual in that learners do not master strategies and patterns with the first encounter. Learners do not tackle the patterns of the L2 one pattern at a time, first mastering one and then turning to another. Teachers must realize that even when learners have mastered one particular pattern, it is not uncommon to find some “backsliding” occurring when new patterns are introduced, presumably due to underlying restructuring which is taking place in the learner language (McLaughlin, 1990). Therefore, it makes sense to recycle the presentation of L2 patterns of interaction so that learners will have opportunities to work out when each pattern is supposed to be used in the target language.

D. Accommodating Learner Idiosyncracy

It is important to realize, however, that none of these implications will work for the individual student without taking into consideration the idiosyncratic ways in which
each learner employs strategies. Learner idiosyncracy in terms of discourse transfer was confirmed by the data in the present study. It was confirmed in terms of learners' choice to transfer or not to transfer certain patterns from L1 to L2 as well as learners' reactions to specific L2 discourse patterns employed by the native speakers. It makes sense, therefore, to recognize that introducing discourse transfer in the form of collective activities still leaves some room for individual variation. Corder (1971) argued that learners of any given foreign language who share the same L1 and have been taught under similar conditions with the same texts may still emerge speaking their own "idiosyncratic dialect" of that foreign language. As much as they have in common, learners vary in terms of their production of discourse transfer, and their attitudes toward the target language and its speakers.

The concept of idiosyncrasy suggests in particular activities that treat students' utterances as "idiosyncratic" products in their own right. In addition to group activities that address the class as a whole, there is a need, therefore, to include various teaching activities that allow for and maybe even foster learner idiosyncracy. Practical examples of these activities include using the summary, the script, and the schemata as different ways of having the students, after being exposed to authentic materials, individually express in their own words what they believe the material is about. In the summary activity, for example, an open comparison of all the summaries, pinned to the wall or written on the blackboard, gives the students the opportunity to interpret their choices as to what to say and how to say it, and to reflect on why their choices differ from those of other students. The teacher can point out to the students areas of positive or negative discourse transfer in
their responses. The whole class may participate by suggesting alternatives that are subjected to further discussion and criticism by the teacher, and so on. In another type of classroom activities that incorporate elements of drama, the students can role play different characters in the same text. After performing their main roles, they can then “script” other students’ roles. What students discover is how much each one of them has constructed the meaning of the material according to their life experiences, distinctive personalities, and attitudes and beliefs about the target language and its speakers. The teacher’s task is to point out these areas of idiosyncrasy as they relate to discourse transfer, and thereby increase the students’ awareness of the role played by the native language in second language performance. And then based on the individual student’s classroom learning experience, the teacher can assign a written journal or a reflection note as the homework that may allow students to further strengthen his/her own awareness of the similarities and differences between L1 and L2.

When the “Tiger Woods” poster is used to teach English in Taiwan, students must not only learn relevant information about Golf, but also must be exposed to the “cultural knowledge” necessary to make sense of the world evoked by the poster (Kramsch, 1998). For example, because Tiger Woods visited Taiwan to encourage Taiwanese young Golf players, the teacher could conduct an interesting discussion on those aspects of the Tiger Woods visit that had to do with second language use. A video tape of an interview with Tiger Woods can show the students how he uses English to communicate his purpose of encouraging young people to accomplish their dreams in life just as he did. In the process, the students must confront their own frames of reference which are likely to be different
from each other student in the class. Some learners might relate to the concept of high salaries for professional athletes, others may simply take an interest in Golf because they discovered that they had something in common with Tiger woods. The list of reactions can go on and on. So, the teacher may use the blackboard to list every student's reaction to the interview. In addition to the pedagogical value of this activity in terms of Tiger Woods being a role model for young students, the students may increase their knowledge of how he used English to encourage young people and to talk about the sport of Golf.

In conclusion, the implications of this study were intended to contribute to the teaching of discourse skills and regular L2 patterns of interaction after which learners can begin to use the L2 for social interaction and crosscultural communication with native speakers of the target language. An understanding of L2 discourse as it relates to L1 discourse is important for all second language learners. But attaining L2 discourse competence may be especially important for a growing number of Taiwanese students who eventually become ESL students in U.S. universities. A good knowledge of how to interact in the L2 can maximize the chances of success for Taiwanese students in American universities. A knowledge of discourse skills for crosscultural communication can be an effective tool for enhancing communication skills with faculty members, native-speaking peers, and other L2 learners in American universities. Therefore, the implications of this study in the EFL language classroom can contribute positively to the goal of Chinese students' successful acquisition of the discourse skills needed to carry on face-to-face interaction with native speakers of English.
Recommendations for Further Research

One of the limitations of this study is the small number of participants. However, because the topic is underrepresented in SLA research, an ethnography was conducted to investigate in-depth the processes involved in discourse transfer phenomena and their impact on the interactional context as well as the role played by idiosyncracy in the production of discourse transfer from Chinese to English. Because of the small number of participants, the findings from this study cannot be generalized to other Chinese learners in other situations. To compensate for this limitation, this study presented a thick description of the different manifestations of discourse transfer so that future readers can judge the transferability of the findings to their own situations. The research was intended to present a qualitative analysis of the data collected from a small number of Chinese informants who participated in casual face-to-face interactions with a small number of native speakers of English.

The researcher generated three hypotheses to provide an interpretation that can account for the data on discourse transfer. These hypotheses were related to the cognitive mechanism of modularity, the relationship between discourse transfer and the interactional context, and learner idiosyncracy. Further research is needed to test these hypotheses and address questions of discourse transfer that may have implications for language teaching. For example, does the nature of the interactional task have an impact on the relationship between discourse transfer and learners' L2 speech? The findings in this study suggested that at least to some extent, there was an interplay between the learner's L1 and L2 that resulted in the production of discourse transfer in the interactional context of the
conversations between the 4 Chinese speakers and the 3 native speakers of English.

Further research is needed to determine if “task type” or “interlocutor familiarity” have different effects on the information-processing outcomes of L2 learners in terms of the production of discourse transfer in their L2 speech. A controlled experimental study should investigate the effects of “task type” and “interlocutor familiarity” on the production of discourse transfer in L2 learner speech.

Other needed areas of investigation include studies of questions such as the following: To what extent is the production of discourse transfer determined by the social relationship between Chinese speakers and English native speakers? Do Chinese learners who have conversations with unfamiliar native speakers produce more discourse transfer categories than those who were familiar with their English native-speaking interlocutors? Why? Why not? What are the implications of this type of research on the L2 classroom as a social setting? Furthermore, classroom-based research on discourse transfer should investigate issues related to the extent to which such pedagogical interventions as the provision of authentic input, strengthening L1-L2 relations, strategies for communication and social interaction, and accommodating learner idiosyncracy contribute to learners' awareness of the differences and similarities between their L1 discourse conventions and those of the L2. Questions such as the above need to be thoroughly investigated, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Further research on these topics has the promise of making significant contributions to the related fields of second language teaching and second language acquisition.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE PROGRAM
July 10, 1996

Mr. Bill Holschuh
Director of the American Language Program
The Ohio State University

Dir sir:

I am a fourth year doctoral student in the Foreign Language Education Program at the Ohio State University. My area of interest lies in how English as a Second Language (ESL) students perform in casual conversations with adult native speakers of English. At present, I am beginning my dissertation research on how Chinese students use their English in conversations with adult native speakers. The study will be conducted during the summer and Autumn Quarters, 1996.

In reviewing the research on this important topic in the filed, I have found that one of the general assumptions in studies of native speaker and non-native speaker interaction is that intercultural miscommunication is often caused by the learners’ falling back on their first language sociocultural norms and conventions in spoken performance in a second language. In most of these studies, the second language learners’ voices were not included. In my research, Chinese students will be given the opportunity to talk about their experiences in their conversations with native speakers of English. Because my first language is Chinese, I will be able to understand their experiences from their own perspectives, even if they have to use Chinese to express them. Through interviews (approximately 2 hours) and audio-recorded conversations with native speakers (approximately 7 hours), I hope to document what it is like to talk with native speakers of English from the Chinese student’s point of view. I also hope that my study will benefit students by raising their consciousness regarding their spoken performance in ESL. I would greatly appreciate it if you see to it that my letter of intent gets distributed among the Chinese students and their native-speaking partners so they can be informed about my study without any undue pressure on them to participate. I have to acknowledge to you that your support in this matter is key to the success of the study. I am seeking four Chinese volunteers from different proficiency levels in the Conversation Partners Program who would be willing to have around 7 hours of their conversations recorded at their convenience, of course. Every effort will be made to collect data during the times the partners meet with each other. Also, they will be interviewed for approximately 2 hours about their experiences during their conversations.

Because this dissertation research represent the completion of my doctoral degree requirements, I must follow protocol and assure all the participants of anonymity (i.e., participants’ given names will not be used in reporting the study), and confidentiality (i.e., their recorded voice will only be used for the purpose of the study). Finally, I would like to thank you very much for your support in helping me gain access to the students and their conversation partners.

Respectfully yours,

Shu-hua Wu (Connie)
650 Providence Ave., #C
Columbus, OH 43214
TEL: (614) 538-1533
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO TEACHERS OF THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE PROGRAM
Dear ESL teacher:

This is to request your support in taking some of your class time to introduce my letter of intent to your Chinese ESL students.

In reviewing related studies on my topic of interest, I found that the second language learners' voices were not included in the published research reports. In my research, the Chinese students will be given the opportunity to talk about their experiences in their conversations with native speakers of English. Being a Chinese myself, I will be able to understand and report their experiences even if they have to use Chinese to express them.

I would greatly appreciate it if you see to it that my letter of intent gets distributed among the Chinese students during or after your class time. Because I have to follow protocol rules and inform potential participants without any undue psychological pressure on them to volunteer, your support in explaining the contents of my letter to your Chinese students is critical to the success of my study. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Cordially yours,

Shu-hua Wu (Connie)
650 Providence Ave., #C
Columbus, OH 43214
TEL: (614) 538-1533
APPENDIX C

SOLICITATION LETTER TO TAIWANESE ESL STUDENTS
Dear ESL student:

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce myself to you and to invite you to participate in a very exciting research project.

I am a fourth year doctoral student in the Foreign Language Education program at the Ohio State University. My area of interest lies in how English as a second Language (ESL) students perform in casual conversations with adult native speakers of English. At present, I am beginning my dissertation research on how Chinese students use their English in conversations with adult native speakers.

In reviewing the research on this important topic, I have found many studies analyzing ESL spoken language from the viewpoint of English native speakers. In my research, Chinese students will be given the opportunity to talk about their experiences in their conversations with native speakers of English. Because my first language is Chinese, I will be able to understand your experiences from your own point of view, even if you have to use Chinese to express them. Through interviews and audio-recorded conversations, I hope to document what it is like to talk with native speakers of English from the Chinese student’s point of view.

The study will be conducted during the Summer and Autumn Quarters, 1996. To be a participant means that your are willing to have 7 hours of your conversations recorded at your convenience, of course. I will also interview you regarding your experience during the conversation (approximately 2 hours). If you wish to participate in the study, please return your PARTICIPATION REQUEST FORM to your ESL teacher so I can get in touch with you. Also, if you would like any further information about the study, please give me a call or leave your name and phone number on my answering machine, and I will call you back as soon as I can. Finally, all participants’ identities will be anonymous (i.e., your given name will not be used in the study report). I also assure you of confidentiality (i.e., your recorded voice will only be used for the purpose of the study). Thank you in advance for your contribution to the success of the study.

Sincerely yours,

Shu-hua Wu (Connie)
650 Providence Ave., #C
Columbus, OH 43214
TEL: (614) 538-1533
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPATION REQUEST FORM
Research Focus: Chinese ESL students’ spoken language in natural conversations with native speakers of English

Location: Wherever Chinese students and their partners have decided to meet.

Participants: Chinese ESL students of different proficiency levels at the American Language Program and their conversation partners

Research Task: (a) Approximately 7 hours of audio-taped conversations between Chinese ESL students and their conversation partners

(b) Interviews regarding their experiences during the conversation (approximately 2 hours)

Recording Time: I will record your conversations with your partner at the times you two agree that it is convenient.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at 538-1533.

Shu-hua Wu (Connie)/Foreign and Second Language Education

(Please tear off and give to your teacher)

I am willing to participate in your research project.

Name: _____________________________

Phone No. _____________________________
APPENDIX E

SOLICITATION LETTER TO AMERICAN PARTICIPANTS
Dear Conversation Partner:

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce myself to you and to invite you to participate in a very exciting research project.

I am a fourth year doctoral student in the Foreign Language Education Program at the Ohio State University. My area of interest lies in how English as a Second Language (ESL) students perform in casual conversations with adult native speakers of English. At present, I am beginning my dissertation research on how Chinese students use their English in conversations with adult native speakers.

In reviewing the research on this important topic, I have found many studies analyzing ESL spoken language from the perspective of English native speakers. In my research, Chinese students will be given the opportunity to talk about their experiences in their conversations with their native speaking partners. Because my first language is Chinese, I will be able to understand their experiences from their different points of view, even if they have to use Chinese to express them. Through interviews and audio-recorded conversations, I hope to document what it is like to talk with native speakers of English from the Chinese student’s point of view.

The study will be conducted during the Summer and Autumn Quarters, 1996. To become a participant in the study means that you agree to be recorded for approximately 7 hours of your conversations with your Chinese partner at your convenience, of course. I will also interview you regarding your reactions to your partner’s performance (around 1 hour).

Because this research project represents the completion of my doctoral degree requirements, I must follow protocol and keep your identities, as well as those of the Chinese students, anonymous. If you wish to participate in the study or would like further information about it, please give me a call, or leave your name and phone number on my answering machine, and I will call you back as soon as I can. Your agreement to participate is important to the success of my study. Thanks in advance.

Sincerely yours,

Shu-hua Wu (Connie)
650 Providence Ave., #C
Columbus, OH 43214
TEL: (614) 538-1533
APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transcription Conventions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>word</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/words/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Adapted from Schiffrin (1994).