

**LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CONTACT PHENOMENA IN A MANDARIN
CLASS IN THE U.S.**

A thesis presented

by

DAN ZHANG

**Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2012

Department of Communication

**LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CONTACT PHENOMENA IN A MANDARIN
CLASS IN THE U.S.**

A thesis presented

by

DAN ZHANG

Approved as to style and content by:

Benjamin Bailey, Chair

Donal Carbaugh, Member

Lisa Henderson, Department Head
Communication

ABSTRACT

**LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CONTACT PHENOMENA IN A MANDARIN
CLASS IN THE U.S.**

MAY 2012

DAN ZHANG, B.A., ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Benjamin Bailey

This study explores English language pragmatic phenomena in the Mandarin speech of a native Chinese language teacher as she interacts with American learners of Mandarin in a university classroom setting. I document and analyze her use of English backchannel 'mm hmm' in interactions that are otherwise in Mandarin, and I document and analyze the transfer of American interaction rituals and English syntax to her Mandarin language interactions with students. In this context, her patterns of communication both reflect and constitute cultural worlds. These pragmatic transfers to her Mandarin reflect her cultural and communicative assimilation to America, but they also serve to constitute pedagogical contexts that are familiar to American students and may facilitate their learning, and they serve to constitute a sojourner Chinese scholar identity for the teacher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
CHAPTER	
1. CONTACT PHENOMENA AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Introduction	1
Literature Review	3
Borrowing	3
Backchannel	5
Pragmatic Transfer	11
Pragmatics of Language	14
Research Questions	17
2. METHODOLOGY	19
Data Collection	19
Data Analysis	20
3. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	21
Backchannel of 'Mm Hmm'	21
Frequency	24
Example 1 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction	27
Example 2 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction	35
Example 3 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction	39
Pragmatic Transfer	44
Transfer of '周末快乐(happy weekend)'	45
Transfer of '说得很大声(say it loudly)'	50
Examples from Ethnographic Observation	54
4. CONCLUSION	60
APPENDICES	

A. TRANSCRIPTS.....	62
B. INTERVIEW GUIDELINES.....	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68

CHAPTER 1

CONTACT PHENOMENA AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study examines the pragmatic and communicative assimilation that occurs in a case of cultural and linguistic contact. Specifically, it focuses on contact phenomena in the Mandarin speech of a Chinese language teacher as she interacts with American learners of Mandarin in a university classroom setting. I focus on the transfers of English backchannel responses to interactions that are otherwise of Mandarin, and, to a lesser extent, the transfer of syntactic and ritual patterns between Mandarin and English. Such pragmatic transfers/borrowings do not only exist in transfers from a first language to a second language, but also from a second language to a first language. In other words, the influences between the two ways of communicating are mutual. These transfers contribute to constitution of hybrid cultural worlds. The use of these hybrid ways of communicating can be variously explained in terms of pedagogical function, linguistic and cultural assimilation, and identity work.

The corpus of data from the ethnographic observation, audio and video recording, and interviews were collected in a Chinese language class at the University of Massachusetts Amherst in 2011, focusing on one instructor and her

interaction with students in the class. The main subject, the instructor, has been in the U.S. for four years and has been teaching American students Chinese for eight years. The ethnographic observation was conducted for several weeks in both the lecture and discussion sessions, and the recordings in total were around ten hours long. In addition, an hour long interview with the instructor was conducted afterwards.

Two main patterns of borrowings were identified and analyzed in this study. One is the use of English backchannel tokens within interactions that are otherwise of Mandarin. When the instructor interacts with students asking or answering questions, in cases where students were creating their own sentences in Chinese, she frequently—but not always—uses the English '*mm hmm*' as a backchannel. While, '*mm hmm*' itself is absent in Chinese conversations, interactional tokens with similar connotations exist in the Chinese language. The way she uses the American tokens, instead of the Chinese ones when teaching her students in Chinese, were analyzed in detail in this study.

A second form of pragmatic transfer is the ritual and syntactic transfer. The instructor not only switches code at times, but also transfers specific departure sequences like '*have a nice weekend*' to Chinese, where it is not a typical Chinese leave-taking. The instructor borrowed the ritual and performed it in Chinese. Her use of '*happy weekend*', as a version of '*have a nice weekend*', spoken in Chinese, to the students, which will be discussed later.

It could be argued that pragmatic transfer is bidirectional, from L1 to L2,

but also from L2 to L1, and different cultural worlds are constructed by such communicative behaviors. Through close inspection of the information gathered in our research, we have found out that ways of communication is indeed influenced by culture, and that the constitutive nature of communication could construct cultural worlds of interactions. It is claimed that pragmatic transfer between two ways of communication occurs under specific situations, which relates to perspectives of pedagogy, assimilation to culture, and negotiation of identities.

Literature Review

Borrowing

The term 'borrowing' will be adopted to describe the transfers of speech patterns found in this study. Matras, Y., & Sakel, J. (2007) defined two types of borrowing: MAT (matter) and PAT (pattern) borrowing.

'MAT are borrowing when morphological material and its phonological shape from one language is replicated in another language. PAT describes the case where only the patterns of the other language are replicated, i.e. the organization, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed. (p15)

In this definition, MAT is proximate to the idea of code-switching.

Words are borrowed from one language and inserted to another language, while PAT is more subtle and is the focus of this study. As the authors indicated, the distinction between MAT and PAT is whether the actual words have been taken

over to the recipient language.

Usually in MAT, a new phoneme that is initially absent in the recipient language gets introduced. As the form of sound '*mm hmm*' does not exist in Chinese, this borrowing could first of all be categorized as MAT borrowing. In fact, in many cases of MAT borrowing, the function of the borrowed elements is also taken over, and that will be the combination of MAT and PAT (P15). In this sense, the '*mm hmm*' token is MAT and PAT combined, as both the phonology and function of this token are borrowed in this example. While the phonology is borrowed, '*mm hmm*' does not consist of morphemes and has no referential meaning, so it does not fit traditional notions of MAT or code-switching.

The PAT borrowing refers to the cases with no certain phonological distinction, i.e. a change of overall patterning rather than the change in actual form taking place. In this case, more PAT borrowings occurred in the data. The form is still the same, as the language remained the same without switching. The sentence patterns, the grammar usage, and even ritual pattern borrowed from English to Chinese in this study match 'the organization, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning' in their definition; moreover, the leave-taking ritual by which the instructor utters to the American students in Chinese, is of American patterns, not of the Chinese convention. The examples in this study could be termed as PAT borrowing.

Field (2000) argues that patterns of borrowing result from the power dominance of one language over another such that culturally subordinated

speakers take up forms from the dominant language and become more and more alike in linguistic use. This may be one of the explanations for such phenomena. In this study, though English is the second language, it is dominant in several aspects. First of all, as the instructor is living in the U.S., she probably needs to communicate in English most of time with her surroundings. Even silently, American culture is surrounding her, with the building layout, western lifestyle, white-dominant demography, etc. which created the general background of English dominance. Also, although she works in the Chinese department, the majority of students are Americans, and she revealed in her interview that she believes that the classroom interaction should be taught in the American style because of the students. This creates the specific English-dominant culture and approachable for students used to the American educational system. Therefore, in this sense, English is the dominant language here in her life. Compared to English, Chinese is considered to be culturally subordinated in the U.S. Even from a second language, linguistic use from the yet-dominant language would possibly be picked up into native language use because of the power difference.

Backchannel

The definition of backchannels by Kjellmer (2009), is the noise/sounds/utterance, made by non-speakers, not wishing to take over the floor. The regulative function of backchannels is to encourage the other part to carry on.

Usual backchannels in English are interjections like 'un huh, mm hmm, yeah, yes', etc. that are produced by the listener, to indicate that 'I'm listening'. The backchannels are employed by the listeners to acknowledge that the other speaker has the floor, and that they want the interaction to continue.

Tottie (1991, as cited by Klellmer 2009) distinguishes the “supportive” function of backchannels, signaling understanding and agreement, and the “regulative” function, encouraging the speaker to continue his/her turn. In short, these two functions could be defined as 'agreement' and 'continuer'. Also, Maltz & Borker (1982) found that men and women may use these tokens differently, in that men tend to use the backchannels to show understanding or agreement as the 'supportive' function mentioned above, while women tend to use them as continuers, the 'regulative' function as mentioned. Their findings supports the multiple meanings that such forms can have.

In Mandarin, there are similarly functioning backchannels, which are '嗯 (en), 噢 ao, 哎 ai; 好 hǎo/对 du 是 shì. As in English, they indicate acknowledgement or agreement in conversation. However, they function less as a 'continuer' to encourage the speaker to keep on talking. The list below is an explanation of each one of the common Chinese backchannels.

嗯 en: mainly showing acknowledgement.

噢 ao: mainly showing understanding.

好¹hǎo: similar meaning as 'okay', mainly showing acknowledgement.

对 du is similar meaning as 'right', mainly showing acknowledgement.

是 shì is similar meaning as 'yes', mainly showing acknowledgement.

¹ The meanings of 'hao' are multiple in Chinese. Basically it means good. However, in such situation, it is similar to 'okay/yeah', as a backchannel, not a lexical usage.

哎 *ai*: *interjection*, usually coming right before 好 *hǎo*/对 *duì* 是 *shì*, showing acknowledgement.

The differences between the Chinese and English styles of backchannels are compared in Tao and Thompson's research. Their study is fairly relevant to the backchannel transfer phenomenon in this study, so it will be examined closely in the following section.

Tao and Thompson (2009) studied English backchannels in Mandarin conversations. Two sources of data were included in their research. One is a conversation between a Chinese professor who had been in the U.S. for 17 years and a native Mandarin speaking student. The professor had spoken English almost exclusively on a daily basis, both at home and at work. It was a naturally-occurring conversation recorded in 1978 in Taiwan. The second source of data is a series of eight interview-style conversations between another Chinese professor, with a very similar cultural background to the first one, and a Mandarin-English bilingual student, who had spoken Mandarin more on a daily basis. This took place in the early 1970's, in the U.S.

Based upon recordings from the corpus, there were four main findings regarding the usage of backchannels. First of all, the data demonstrated that English uses backchannels more frequently than Mandarin does, which was supported by the counting and comparison of the frequencies of backchannel responses in speaker changes (i.e. as a change in speakership, whether in overlap or not): 25% of English backchannels in speaker changes and 8% of Mandarin ones in speaker changes.

Secondly, English speakers overlap other speaker's turns with their backchannels while Mandarin speakers rarely do so, as the results showed that there were 51% of overlaps in English backchannels and none in Chinese ones. In other words, about half of English speaker's backchannel tokens occur within the other speaker's turn, the other half occurring at the end of the other speaker's turn, while Mandarin speakers in their data never use a backchannel token within another speaker's turn (Tao and Thompson 2009, p211).

Thirdly, almost 20% of English backchannels are continuers, while none of Mandarin backchannel tokens are, which instead, functioned more as claims of understanding or agreement. According to them, the distinction between continuers and tokens of understanding or agreement lies in placement: claims of understanding or agreement are placed at the ends of turns, which are candidates for semantic completion points. When a continuer is used, neither the turn nor the semantic content needs to be complete (Tao and Thompson 2009, p221).

Lastly, most Mandarin backchannels were preceded by noticeably long pauses (longer than 0.3 seconds), which is considered as consistent with what has been mentioned in the previous two findings, as overlap or continuer markers seldom occur in Mandarin. The long pauses before the Mandarin backchannels are considered as lack of utterance, which indicate the completion of the last speaker's turn. Thus, those Mandarin backchannels are not continuers, but claims of agreement or understanding, as stated in the preceding paragraph.

On the basis of those findings, it was claimed by Tao and Thompson that

the two professors who have been in the environment of the second language, English as the dominant language, for a certain length of time, unconsciously adopted strongly American-English communicative habits of frequent backchanneling. It is the superstratum influence from the dominant language, as suggested by the authors, on their first language that caused the change of discourse strategies in their native language, as the two professors had been living and working in the U.S. for more than twenty years, in which English has been their main language. The original usage of 'superstratum' referred to the language of 'linguistically victorious', who were generally newcomers or conquerors that had come to dominate another group's culture leading to an inequality in the status of languages. So, in this case English, could be seen as the 'newcomer' language from the perspective of a member of a linguistic minority within the U.S. precisely because that superstratum language, English, exerts influence on their Chinese usage. Moreover, they had been using English most of the time for over twenty years as the authors suggested. Such effects were considered pragmatic changes. Other elements may derive from the newcomer language, and these influences form the superstratum of the emerging contact variety (Filppula, 1990).

That study is highly relevant to my research, but distinct from it. The contact phenomenon that will be examined here are more contextualized and situation-specific, as most of them took place in a classroom, with pedagogical factors influencing the language usage. Also, the conversations were between a Chinese teacher and American students, rather than between two Chinese, which

created an intercultural communicative context in this study. Thus, we were able to observe the usage of borrowed backchannels in discourse between a native speaker and non-native speakers. The disparate cultural backgrounds that they have may exert influence on their communication, such that backchanneling by the teacher in this study were both English and Chinese styles and may have been used for different functions. It is believed other factors may be at play, instead of simply superstratum language influence.

Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki & Tao (1996) did a research that compared the usage of reactive token (similar to the concept of backchannel here) among Japanese, Mandarin and English speakers, and one of their findings was consistent with Tao and Thompson's. They found that Mandarin speakers play a less active role in supporting the primary speaker, with much less ratio of reactive tokens as in speaker change as compared to Japanese and English speakers.

Other studies have researched the backchannel behaviors in cross-linguistic situations. Heinz (2003) found that bilingual Germans diverge from monolingual Germans in backchannel behavior. It is documented that native Germans who have become equally proficient in American English, when they speak to other native Germans in German, produce a higher number of backchannel responses, more often in overlapping positions than do monolingual Germans. In addition, this finding supports the idea that second language would influence the usage of first language. However, whether they were using German style backchannel or US style was not mentioned, but presumably the German

styles. The difference is that the focus of this study is on how the usage of backchannels of one language does not match the other language.

Pragmatic Transfer

According to Kasper (1992: 207), pragmatic transfer can be defined as the influence exerted by learners' pragmatic knowledge of their native languages and culture, on their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information. She further categorized transfers into two kinds: positive transfer and negative transfer. Positive transfer refers to the idea that language specific conventions of usage (such as apology and refusal) are shared between L1 and L2, such that a specific usage will successfully transfer to the target language. It is regarded as 'positive' as there are few discrepancies between the two conventions of pragmatic usage; this transfer experiences less difficulty and could be understood by both interlocutors. Negative transfer is when the L1-based pattern of specific conventional forms is not matched by the behavior in the L2-target language, leading to transfer failure or interference between the two languages. Such transfer is thus labeled 'negative' transfer. The existence (or lack) of significant difference in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature in L1 and L2 differentiate the two kinds of transfers. The transfers taking place in this study could also be classified as pragmatic transfer, though transfers can happen in both directions, i.e. not only from L1 to L2, but also from L2 to L1.

Most previous studies focused on the pragmatic transfers from the first language to second language (Bu 2010; Chang 2009; Kirkpatrick & Xu 2002; Saito 1997; Tran 2007; Zhu 2011; etc.). Cultural norms as reflected in certain speech acts, such as refusal and compliment response, especially among Chinese students learning English, were mostly transferred to L2 linguistic behaviors. Negative pragmalinguistic transfer (Chang 2009) occurred frequently when L2 assumed the form-function mappings between L1 and L2 are the same and literally translate the L1 routine to L2. This idea is very close to Matras, Y., & Sakel, J. (2007)'s PAT borrowing. In Chang's study for example, Chinese students learning English employed more specific reasons and excuses when doing refusals indirectly in English than American students, which may seem unnecessary in American culture, or even vague or insincere. Similar ideas and findings were presented by Zhu's (2011) study on the negative cultural transfer among Chinese learners of English, which generally discussed the negative cultural transfers in perspectives of translating, connotative meanings, speech acts and some deep structures in thinking patterns and value systems.

However, seldom did the previous studies mention the influence of the second language on the first language use, except Kirkpatrick & Xu (2002) and Shi & Zhu (1999). The influence from L2 to L1 could exert different functions or effects on communication, as compared to the influence from L1 to L2. The transfer of discourse and rhetorical norms discussed by those researchers did not limit in just L1 to L2, but also the other way round. They took the example in

changes of syntax in Chinese, after when western books were translated into Chinese in the beginning of 20th century. Chinese was considered as a more paratactic language than English because explicit connectors were not necessary to show the relationship between two clauses. However after that time, sentences following the clause sequence of 'the match was postponed *because* it was raining' started appearing in Chinese, together with an explicit connector that shows the relationship between the two clauses. Therefore, it is believed that the influence of western languages upon sentence structures in Chinese is significant too. This sheds light on the gravity of this study of the pragmatic transfer from English to Chinese.

Another study also investigated the influence of English on written Mandarin in Hong Kong by Shi & Zhu (1999). English does influence the syntax of written Mandarin in Hong Kong, not only in the code-mixing level of words, but also in transfer of grammatical structures and even generating new grammars. Because of the long and steady influence of English in Hong Kong from history, variation of vocabulary, syntax change, as well as code-switching took place in the written Mandarin. One of the variations is the transfer of part of speech of some vocabulary, such as adjectives or nouns being used as verbs:

娱乐学生 (*literally*; 'entertainment student')

娱乐 *yúlè*, which can only be a noun in Chinese, means 'entertainment'. However, above it is used as a verb, clearly an example where the English sense that the word 'entertain', can be used as either noun or verb may have informed the novel behavior of using the English pattern or grammar in an otherwise Chinese utterance

Also, intransitive verbs in Chinese were used as transitive verbs:

挑战司法界 (*to challenge the law*)

挑战 *tǎo zhàn*, means 'challenge', but is only used in Chinese in the structure of '向...挑战, which means 'to challenge sth./sb.'. In this structure the object, 'sth./sb.' should be put in between, 向 (*xàng*), a preposition, and 挑战 (*tǎo zhàn*), a verb. The example was wrong in that the object, 司法界 *the law* was put right after 挑战 *tǎo zhàn*. The right structure in Chinese should be 向司法界挑战.

Variations such as these occurred because of word usages that exist in English which were borrowed for use in another language. This study contributes to the body of evidence that show the influence of English on Chinese as it is used today.

Pragmatics of Language

As this study investigates forms of linguistic behavior from a pragmatic sense, it is important to lay out the communicative, pragmatic foundation of this approach. Language is used for practical, communication action in specific situations, as in the multiple, primitive forms of language proposed by Wittgenstein---'language games', such as 'giving orders, requesting, thanking, cursing, greeting, praying', etc.(Para23, 1953). The classroom interactions examined here are also a form of "language game". The notion of 'language game' is not a reductionist view of language use, but rather the basic forms that can be built up with new forms added on to the social and cultural settings (The Blue Book, as cited in Monk, 2006). This idea can be applied to the speech phenomena that have been preliminarily explored in this study too, in that even a nuanced linguistic exchange like a backchannel shall not be neglected and will extend to the pragmatic form of its use, in certain situations.

Further on, a language use cannot be separated from the culture aspects. As described by Carbaugh, "the fundamental status of communication, speaking, and silence is cultural" (1993:127). Cultures shape individual's communicative styles in many ways, as in the framework of intercultural communication proposed by Gumperz (1982a)—Carbaugh's approach of cultural pragmatics lays out the significance of culture to detailed level of talks in the meaning making in social interaction:

"Our models for understanding would be well served to move in the direction of cultural pragmatics, to create a better knowledge of the cultural and social foundations of communication, and the various ways they construct specific conversational occasions." (Carbaugh, 1993: P128)

As in this study, the instructor is Chinese, who has been in the U.S. for four years and teaching American students for eight years. The culture difference is significant and influential in their communication in the classroom. Therefore, her linguistic behavior in terms of backchannel borrowing and transfers should be analyzed through the situation of both classroom interaction and intercultural encounters as well. At the same time, under specific situations, ways of communication will also construct specific conversational occasions, for the purpose of interaction and intercultural understanding. When interactions are woven within different cultural backgrounds, even nuanced communicative behaviors can serve practical understanding among interlocutors.

It may also relate to the theory of cultural assimilation, or in this case, communicative assimilation to be specific. In the process of intercultural

communication, discrepancies may occur because of the differences between cultures, consciously or unconsciously. However, the traits from the more powerful culture will be likely to be picked up by the outsiders, in order to assimilate to the new culture as supported by Kim's (1998) theory of cultural adaptation. In this study, it is evident the Chinese instructor came to the States with certain proficiency in English and has been immersed in the American culture. It could be argued that she had picked up such departure rituals or backchannel tokens in order to adapt to the society by fulfilling her duty as a Chinese language teacher in America, and furthermore to adapt to the American culture. As indicated in her interview, she considers herself as somehow a 'westernized' Chinese, as she has been in touch with American students for so many years, as well as the culture. Communicative behavior is one important indication of cultural assimilation. This general background should be taken into consideration too.

The power of language use to reflect identity may also be paid attention to, as Kroskrity (2001) once defined identity as 'the linguistic construction of membership in one or more social groups or categories' (P106). Also, Carbaugh (1996) stated that identity is grounded in particular social scenes of symbolic activity (p34). Thus, the use of certain discursive practices could help construct or perform one's identity situated in social occasion, such as in the context of this study--classroom interaction, with the pedagogical purpose.

The instructor has several identities to perform and maintain in the case, such as American sojourn scholar and Chinese language teacher. She is first of all,

a Chinese. That is her master identity (Tracy 2002), her skin color, native tongue presenting that well. Secondly, she is a sojourn scholar in the U.S., who has been in contact with American culture for a period of time, in many respects of life here, a non-indigenous American alien identity. Her physical location leads to her second identity. She is also a Chinese language teacher in an American university, teaching American students, as a Chinese teacher identity. Her third identity is situation specific and requires her maintenance in performing in class in this case. The three identities juxtapose, overlap, and intertwine in the class, and could be reflected by her communicative behaviors in particular. When she speaks Chinese in class, these identities appear at the same time. When she speaks English, her sojourn scholar identity and Chinese teacher identity will stand out more. When she especially interacts with students using English backchannels, such accommodation to the students represents her third identity most. Therefore, the multiple identities were manifested and negotiated while teaching in the class.

Research Questions

Research questions include:

--- What particular contact phenomena are observable?

---What was the instructor doing when she switches backchannels?

What kind of communicative world is constructed, when she switches to

English backchannels in the Mandarin class? When does she usually switch

codes? What might be the possible reason of her doing that? What may this function for the teacher, and the students?

---What was the instructor doing when she transfers the American patterns of ritual or syntax?

What kind of change of footing is that when the instructor borrow the patterns of American style of leave-taking? What are the detailed situations when the borrowing takes place? What might be the possible reason for her doing that? What may this function for the teacher, and the students?

---How is culture influencing the linguistic behaviors?

How could American culture shape the Chinese instructor's language use, when she interacts with American students? What are the manifestations of such cultural influence in the classroom interaction?

---- How would the instructor identify herself?

How would the instructor perceive from her own view of cultural influence? What are her possible identities and how would she negotiate those in interactions.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

This study draws upon three language corpora: 1) notes from ethnographic observation for several weeks in both lectures and discussion sessions of one Mandarin course in University of Massachusetts Amherst; 2) audio and video recordings for several hours of classes including lectures and discussion sessions; and 3) an interview with the instructor.

There were two lectures and three discussion sessions for this Mandarin course in UMass Amherst. The researcher went to sit in the class for ethnographic observation starting from the beginning of the fall semester, for approximately eight weeks, to observe the interactions between Chinese instructors and American students. Audio was recorded for around three weeks and videos were recorded for one week, after obtaining Informed Consent. With such recording devices, the interactions of voice, gesture, gazes, etc. were recorded and provided for analysis. At the beginning of November, an interview with the instructor of the lecture was conducted for around one hour, also audio and video recorded. The question guide of that interview is attached in the Appendices in this paper.

The portions of recordings that contained instances of pragmatic transfer

phenomena were transcribed. Chinese language in these was transcribed and translated.

Data Analysis

The analysis in this study uses a qualitative approach. Each contact phenomenon was noted and transcribed according to Atkinson and Heritage's (1999) style. Each significant or meaningful turn was analyzed for form and meaning.

Each time when there is linguistic borrowing of backchannel or pragmatic transfer, the conversational turns of one topic will be selected for analysis. Thus, the dimension of communication will be several turns of talk, and may include several units of analysis, as each turn of borrowing or transfer will be considered as one unit of analysis.

In each unit of analysis, the significant linguistic behavior was picked out and scrutinized to see that if such borrowings or transfers may be found as a pattern, also when and where such contact phenomena take place. Each pattern was defined and categorized in the procedure. Furthermore, the function or reasons of such pattern will be tentatively discussed in the following part of the paper, to see if it can be explained in terms of, for example, classroom pedagogy, cultural assimilation or negotiation of identity.

CHAPTER 3

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Backchannel of 'Mm Hmm'

Two lectures were recorded, which last two and half hours in all. In interactions among the instructor and students, the backchanneling that she adopted consists of both Mandarin and English styles. The instructor used backchanneling very often, with 125 of '*Mm hmm*' and almost three times that of Chinese style backchanneling, such as '哎 *ai* (interjection), 对 *dui*(right), 好 *hao*(okay)' in the two lectures being recorded.

The physical context of the lectures is a classroom in Amherst, a university town in northeast part of the U.S. The students are Americans. Such physical context constructed first of all, an American cultural world in the classroom. The linguistic world created in this classroom is Chinese, as the instructor specifically told students not to speak English when classes began. The differences between US and Chinese classrooms will be explained first, as it is important to differentiate the two styles in the analysis.

In a traditional Chinese class, the teacher is the one in hierarchy such that students need to follow the instruction from the teacher, with rare objections. The hierarchy difference is shown through several perspectives: students need to

address the teacher with the last name and 'teacher', so a teacher with the last name of '王 *Wáng*' will be addressed as '王老师 *Wáng lǎoshī*' (Teacher Wang); in class, students should stand up and bow to the teacher before the class starts and after it ends; students should raise up hands whenever they have questions or want to answer questions, wait for the teacher to call by name, then that student can stand up and ask/answer questions. (While this strict protocol is still rigorously adhered to in primary and secondary schools, it is not so closely followed in college and university classrooms.) These practices create the atmosphere of the traditional Chinese classroom, where teachers are highly respected, and there is less accommodation to students, as compared to an American style class. A typical Chinese class in elementary or high school might consist of fifty, sixty or even more pupils. Because of scarce resources the teachers cannot pay attention to every student, let alone meet the needs of every individual.

The American classroom, in the researcher's view, is generally more interactional, and teachers need to try to understand the students and meet their needs. The classroom that was being observed in this study is somewhat unique among American classrooms in that the teacher is a Chinese person, the subject matter is linguistically (and often culturally) Chinese, and basically there was an effort to create a culturally Chinese space. However, despite all that effort, the classroom was still observed to be distinctly American in important ways, like the personal attention afforded in small class size and more informal teacher student dialogue. In this way both the American style and the Chinese style of classroom

interaction seem to somehow coexist in this kind of scenario

When the instructor asked the students not to talk in English in class, most of the interactions were taking place in Mandarin, with few exceptions of code-switchings when students did not know how to say certain words or sentences in Mandarin and when she explained certain grammar or instructions in English to make sure that students understand. Thus, in the linguistic world created, Mandarin is in dominance with little portion of English. Moreover, the cultural world here is a hybrid of Chinese and American cultures. On one hand, that the language spoken in class was primarily Mandarin, and that the students all used a formal Chinese style of address for their teacher, contributed to the sense that this was a culturally Chinese world. On the other hand, as to meet the expectations of an all American class, the instructor may have tended to accommodate their interactional styles, such as humor style or wording in giving instructing, as she expressed in the interview. One example of this accommodation is avoidance of using 'should' with American students such as 'you should keep silent when the teacher is talking'.

In this sense, such physical, linguistic and cultural worlds that were created through talk constitute the overall context of these lectures. It is found out that most of her '*mm hmm*' took place when she was interacting with students who were engaging in one-to-one interactions, which created specific contexts for such transfer to happen.

Also, it is noticed that, her backchannels of '*mm hmm*' took place more

when the students were speaking Chinese. In other words, she used '*mm hmm*' in a Chinese linguistic context, a hybrid of Chinese cultural world (way of addressing her, requirement of only speaking Chinese) and American cultural world (using '*mm hmm*' or gestures as encouragement to the American students). As suggested by Tao and Thompson (1991), Mandarin speakers tend not to use many backchannels during conversations, which is a contrast with English. Such high frequency of adopting backchanneling in verbal interaction in this study, no matter in Mandarin styles or English ones, leads to an English style interactional world that those American students are familiar with as they use backchannels quite often in their native language interaction. This may lead to the assumption that such communicative transfer occur in specific context, with specific functions in the temporarily created world.

Frequency

In the video of two lectures, which lasted two and half hour long in all, there were 125 times of using '*mm hmm*' by the instructor, and almost three times of Chinese style of backchannels. Compared with the frequency of Chinese subjects in Tao and Thompson's study, 5 backchannel utterances in half an hour, the instructor's usage of such conversational strategy could be considered high in that situation. Also, in the interview with researcher (two native Mandarin speakers, conversing in Mandarin), the instructor only uttered '*mm hmm*' once in

the one-hour long interview, which made the '125 times out of two and half hour' outstanding. As discussed by Tao and Thompson (2009), frequency of the usage of backchannels matters, as an indication of the influence of the second language. In this sense, the superstratum influence from English seems to make some sense here. However, as most of the data were collected in a classroom, with teacher-student interacting patterns, these factors could be open to more possibilities, which will be discussed in the following part.

There was another significant specialty in this study that shall not be overlooked. That 125 times of applying English backchannels was not evenly or quasi-evenly distributed in the two lectures, but with sharp contrast. She used 102 '*mm hmm*' in the first lecture, and only 23 times in the second lecture. Such significant difference may be resulted from the realm of pragmatics, as the types of interactions in the two lectures were quite distinct.

In the first lecture, there were 21 students appointed by her to make sentences from a just-taught sentence structure, leading to those occasions of interactions between her and each student who were asked. Most occasions were when a student was making Chinese sentences, she uttered '*mm hmm*' and nodded her head during the student's floor. While, in the second lecture, there were no such obvious one-to-one interactions except when a general question was answered by one student and she continued interaction with follow-up questions. Most of the time during the second lecture, she addressed to the whole class.

Such distinctive frequencies indicate that first of all, the superstratum influence from English to Chinese may not be quite supported by these two classes. If it is the simple influence between the two languages, the frequency of '*mm hmm*' usage may be similar or matching, but the data shows very distinctive patterns, so that this may not be simply explained by the superstratum influence. Because of the two interactional patterns in the two lectures, the context-specific factors shall be strengthened. In the first lecture, there were more 'teacher-to-one student' interactions. When she interacts with those students individually, she might tend to use more English backchannels, which could result from certain level of accommodation to American students especially on a one-to-one base, so that, by doing so, the students may be encouraged to engage more in demonstrating sentence-making. Also, her second identity as a Chinese sojourn scholar is emphasized. Her adaptation to the English style of interacting might be reflected through application of such backchannel as ways of encouragement, and additionally, her adaptation to the American culture. More detailed level of factors would be discussed and analyzed.

The following three instances are representative in the whole process of classroom interaction, but also with their own features. The selection of these instances could illustrate the pragmatics of such transfers.

Example 1 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction

This is the episode from the first lecture where more individual interactions took place, and several turns were selected from such interaction pattern. In this interaction, the 'Mm hmm' token was selected as the unit of analysis. The context of this interaction was that a student was describing in Chinese her favorite food using the words and phrases taught before and the instructor was listening to her answer. During this process, the instructor did not comment on her articulation, but only uttered 'Mm hmm', as well as nodding her head almost during every pause in the student's speech. From the beginning when students started to speak till almost the end, her main responses included eight 'Mm hmm's.

Transcript 1²:

I: instructor. S1: student 1

- 1 I: 噢, 你倒说一下.
Oh, you can say something.
- 2 S1: Um, (0.9) 我最喜欢吃 (0.8) 北京烤鸭.
Um, I like eating Peking Duck the most.
- 3 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))
- 4 S1: ° Um, 最喜欢吃的° (…)/(0.9). 又, (0.5) 因为, (0.5) 北京烤鸭又
Um, the favorite food...Also, because Peking Duck is tender
- 5 (.) 又香
and savory.
- 6 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))
- 7 ? : (2.2) ((cough))
- 8 S1: 北京烤:鸭的, (2.0)° 北京°, (2.8) 味道::::味道是 (0.6) 油:::?

² This transcript follows Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999) style of transcript. As the primary language is Chinese, the English translations are italic and in grey, so that it will be easier to understand and differentiated.

The flavor of Peking Duck, Peking...The flavor is oily.

→ 9 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))

10 S1: 我也喜欢吃:::寿司.

I also like eating sushi.

→ 11 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))

12 S1: Um, / (1.0)

13 ? : °Sushi°

→ 14 I: °m:h:m° ((nodding her head))

15 S1: 寿司, (1.5)很, (1.3)很::清蒸, 也很[::

Sushi is very, very steam, and also very,

16 I: [清, 清什么?清淡吗?

Cl, clear?

17 S1: 清:::清淡.

Cl, clear.

→ 18 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))

19 S1: 清:清淡. 也很::新鲜.

Cl, clear and also very fresh.

→ 20 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))

21 S1: 所以, (0.5)um_(3.0)寿司:::的_(1.3)味道_(1.0)有一点儿咸.

So, the flavor of sushi is a bit salty.

→ 22 I: Mm hmm? ((nodding her head))

23 S1: 寿司_(1.3)寿司_(1.4)不如_(1.4)北京烤鸭_(1.4)便宜.

Sushi, sushi is not as cheap as Peking Duck.

24 I: 好的, (0.5)好的.(.)还有吗?

Okay, okay, what else?

→ 25 ? : °没有问题°

No.

→ 26 I: 哎, 没有了, 啊, 好, 啊, (.)好. (0.2)还有问题没有?

Nope, ah, good. Other questions?

27 ? : ((silence))

In this interaction, eight '*Mm hmm*' were applied as backchannels by the instructor, as in Line 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22. The normal usage of '*Mm hmm*' in interlocution is a sign of 'I am listening', a continuer, which is very common in English conversations. Here in the context, as we can see, she was nodding her head at the same time when she uttered '*Mm hmm*'. These two verbal and non-verbal gestures may suggest she was using this utterance as a showing of agreement, or a way to ratify the student's contribution, as saying 'okay' or 'correct'. On another level, as she was looking at the student's direction all the time during the student's speaking, her '*mm hmm*' might also serve as an encouragement to the student, as if telling them 'yes, that's right. Keep on going', because Mandarin is considered to be hard for English speakers to learn, so that they need more encouragement in the process of learning. Such backchannel from teachers are very rare in Chinese classrooms, unless when the teacher truly thinks the student is making excellent point that make sense to the teacher, and then the teacher would wait until the student finishes the answer and would use '嗯 *en*' or '对 *du* *ì(right)*' to show agreement or acknowledgement. Just as Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki & Tao (1996) indicated, Mandarin conversationalists are the most likely to continue listening in silence (p377), a Chinese teacher usually waits for the student to finish the whole process of answering or asking questions, and then evaluate at the end. Because if a Chinese teacher applied a reactive token, it may lead the students to think that the teacher has something to say, to take the floor, as found by Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki & Tao (1996). Therefore, not many Chinese teachers would

use backchannel frequently when interacting with students, which is very different from American style. In fact, the backchannel of '*mm hmm*' is common in many cases of teacher-student interaction in classrooms that the researcher has experienced in America, especially when a student is answering a question while the teacher is listening. American teachers always give attention to students during interaction. When listening to a student speaking, American teachers may tend to fill each pause the student takes with backchannels, so that the student may be encouraged to continue talking.

Furthermore, this token here functions not only as agreement as the pedagogical usage, but also as a further interpretation or as a sign for her verbal assimilation to the English culture. When the instructor was interacting with a student from another culture individually, the instructor may tend to utilize/draw out her second identity--a sojourn scholar in the U.S. and her third identity--a Chinese language teacher. These two identities were negotiated at the same time, as different aspects serve for specific functions. First of all, as a sojourn scholar in the U.S., she probably became familiar with the American ways of interacting and usage of backchannels in conversations, so she probably knows that, to encourage the interlocutor to keep on talking, '*mm hmm*' token is one conversation strategy to facilitate this situation. By applying such backchannel, her successful verbal interaction may indicate her assimilation to the culture, and thus her identity of sojourn Chinese scholar can be recognized. Her third identity is a language teacher, where the pedagogical factor and such identity labeling overlap, with same

function. By using this trait of '*mm hmm*', as a way to accommodate/facilitate American students in interaction as a way they are used to, she was encouraging the student to engage in class activities in order to achieve the pedagogical purpose. If she uses the less active-role as a Chinese teacher would do, without using backchannels, the American students may feel awkward about the silence during the pauses between their utterances, which may result in less intention to keep on trying to speak Chinese, a discouragement. Therefore, she is not only a Chinese teacher, but more importantly, an overseas Chinese teacher, in a foreign environment. Once the goal of engaging students was achieved, her identity as a sojourn Chinese teacher was distinguishably established too, as the student engaged and complied with her teaching.

Therefore, during her usage of '*mm hmm*', I perceived that her footing slightly changed, from a Chinese to a sojourn Chinese scholar. Since this is in line with the English pragmatics, this transfer could be counted as a positive transfer in Kasper's definition. In fact, such subtle influence did not occur only in the case of '*mm hmm*', but also several other times of putting Chinese in English grammar in the instructor's utterance, which will be covered by later parts of this paper.

The footing later on was changed back to 'teacher-whole class' interaction, when she began to ask questions to all the students in class. She used '哎(*ai*), 好(*hao*), 啊(*a*)' in Line 26, which are normally Chinese interjections as tokens of showing agreement or confirmation in interlocution. As in Line 25 the instructor checked with the student that she had finished her response, the instructor began to

address the whole class in Line 26 asking if there were further questions. Interestingly, when the end of the student's talk indicated a change from 'teacher-one student' interaction to 'teacher-whole class' interaction, her interjection token also changed from English style to Chinese style. It could be claimed that these two processes occurred in parallel. At the time when she perceived that the interactional context of the class was changing, she then also switched her backchannel style perhaps to support that change in classroom dynamic. The tokens of '哎(ai), 好(hǎo), 啊(a)' immediately created a Chinese linguistic world, whereas the 'mm hmm' backchannels between Line 1 to 23 created a world with Chinese content but English interactional style. Such changing interjection tokens achieve the identity as well as pedagogical function, as it may indicate her third identity as a Chinese teacher to the whole class and resituate students to a Chinese linguistic world.

Through several layers of analysis, it can be argued that in this certain interaction, the backchannel is pragmatic, rather than lexical, phonological, since the interactional function is the primary factor, that the instructor was engaging in the communicative action with students, which was question-answer pattern. The basic role of the listener was to signal the speaker that 'I am listening. Keep on speaking' so that the speaker could continue to take the floor, so as to express the idea and develop the next utterance. Thus, the two-party engaging activity could be performed well by the employment of such backchanneling.

Secondly, the pedagogical factor was at play significantly. In a classroom

where a language is taught, the primary goal for the teacher in an American class, is to engage students in the learning process, so that they could get real practice in class and improve their language skills. In this regard, the backchannels as encouragement to students is necessary for the instructor to keep the students talking and practicing.

Even she herself admitted in the interview that she believed American culture should be the dominant perspective of interaction in the class, as the students are from America. As she said in the interview, *'But I think from the perspective of teaching, in interaction, um, you probably should emphasize on American culture, because this is their habit'*, (this was translated from Chinese to English, as the interview was conducted in Chinese), she believes that the American culture should be applied to facilitate classroom interaction. This confirms the intention of her action of changing tokens in this example. On one hand, she bears in mind that she is teaching a Chinese language class, with utterances mainly in Chinese in that a Chinese linguistic as well as cultural world to be created in the classroom. On the other hand, she considers the students' cultural background, and caters to their 'habit' of interacting in American ways, which likely encouraged her to use *'mm hmm'* as a backchannel even when the student was uttering in Chinese, constituting an American interacting world. The two worlds do not negate each other as each emphasizes different facets of behaviors according to its appropriate situations that can be identified within a lecture class , through the use of talk. In this regard, her behavior was in line with

her recognition.

At the same time, that idea could also be considered as accommodation to the students, which further renders the possible functions of negotiating her identity in the process. As this borrowing of the backchannel in her speech is a way for her to adapt to the linguistic aspect of the American culture. Such performances can identify her language ability, as a sojourn Chinese in America, having experienced eight years of teaching and more years spent learning English. This could be a way to demonstrate her proficiency in English, a self-label of somehow westernized sojourn Chinese, by uttering '*mm hmm*'-- the English backchannel while talking in Chinese. This process of self-identifying is somehow out of the cultural assimilation desire, particularly when there is power difference between Chinese culture and American culture here in the U.S. As she currently lives in the U.S., where the American culture serves as the 'host' culture according to Kim (1998), there might be a desire for social-recognition in the host culture. In the observed class, the physical context is a classroom in America at a university setting, with all American students, creating the host culture for her. Although, in hierarchy, she is in a dominant figure as the teacher of the class, in the cultural context, her dominance is less significant within the American world as she is the minority Chinese. Such context may cause her to change communicative behavior to negotiate her identity. Therefore, it is possible that negotiation of her second identity of a sojourn Chinese scholar in the U.S. may be at play in the process too.

Example 2 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction

The second example shows a mixture of English and Chinese backchannels in one topic, which is different from the first example, but with more issues at play. In contrast, when interacting with more students in the second lecture that was recorded, the instructor's backchanneling was often switched back to Mandarin style. The observation was done with the same variables in the same classroom and same students. In this following situation, the instructor was assessing the students' mastery of some vocabulary from the previous lesson, when words in Line 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 in the transcript were all vocabularies shown in the screen in front of them, left to the teacher.

This scene was selected as in this interaction, apart from the '*mm hmm*' tokens, Chinese style of backchanneling appeared too, like '哎(ai), 好(hao)'. In fact, throughout the whole class, there were less '*mm hmm*' used by the instructor. It is speculated that such difference in frequencies of backchannel usage depends on specific situations, where different cultural worlds were being created throughout her lecture. Unlike the first example that dealt with more 'teacher-to-one student' interactions, the second example deals more with the pattern of 'teacher-whole class' interactions. Specific context may require different backchannels with different functions.

Transcript 2:

1. I: 好, (.) 来, 开始了啊.
Okay, come on. Begin.
2. Ss: 口水.

- Saliva.*
- 3. I: Mm hmm?
4. Ss: 菠菜.
Spinach.
- 5. I: Mm hmm?
6. Ss: 不如.
Not...than...
- 7. I: 哎, 大声一点儿, 大声一点.
Ai, a bit louder, a bit louder.
8. Ss: 不如.
Not...than...
9. I: (...)
10. Ss: 味道.
Flavor.
- 11. I: 好.
Okay.
12. Ss: 嫩. (0.5) 嫩.
Tender. Tender.
- 13. I: 好.
Okay.
14. Ss: 四川.
Szechuan.
- 15. I: 好.
Okay.
16. Ss: 正(zhēng)好.
Just right.
- 17. I: 好嘞, 我们说'正(zhèng)好', 对不对?
Okay, we say 'just', right?
- 18. Ss: 正(zhèng)好.
Just right.
- 19. I: Mm hmm.

During the interaction, it could be perceived that the transfers were going on within the interaction. In Line 3 and 5, 'mm hmm' was still used, until Line 7. Here, the process could be tentatively discussed. As it was the beginning of an informal quiz, the first two 'mm hmm' may still be used as continuers, to indicate the students to keep on participating in this group quiz. This is employed for the function of signaling students to keep on going, as a way of encouraging students

to engage in this activity.

However, the students did not seem to engage in this group practice enthusiastically, as in Line 7 the instructor asked them to say the word louder. In fact, there were some students not heard in Line 6. That may be the reason she asked them to speak louder. Right in line 7, she switched back to Mandarin style of '哎 *ai*', and further on in Line 11, 13 and 15, she switched to '好 *hǎo*'. The change of backchannels from English style to Chinese style may serve as a stronger way to encourage students to participate in the activity more by giving them explicit positive acknowledgement in Chinese. As pointed out by Tao and Thompson (2009), Chinese style of backchannel functions more as agreement or understanding, less as continuers. To be more specific, as the situation is a group practice of recognizing the Chinese vocabulary on screen, the backchannel of '好 *hǎo*' here functions as an acknowledgement, meaning 'that's right.', while 'mm *hmm*' may not be strong enough as encouragement to the students to participate. Here, it is claimed that Chinese and English backchannels may function in different degrees of encouragement in this class interaction, with Chinese style being stronger while English ones less so. Since students are accustomed to the English style, they may not be motivated to engage by them. Therefore, the Chinese style of backchannels functions here first of all as a strong evaluation, to assess their performance positively. Moreover, as those backchannels are all positive, or strongly conformational, they further function as motivator by giving a student standing in the class. Whereas backchannels functioning as continuers

invite the recipient to continue his turn, when functioning as a motivator the recipient is activated to participate in the class generally.

At the same time, the change of backchannels also created the Chinese cultural world as well as linguistic world for the students, as in China, group practice is exactly like this: students say the word out loud together, and the teacher use '好 *hǎo*' or '对 *duì*' as acknowledgement or assessment, if they say it right. An upgraded version of such assessments are '很好 *hěn hǎo* (very good)', '不错 *búcuò* (very right)', which would make the students even feel proud if they get feedbacks like that, a very positive assessment. The change of interactional tokens thus switched the learning cultural environment to Chinese too. Under such context, the students may be encouraged to take more active role in answering the informal quiz because the instructor acknowledged their performance by using the Chinese backchannel '好 *hǎo*'. From the pedagogical point of view, this strategy was successful as students did engage more from Line 8 till later.

In Line 19, she switched back again to '*mm hmm*', as the situation changed again. Students in Line 16 did not pronounce the word '正' with the right tone, so she corrected them in Line 17, '我们说正 (*zhèng*) 好' (we say *zhèng hǎo*), by stressing the forth tone of '正'. When the students made it sound right in Line 18, she used '*mm hmm*' in Line 19 again. Here, the '*mm hmm*' might functions at two levels: one is a slight agreement, as if telling the students "You're right this time."; the second function is a continuer to signal 'Keep on going', as there were other words following, such that she might want the students to keep on focusing on the

screen, without jumping out of the quiz mode to interact with her.

Most of her usage of '*mm hmm*' may be out of unconscious use, as she switched back and forth in the above interaction, but detailed analysis may indicate specific situations or contexts, which require different functions of backchannels. She may use more Chinese backchannel as acknowledgement or agreement in a Chinese cultural world, while using '*mm hmm*' as continuer signals in a American cultural world. Similar pattern took place in the following interactions.

Example 3 of English Backchannel in Mandarin Interaction

Another interaction was selected here as both English and Chinese styles of backchannel appeared in the same topic again. But different from the previous one emphasizing more on group discussion, this was 'teacher-to-one student' interaction. This interaction occurred in the same class as in Example 1, when a student (S8) was creating sentences of a newly learned vocabulary, so the instructor was listening to him and helped him complete the sentences too.

The switching between the two styles of backchannel tokens may provide support to the claim that their different functions worked in different situations, as strategies employed by the instructor, in this language teaching class. Specific cultural worlds were created as learning environment to engage students in different ways.

Transcript 3:

1. S8: 我很想买一件毛衣,
(*I really wanted to buy a sweater.*)
- 2. I: [嗯.
(*Mm.*)
3. S8: [可是_(1.5) 不时髦.
(*But, not fashionable.*)
- 4. I: Mm hmm?
5. S8: 于是, 我就-
(*Therefore, I,*)
6. I: =哎, 于是我就不买了啊. (.) 可是 (: :), 毛衣不时髦.
(*Ah, therefore, I didn't buy it. But, the sweater was not fashionable.*)
7. S8: ° 毛衣不时髦. °
(*The sweater was not fashionable.*)
8. S8: 嗯_可以说, 我想买一件毛衣_可是, (0.2) 我的钱不够.
(*Um, can (I) say, I wanted to buy a sweater, but, I don't have enough money*)
- 9. I: Mm hmm?
10. S8: 于是我就不要买?
(*Therefore I didn't buy it?*)
- 11. I: 哎 ↑, 可以啊.
(*Ai, yes.*)

The transfer pattern spotted in this interaction was in fact the opposite to the second interaction; here the instructor adopted Mandarin style backchannels, 嗯(en) in Line 2 and 哎(ai) in Line 11, while transferring in the middle into English backchannels. This pattern may strengthen the pedagogical perspective of pragmatic transfer, as she switched between Chinese and English styles of backchannels, resulting in different levels of motivation or encouragement.

In line 2, after the student successfully uttered the opening sentence in Chinese in Line 1, the instructor's '嗯'(en) functions as one kind of acknowledgement in Mandarin conversation strategy, which has been discussed in the earlier section. While, in line 4, she switched to English backchannel 'mm hmm', which could be perceived as a continuer function, so that the student might

proceed to make the utterance in Mandarin with such signal. That is the same with 'mm hmm' in Line 9. Both of the two tokens function as a continuer, without the intention of taking over the floor until Line 11. It seems she used 'mm hmm' as a way to indicate 'what's more? You are not done yet', while using Chinese backchannels as to say 'okay, you're done. That's right'. In this way, the cultural world of 'Chinese content with American interaction style' was created again, so that the student might be more engaged and be able to interact in his familiar classroom setting. At the same time, this backchannel also functioned in identity work, as 'mm hmm' usage may identify her as a somehow westernized sojourn Chinese who understands Chinese but also knows how to interact with the Americans.

As this practice is to apply the word '于是 *yú shì* (therefore)' to create a sentence, once the student put the word in a right place, he successfully completed the sentence in Line 10. When the student finished the sentences and the instructor might sense the completion and so she switched back to Mandarin tokens of 哎 (*ai*) in Line 10. By switching back to Mandarin tokens, she may also be confirming the student's completion of that task. This change of token may be used to restore her teaching role as she finishes her interaction with certain students and begins to address the whole class. As the Chinese backchannel might indicate the change of situation from a hybrid of Chinese and American cultural world back to a purer Chinese cultural world, which signaled the end of focusing on individual student, it could engage more students in the Chinese learning environment. Because

American students may get used to '*mm hmm*' as American style of interactional tokens, but not so much with those Chinese tokens as illustrated above. When the instructor switched back to Chinese tokens, students may be more aware of that change and be alert to her following utterance or statement. In other words, the Chinese interjection tokens may also function here to attract attention from the rest of the students, as a pedagogical strategy to engage students in group interaction with her.

Such strategy was successfully implemented by the instructor as it seems this had been a pattern for her class interaction. In this sense, the pedagogical pragmatics stood out more in this case.

These three situations are typical in this classroom interaction. In the first lecture, there are more individual interactions where such backchanneling transfers occurred more often. While in the second lecture, when interaction with whole class dominated the classroom interaction, fewer transfers occurred. These three instances represent the classroom situations accurately. Through the inspection of these instances, the context created by specific situations seems to affect her usage of English and Chinese backchannel styles, implementing to the class to different functions by creating different cultural/pedagogical worlds. The language dynamics of cross-lingual behaviors is possible to be subject to cultures. Such instances and comparison provides substantiality to the transfers in the realm of pragmatics, as pedagogy, cultural influence, identification processes may all be

reflected in the backchannel transfers in this study.

As very few past researches focused on the influence from a second language to a first language use, this study may exert certain value in the intercultural linguistic studies. The main factor, one that could not be overlooked, is the context of classroom interaction, so that the pedagogical intention of encourage students to engage in different situations, especially in this intercultural communicative settings, shall be emphasized.

The second factor is the different functions of backchannels in the two languages. As discussed and supported by the examples above, the English backchannel of '*mm hmm*', especially when implemented by this female instructor, mainly functions as a continuer, to signal students to keep on talking, creating a cultural world of American interactional style, so as to engage the students more in 'teacher--to-one student' interactions. The Chinese style of backchannels are used by the instructor to function as acknowledgement or agreement, creating a cultural world of purer Chinese learning environment, but also as a strategy to attract attention from the rest of the students to engage more in 'teacher-whole class' interaction.

The third factor, partly overlapping with pedagogical factor, may be the negotiation of identity. By applying the transfers, the code-switching signifies her bilingual characteristic and further her identity as an experienced Mandarin teacher in the U.S. Her accommodation to the students may be a way to assimilate to the culture. From discussion of those factors, these pragmatic transfers of

backchanneling indeed fit in the context and may render future findings.

Pragmatic Transfer

Pragmatic transfer discussed in this study emphasizes on the transfers from the second language, which is American English here, to the first language, Chinese in this case. The pragmatic transfers occurs in this case, not in the form of code-switching, but more on the pattern level of rituals and syntax, which were less explored in previous studies. In the data, most of the cases were uttered in Chinese, but within English sentence structures or rituals, which are completely absent in Chinese culture or grammar. It will be suggested that such transfers may also be out of the pedagogical purpose, accommodating American students so as to help them understand better what the instructor meant. Moreover, the cultural element and the identity negotiation are influencing such pragmatic transfers too.

In this classroom interaction collected from the data, normal style of pragmatic transfer occurred numerous times as code-switching. However, several contacts of transfers stood out as different from normal styles of Chinese influencing English, and rather, the opposite. In the following cases, the influence between Chinese and English are proved to be mutual, bidirectional, instead of single-directional.

Transfer of '周末快乐(happy weekend)'

This scene happened at the end of one lecture, which were recorded but not video-taped. In this example, the instructor said 'happy weekend' in both Chinese and English, as a way of saying 'have a nice weekend' before the lecture ended, with one student responding to her right after. It is significant as the ritual of leave-taking such as 'have a nice day' or 'have a nice weekend' is nonexistent in Chinese culture, yet is a common leave-taking in the American culture. This example demonstrates the PAT transfer at different levels as ritual is borrowed from English to Chinese, but syntax was transferred into a hybrid of two sets of grammars, which lead to complexity of this case. It is claimed that such transfers may create different cultural worlds with the possible function of pedagogy in this case.

Transcript 4:

- 1. I: 其他人下课, 再见. (0.3) 周末快乐.
All the others, class dismissed. Goodbye. Happy weekend.
- 2. Happy weekend.
- 3. S: °周末快乐. °
Happy weekend.

(The instructor called some names in the class, asking them to stay to have a talk with her after class, so she told the rest of the students that class was over)

This case attracted the researcher's attention as there are multiple levels of transfers taking place in this seemingly short interaction, leading to complicated, hybrid cultural worlds the instructor creates in her language usage.

The leave-taking form of '周末快乐(*zhōumò kuaī lè*)' ('周末' means weekend; '快乐' means 'happy') is transferred to the instructor's Chinese, as there is

neither such a ritual nor specific expression to wish others to have a good weekend in Chinese culture. While, in English speaking culture, it is considered as interactional courtesy to say 'have a good day' or 'have a nice weekend' before departing with friends. Like in this case, it is the last class in this week, a Thursday, before that weekend. Therefore, an American teacher may tend to say that to students at the end of the class, as it is considered as a departing situation.

However, such a ritual leave-taking expression is almost completely absent in Chinese culture. When people depart with each other in China, they probably will say 'zǎ jiàn' or 'xià jiàn', which means 'goodbye', and 'see you next time'. At the end of a regular class in China, the teachers usually would announce 'xià kè', which means 'class dismissed' and then leave the classroom. This way of announcing 'class is over' is a ritual in traditional Chinese class.

The full routine of a class in China will be: in the beginning of the class, the teacher will come into the classroom, standing behind the front table and say '上课! *shàng kè* (class begins!), then the class monitor would say out loud '起立! *qǐ lǐ* (stand up!). The students will all stand up behind their desks and bow to the teacher, saying '老师好 *lǎo shī hǎo*' (老师--teacher, 好 --good), as a greeting to the teacher. The teacher would nod the head and say '同学们好 *tóng xué men hǎo*' (同学们--students, 好--good) as a greeting back. Then, the teacher would say '请坐 *qǐng zuò* (sit down please), and the students will all sit down and the class begins afterwards. At the end of the class, the teacher will say '下课! *xià kè* (class dismissed!), and the class monitor would say out loud '起立! *qǐ lǐ* (stand up!) again.

The students will all stand up again and bow to the teacher, saying '老师再见 *lǎo shī za jì àn* ' (老师--teacher, 再见--goodbye). Then the teacher would nod the head and say '同学们再见 *tóng xu é m én za jì àn* ' (同学们--students, 再见--goodbye) and leaves the classroom. This routine is to show respect to the teachers, a tradition originated from the Confucius thought of paying homage to teachers. Such routine is exactly followed in primary school classes, but less so in secondary school or college classes, as simplifying with only '上课! *shàng kè* ' (class begins) in the beginning and '下课 *xià kè* ' (class dismissed) in the end.

It seems that the instructor kept this routine, to some extent, in saying '下课 *xià kè* ' (class dismissed) at least, thus creating a cultural world of traditional Chinese classroom. Therefore, this ritual is borrowed from Chinese cultural to this physical classroom in Amherst. This ritual transfer preset the following 'happy weekend'.

The instructor's utterance of '周末快乐 (*zhōumò kuaī lè*)', which means 'happy weekend', is a way of expressing the idea of 'have a good weekend'. To her, this may be a ritual that she has got used to, which is influenced by the American culture. It is a ritual that she has been accustomed to after being exposed to the culture for many years. This is the PAT borrowing, as only the concept of the ritual of leave-taking phrase is borrowed here, but not the exact language translation. In other words, this is not code-switching taking place in Line 1 in transcript 4, as the whole line kept consistency in Chinese. However, the usage of '周末快乐 *zhōumò kuaī lè* ' by the instructor is definitely influenced by English language usage in light

of the ritual concept being absent in Chinese. Therefore, this is the first level of transfer.

On the second level, the influence from Chinese on her language is at the same time, significant. As mentioned in the previous part, in Chinese, there is no such saying as 'have a good weekend'. Thus, the direct translation of 'have a good weekend' would be very uncommon, or even absurd in Chinese interaction. While, other similar expressions exist and can be compared to Chinese usage, such as '生日快乐(*shēngrì kuaī lè*)', which means 'happy birthday', and is used very commonly.

From the grammatical perspective, her usage of '周末快乐(*zhōumò kuaī lè*)' is similar in style with '生日快乐 *shēngrì kuaī lè*, or '周年快乐 *zhōunián kuaī lè*(happy anniversary)', which could be defined as '**event + happy**' structure in Chinese. These two examples mentioned above exist both in Chinese and English with such structure. She probably adopts this structure to create the Chinese version of 'have a good weekend' --- '周末快乐(*zhōumò kuaī lè*)'.

What is more, she did not simply transferred 'happy weekend' in Line 1, instead, she used the English translation of that Chinese structure in Line 2---'Happy weekend'. Both of the two language usage (周末快乐 *zhōumò kuaī lè* or Happy weekend) are rare in the two languages respectively (as 'happy weekend' does not occur in English, but always 'have a good/nice weekend'). To English speakers, 'happy weekend' may probably be made sense to some extent to them, though they will not say so; to Chinese, '周末快乐 *zhōumò kuaī lè* is surely absurd

upon hearing, but might be made some sense to those who have been exposed to the American culture before.

This reflects the mutual influence and pragmatic dynamics communications have, especially in cases of bilinguals, between L1 and L2. As bilinguals may be immersed in a cross-lingual environment for long time, and the transfers therefore might be intertwining, instead of solely single-directional as from L1 to L2. There could be more chances when bilinguals are fluent in L2, just as in the case of this instructor, who have been in the U.S. for several years and teaching American Chinese for many years, their usage of language transfers might be two-way. With such transfers, the cultural worlds of both languages will always be constituted.

Also, the context could be one of the factors, as it is a language class with American students learning Chinese. In Line 2, the instructor repeated the same idea with English at the end of her utterance. This kind of repetition may serve as a reinforcement or assertion so that students could understand what the instructor said in Chinese previously, while the reason could be pedagogical as mentioned, as well as intercultural communicational, which is to avoid misunderstandings.

Therefore, that could be considered as the second level of transfer, which is complicated, yet significant in reflecting the mutual influence of ways of communication through pragmatic transfers.

The third level of transfers looks at not the instructor's utterance, but the student's. In Line 3 in transcript 5, a student's response to the instructor's greeting

----'周末快乐(*zhōumò kuaī lè*)' manifests the mutual influence between L1 and L2. First of all, the concept, of saying 'have a good weekend' to others and responding with the same one, is almost a ritual habit for the American student. This form is rooted in her own culture, so it seems that her response is not a transfer. However, in a closer scrutiny, she was following a Chinese grammatical, American-ritualized way of greeting in Chinese (which sounds as complicated as Geertz's thick description style). Since the concept of greeting is natural and in-born to her, it is the Chinese grammatical style that was transferred here. It could be argued that this is another level of PAT borrowing, although this pattern is not completely originated from her first language--English. It may be considered as a secondary-borrowing in this case, as the pattern that was borrowed '周末快乐 (*zhōumò kuaī lè*)' is a transferred one already. The complexity of this case does provide evidence of the mutual force on language pragmatics among bilinguals.

In this case, the transfers are taking place in different levels, grammatical, conceptual rituals, and a combined secondary-borrowing, which reflect the intricacy and intertwining dynamics of communicative behaviors, especially in such inter-lingual situations.

Transfer of '说得很大声(say it loudly)'

Another example occurred in the first lecture recorded where pragmatic transfer took place again. Slightly different from the previous example, such

structure transferred here does exist in Chinese grammar, but not the same usage and function. In other words, the structure is not strange in Chinese syntax, but the place where this structure occurs is uncommon in Chinese. Thus, this incident was also considered as pragmatic transfer. With such transfer, the overlapping worlds of both English and Chinese linguistic styles were constructed on to this particular structure again.

This scene took place in the beginning of a lecture, when the instructor checked students' preview by asking them to tell some new words on screen when they popped up. She instructed them to 'say it loudly and fast'.

Transcript 5:

1. I: 好, 所以你看啊, 我, 我会写一些生词: (.)
Okay, so you see, I, I will screen some new vocabulary,
- 2. 然后你们要说出那个生词. (0.3) 你要大声地,
Then you need to say that new word. You should loudly,
- 3. 很快地说出那个生词是什么. 懂不懂我的意思?
quickly say what that new word is. Do you understand me?
4. S: °懂°. °
°Yes°.
- 5. I: °Mm hmm° (0.8) 所以你要说得很大声, (0.5) >你要<说得很快.
Mm hmm, so you need to say it loud. You need to say it quickly.
6. 所以你要一直看这儿.
So you need to look at it here all the time.
7. 好吗? Are you ready? 准备好了吗? Ready?=
Okay? Are you ready? Are you ready? Ready?
8. S: =(...)
9. I: 好.
Okay.

In this interaction, Line 2, 3 and 5 should be highlighted as pragmatic

transfer of PAT borrowing occurred, with slight difference however, in that the grammar of this transferred part is not absent in Chinese grammar, but not quite often in the usage either. In Line 2 and 3, when the instructor gave instruction of 'say it loudly and fast' for the first time, she put them in Chinese:

Pinyin	dàshēng de hěn kuài de shuō
Character	大 声 地, 很 快 地 说
Word-to-word	Loudly ↓ very quickly ↓ to say
	'地' is the functional particle connecting the adverbs and verb
Free translation:	<i>say it loudly and quickly</i>

This is authentic, normal-use and correct in Chinese grammar, where adverbs are put in front of verbs, and are connected by '地' in between. This '地' is a functional particle with specific usage of connecting adverbs and verbs, to emphasize the verb as an action, either done or not. Usually, when such instruction is carried out in a Chinese way, it should be addressed in that structure.

However, after confirming with students on Line 3, the instructor repeated the same idea again, but with different structure. In Line 5, she used '你要说得很大声 (nǐ yào shuō de hěn dàshēng)' which means 'you need to say it loudly'. The structure of '说得很大声 shuō de hěn dàshēng (say it loudly)' is illustrated as follows:

Pinyin	shuō de hěn dà shēng
Character	说 得 很 大 声
Word-to-word	to say ↓ very loudly
	'得' is another functional particle connecting the adverbs and verb
Free translation:	<i>say it loudly</i>

Here, the structure of '说得很大声 shuō de hěn dàshēng (say it loudly)' is

first of all, also in existence in Chinese grammar, where verbs are put forward, in front of a degree adverb '很 *hěn*' (which means 'very') and a regular adverb, and then connected by '得 *de*' in the middle. This '得' is a functional particle with exact usage of connecting verbs and adverbs as in this structure, with a stress on the adverb as a state of how that action was done. Therefore, the difference is that '**adverb** + 地 + **verb**' structure emphasizes the verb as an action, while '**verb** + 得 + **adverb**' structure emphasizes on the adverb as a state and usually the action was done. In this case, the first structure should be adopted in instruction in Chinese utterance.

On the other hand, in English grammar, the usual structure of adverbs modifying verbs is '**verb** + **adverb**', such as 'listen attentively', or 'did it perfectly', etc. This structure is in resemblance to the second Chinese structure. In this regard, when the instructor repeated 'say it loudly' in Line 5, this adoption of '**verb** + 得 + **adverb**' structure could be considered as a pragmatic transfer, with half borrowing, as that grammar structure exists in Chinese, but not same usage as in English.

The explanation might be, most importantly, pedagogical strategy, to make sure student could understand their task and complete it. As could be notice in Line 4, there was only a very quiet response from the students. With the almost little feedback, she might have the intention to stress her instruction one more time. Also, the cultural factor should not be ignored, as she could be aware that all her students are Americans, she might cater to their habit of hearing quasi-English style grammar, so that the instruction could reach more understanding among them.

Therefore, this transfer here is out of pragmatics of language use.

At the same time, the culture worlds were constituted. As she was speaking Chinese, this was the basic cultural world existing. When she implemented the quasi-English style grammar of '说得很大声 *shuō de hěn dàshēng* (say it loudly)' in the place, an English syntactic world was constructed onto the Chinese linguistic world. The hybrid of the two linguistic worlds echoed with the general background of cross-lingual communication in this Chinese language class in America.

Examples from Ethnographic Observation

Similar incidents happened some other time during the whole observation too, not quite often, but still significant to be noted down by the researcher. Two additional examples will be illustrated below from the notes of ethnographic observation of the instructor's classroom interaction. They are examples of pragmatic transfers occurring at the syntax level or ritual level, which are closely related to the previous occasions when both English and Chinese linguistic worlds were hybrid in such transfers, with pedagogical purpose of helping students to command particular linguistic feature in Chinese or to understand her instructions, as a way of accommodating American students.

Add. Example 1: Once, very similar as '说得很大声' (say it loudly), the instructor used such a structure when she was teaching students how to pronounce

the fourth tone. As the tone is a linguistic feature that is absent in English, the American students had a hard time to say it right. She then told the students to say the word very angrily:

‘如果四声读不好，就读得很生气，sù shè, 来，宿舍。’

(If you could not pronounce the fourth tone well, you say the word angrily.

'sùshě, come on, 'dorms'.)

Pinyin	dú	de	hěn	shēng qì
Character	读	得	很	生气
Word-to-word	to read	↓	very	angrily

'得' is another functional particle connecting the adverbs and verb

Free translation: *read it angrily*

This is the same structure as '说得很大声'(say it loudly), also similarly awkward in Chinese, as Chinese would say '很生气地读' (angrily read it) using the '地' structure mentioned above, putting the adverb in front of the verb.

Add. Example 2: In another course of the same instructor, a similar transfer occurred too. It was observed without video or audio recording, so the notes were taken down by the researcher. When she told the students to put their names on a sheet signing for presentation assignment according to their time available, she said in Chinese:

‘如果你想先做，就把名字放在前面’ (*if you want to present first, just put the name in the front part of the sheet.*) The direct translation, word by word, is as follows:

如果	你	想	先	做，	就	把	名字	放	在	前面。
<i>If</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>want</i>	<i>first</i>	<i>do,</i>	<i>just</i>	<i>Particle.</i>	<i>name</i>	<i>put</i>	<i>Prep.</i>	<i>front.</i>

The key word that arouse attention was '放' (*fàng*), which means 'put'. This is a direct translation from English to Chinese, as the structure of 'put the name on...' is common and grammatically correct in English. However, in Chinese, it is not the case. '放' will never be used in situations like that. The usual verb should be '写' (*xiě*, which means 'to write'), and it is almost the exclusive verb that could be used here, which will be '就把名字写在前面' (write the names in the front part).

These two incidents can also be ways of accommodating American students, as such structures were borrowed from English ones, which the students are most familiar with. Thus, the Chinese world is the language class, while the English style linguistic world that was constituted by such communicative behavior situated the students with better understanding of the instructor's instruction. Therefore, the hybrid worlds of both Chinese and English linguistic cultures are out of pedagogical purpose.

Moreover, they can both be considered as PAT borrowing, as they were borrowed from the second language and used in the first language by the instructor. When directly translated into Chinese and put in English, it might be easier for the students to understand the instructions. In addition, the strategy could be interpreted as another perspective of pedagogical application. The teacher's responsibility is to think from students' position, background and even culture to find the best ways of teaching so that they can learn the target language better. Therefore, the PAT borrowing here is pragmatic transfer, from the second language

to the first language.

At the same when such phenomena were studied, a similar case happening to one of my friends, a Chinese girl who has been a Chinese language teaching assistant in a university in New York for two years, was recalled. She told me once when she was with some Chinese friends, she said '我看不到' (*wǒ kàn bú dào*, 'I don't see it'), when one of the friends said something she did not understand. It took her a while to realize that she was saying this Chinese in an English way, which put her friends in puzzlement, because such usage is completely absent in Chinese. In the phrase, '我' means 'I', '看到' means 'see', '不' means 'do not', so '看不到' means "don't see". However, the right version should be '我不明白' (*wǒ bù míng bái*) or '我不懂' (*wǒ bù dǒng*), where '明白' and '懂' both mean 'to understand'. The direct translation of 'I don't see it' is uncommon and a misuse in Chinese, as connotation between 'see' and 'understand' does not exist in the Chinese language.

There are similarity and difference between this case and the instructor's examples. They are similar as this is a transfer from L2 to L1 too, a direct translation from English style to Chinese. But the context or situation is different as in the instructor's cases, she was interacting with American students, in a classroom, for which the accommodation and pedagogical strategy seems to offer accounts. While, for my friend, she was with other Chinese, not in a class, and it was obvious that she was unconscious of the utterance when that was spoken. This

PAT borrowing is the grammatical mapping level of transfer, where cultural forms or expression has been transferred to another language. Such phenomenon is interesting to spot yet complicated, but not enough for patterns to seek. Similar phenomena will continually be explored for future research.

So far, these cases illustrated above are pragmatic transfers from the second language to the first language and later on talks about how some secondary borrowing occurs from transferred ones. Such intricacy thus provides evidence to the communication dynamics and pragmatic perspective in specific contexts. Social, communicative meanings of pragmatic transfers that show the constitutive nature of strategy in speech are the primary functions. Yet, these levels of conceptual, pedagogical, culturally communicative perspective are all possibly explanations for such pragmatic transfers.

Conceptual transfers take on the rituals as a linguistic convention from the second language, which is inexistent in the native language. This kind of borrowing is compelling in that even when the same language is used, the speaker creates a hybrid world where two languages and its cultures co-exist in expression; moreover the hybrid world takes the conventional practices from one culture and the morphological or phonological shape from another.

The pedagogical factor is obvious in that, such transfers, or borrowing, made student easier to accept and understand the meaning of such expression, so that they could better apply the ideas into practice. Such accommodation to

students is plausible for teachers to reach in interaction with students.

Likewise, the intercultural communicative aspects are just as important, because the instructor is Chinese and is teaching American students, the culture difference should not be neglected. In fulfilling accommodation or assimilation to the host culture, the borrowing of linguistic traits helps to improve the efficiency of communication process.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

Language is always changing, especially in the terms of cross-lingual communication, because different ways of communication constantly influence each other's social, cultural facets. The cultural influence towards language could be perceived through the strategies implemented by the instructor in ways of how she communicated and interacted with her students. Just as Wittgenstein's notion of "meaning is using", such usages of language, no matter how nuanced they are, are forms of language games, with meanings created and understood in the process of using. The discussed examples also show how ways of communication are situated in contexts, with specific forms and specific functions manifested in the usage. On the other hand, the mutual influence of language and culture are manifested through the process of extracting application of borrowing and transferring strategy with different settings. After much scrutiny of the two types of contact phenomena in linguistic borrowings of the instructor's interaction with the Mandarin class, the dynamics of language can further be discovered and proved by distinctive linguistic behaviors.

The backchanneling borrowing from English that is woven into Chinese interaction, the pragmatic transfers of rituals, and the grammatical usage from English to Mandarin, all show the constitutive nature of communication, as well as the 'language games' played in this classroom. Evidence from this study showed

that such communicative behaviors with pedagogical factors do encourage students to engage activity in classroom interactions. Furthermore, intercultural aspects of accommodation to American students (which might be overlapping with pedagogical perspective) and assimilation to the American cultural has also been explored. Accommodation and assimilation to the American culture are further explained in this observation as to adopt backchanneling strategy or greeting rituals, the negotiation of identity, and performing as a sojourn Chinese language teacher in America with both Chinese and English language characteristics presented, were all tentatively discussed to offer account of the occurrence of such phenomena. However, further issues can be factored in that might generate different results may also come out for future exploration.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTS

Transcript 1:

I: Instructor S1: student 1

28 I: 噢, 你倒说一下.

(Oh, you can say something.)

29 S1: Um, (0.9) 我最喜欢吃 (0.8) 北京烤鸭.

(Um, I like eating Peking Duck the most.)

→ 30 I: Mhm?

31 S1: ° Um, 最喜欢吃的° (…)/(0.9). 又, (0.5) 因为, (0.5) 北京烤鸭又 (0.5) 嫩(.)

(Um, the favorite food...Also, because Peking Duck is tender)

32 (.) 又香

(and savory.)

→ 33 I: Mhm?

34 ? : (2.2) ((cough))

35 S1: 北京烤:鸭的, (2.0)° 北京°, (2.8) 味道:::味道是 (0.6) 油:::?

(The flavor of Peking Duck, Peking...The flavor is oily.)

→ 36 I: Mhm?

37 S1: 我也喜欢吃:::寿司.

I also like eating sushi.

→ 38 I: Mhm?

39 S1: Um,/(1.0)

40 ? : °Sushi°

→ 41 I: °m:h:m°

42 S1: 寿司, (1.5) 很, (1.3) 很::清蒸, 也很[::

Sushi is very, very steam, and also very,

43 I: [清, 清什么?清淡吗?

Cl, clear?

44 S1: 清:::清淡.

Cl, clear.

→ 45 I: Mhm?

46 S1: 清:清淡. 也很::新鲜.

Cl, clear and also very fresh.

→ 47 I: Mhm?

48 S1: 所以, (0.5)um_(3.0)寿司::的_(1.3)味道_(1.0)有点儿咸.

So, the flavor of sushi is a bit salty.

→ 49 I: Mhm?

50 S1: 寿司_(1.3)寿司_(1.4)不如_(1.4)北京烤鸭_(1.4)便宜.

Sushi, sushi is not as cheap as Peking Duck.

51 I: 好的, (0.5)好的. (.)还有吗?

Okay, okay, what else?

52 ? ° 没有问题°

No.

53 I: 哎, 没有了, 啊, 好, 啊, (.)好. (0.2)还有问题没有?

Nope, ah, good. Other questions?

54 ? ((silence))

Transcript 2:

I: Instructor Ss: students S1: student 1 S(n): Student N

1. I: 好, (.)来, 开始了啊.

Okay, come on. Begin.

2. Ss: 口水.

Saliva.

→ 3. I: Mhm?

4. Ss: 菠菜.

Spinach.

→ 5. I: Mhm?

6. Ss: 不如.

Not...than...

7. I: 哎, 大声一点儿, 大声一点.

Ai, louder, louder.

8. Ss: 不如.

Not...than...

9. I: (...)

10. Ss: 味道.

- 11. I: *Flavor.*
好.
Okay.
12. Ss: 嫩. (0.5) 嫩.
Tender. Tender.
- 13. I: 好.
Okay.
14. Ss: 四川.
Szechuan.
- 15. I: 好.
Okay.
16. Ss: 正好.
Just right.
17. I: 好嘞, 我们说'正好', 对不对?
Okay, we say 'just', right?
18. Ss: 正好.
Just right.
- 19. I: Mhm.

Transcript 3:

1. S8: 我很想买一件毛衣,
(I really wanted to buy a sweater.)
- 2. I: [恩.
(Mm.)
3. S8: [可是_(1.5) 不时髦.
(But, not fashionable.)
- 4. I: Mm huh.
5. S8: 于是, 我就-
(Therefore, I,)
6. I: =哎, 于是我就不买了啊. (.) 可是 (: :), 毛衣不时髦.
(Ah, therefore, I didn't buy it. But, the sweater was not fashionable.)
7. S8: ° 毛衣不时髦. °
(The sweater was not fashionable.)
8. S8: 嗯_可以说, 我想买一件毛衣_可是, (0.2) 我的钱不够.
(Um, can (I) say, I wanted to buy a sweater, but, my money was not enough)
- 9. I: Mhm.
10. S8: 于是我就不要买?
(Therefore I didn't buy it?)
- 11. I: 哎 ↑, 可以啊.
(Ai, yes.)

Transcript 4

- 1. I: 其他人下课, 再见. (0.3) 周末快乐.

All the others, class dismissed. Goodbye. Happy weekend.

2. I: Happy weekend.
→ 3. S: °周末快乐.°
Happy weekend.

Transcript 5

110929 L1-1 00:00:55

1. I: 好, 所以你看啊, 我, 我会写一些生词: (.)
Okay, so you see, I, I will screen some new vocabulary,
→ 2. 然后你们要说出那个生词. (0.3) 你要大声地,
Then you need to say that new word. You should loudly,
→ 3. 很快地说出那个生词是什么. 懂不懂我的意思?
Quickly say what that new word is. Do you understand me?
4. S: °懂.°
Yes.
→ 5. I: °Mm hmm°(0.8)所以你要说得很大声, (0.5) >你要<说得很快.
Mm hmm, so you need to say it loud. You need to say it quickly.
6. 所以你要一直看这儿.
So you need to look at it here all the time.
7. 好吗? Are you ready? 准备好了吗? Ready?=
Okay? Are you ready? Are you ready? Ready?
8. S: =((...))
9. I: 好.
Okay.

Interview Rough Transcript

R: 然后, 在...你觉得在课上哪一种文化应该处于主导地位?

I: 这个我觉得很难说。恩, 如果是从学习方面来看, 当然中国文化是一个主导。因为你需要让他们接触, 让他们知道中国人是怎么生活的, 他们的想法是怎么样, 他们的交流是怎么样。但是从教学方式来讲, 你需要以美国文化为主, 毕竟这是他们的习惯。也就是说, 如果你不了解他们的文化, 你在引导他们, 你在教的时候, 或者你在鼓励的时候, 都会出现一些失误。

R: 比如……?

I: 就比如说你说‘你应该做什么什么’, 那美国孩子就说‘我不做你能把我怎么样?’但是, 当然我们中文课学的是中国文化, 所以你要, 我觉得你要, 要看, 要分是从什么方面来讲。

R: 就内容上, 以及形式上, 这两个着重点是不一样的。

I: Mm hum. 但是我觉得从教学方面, 我觉得从 *interaction*, 互动方面, um, 可能你还是要以, 重一些美国的文化。因为这个是他们的习惯。

(But I think from the perspective of teaching, in interaction, um, you probably should emphasize on American culture, because this is their habit.)

R: 就你在互动上会以美国, 美国文化的方式来, 互动?

I: 对。因为, 我自己比较喜欢看美国的电视剧, 我比较了解他们的一些风格。

比如说他们开玩笑的方式，他们怎么挖苦别人，这些我觉得都可以，用他们的一些方式。这样，第一对课堂教学的气氛比较有帮助。然后呢，也可以帮助他们更好地练习。我觉得是这样子。所以上课如果跟他们开一点玩笑的话，如果你是中文的那种玩笑，他们可能都不太理解。但是如果你用他们习惯的一种方式，他们可能觉得，噢，老师也很有意思啊，并不是一个老古董什么的。

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

I. Reflection of interaction

1. How often do you ask your students to speak Chinese in class? Why do you want them to do so?
2. How often do you usually switch to English during the class, and why?
3. How often do you use gestures in lectures/discussions? Do you think gestures help you communicate with students?
4. How much English do you put in your power point slides? Why?
5. Do you feel it difficult to interact with students in Chinese? Are there any factors influencing the process, like students' level of Chinese?
6. Do you feel it difficult to interact with students in English? Why?
7. Do you think your interaction with them lives up to your expectation? Why?

II. Culture and Identity Negotiation

8. Do you encounter culture difference in your interaction with your students? If yes, what are they?
9. How do you deal with such difference, or sometimes, culture shocks?
10. Which culture do you think should be dominant in class? Why?
11. Do you think you have achieved that (related to question 10)?
12. After coming to the U.S., have you noticed any change, behavioral or verbal, in yourself, that is different than before you came here?
13. How would you identify yourself now?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999). Transcript notation-structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis. *Aphasiology*, 13(4), 243-249.
- Benjamin Bailey. (2010) "Language, power, and the performance of race and class" *Multiracial Americans and Social Class: The Influence of Social Class on Racial Identity*.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2007. Multilingual Forms of Talk and Identity Work. In Peter Auer and Li Wei (eds.), *Multilingualism*. pp. 341-370. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2002. *Language, Race, and Negotiation of Identity: A Study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Bailey, Benjamin. (2000). "Language and Negotiation of Ethnic/Racial Identity among Dominican Americans." *Language in Society* 29:555-582.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2000d. "Social and Interactional Functions of Code Switching among Dominican Americans." *Ipra Pragmatics* 10.2 :165-193.
- Bartos, H. (2008). Chinese Syntax and Semantics [special issue]. *Linguistic Review*, 25(3-4), 231-502.
- Bu, J. (2010). A study of pragmatic transfer in compliment response strategies by Chinese learners of English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(2), 121-129.
- Bucholtz, Mary, & Kira Hall (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4-5):585-614
- Carbaugh, Donal. (1996). *Situating Selves: The Communication of Social Identities in American Scenes*. Albany: State University of New York Press. pp. 3-34; 141-153.
- Carey, James (1975). 'A Cultural Approach to Communication'. *Communication*, Vol.2, 1975, 1-22.
- Chang, Y. (2009). How to say no: An analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Language Sciences*, 31(4), 477-493.

- Charmaz, K. (2004). Grounded Theory. In *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice*. pp.496-521. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ching-yi Tien. (2009). Conflict and accommodation in classroom codeswitching in Taiwan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 12(2), 173-192.
- Clancy, P. M., Thompson, S. A., Suzuki, R., & Tao, H. (1996). The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics: An Interdisciplinary Monthly of Language Studies*, 26(3), 355-387.
- Erickson, Frederick. (2004). *Talk and Social Theory: Ecologies of Speaking and Listening in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Field, F. W., & Comrie, B. (2002). *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.
- Filppula, M. (1990). Substratum, superstratum, and universals in the genesis of hiberno-english. *Irish University Review: A Journal of Irish Studies*, 20(1), 41-54.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1973). "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture". In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 3-30.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982a). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Languages and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hall, Bradford 'J' (1998). "Understanding *Rituals in Everyday Life*," in J. Martin, T. Nakayama, & L. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in Cultural Contexts*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, pp. 172-179
- Heinz, B. (2003). Backchannel responses as strategic responses in bilingual speakers' conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(7), 1113.
- Hsu, C. (2010). Acculturation and communication traits: A study of cross-cultural adaptation among Chinese in America. *Communication Monographs*, 77(3), 414-425.

- Kecskes, I. (2006). The dual language model to explain code-switching: A cognitive-pragmatic approach. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 3(3), 257-283.
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Xu, Z. (2002). Chinese pragmatic norms and 'China English'. *World Englishes: Journal of English as an International and Intranational Language*, 21(2), 269-279.
- Kim, Y. Y. (1988). Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: an integrative theory. Clevedon /Philadelphia: Short Run Press
- Kjellmer, G. (2009). Where do we backchannel?: On the use of mm, mhm, uh huh and such like. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(1), 81-112.
- Kroskrity, Paul. (2001). Identity. Duranti (ed.) *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Bath: Blackwell Publisher. pp. 106-109.
- Kuang-ming, W. (2010). "Let Chinese thinking be Chinese, not Western": Sine Qua Non to Globalization. *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, 9(2), 193-209.
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2011). Negotiation style, speech accommodation and small talk in sino-western business negotiations: A Hong Kong case study. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 197-226.
- Lindlof, Thomas R. & Taylor, Bryan C.(2002). Qualitative Analysis and Interpretation. *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. 2nd ed. 209-246. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Languages and social identity* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Marian, V., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). Cross-linguistic transfer and borrowing in bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28(2), 369-390.
- Matras, Y., & Sakel, J. (2007). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2005). Validity. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. 2nd ed. 105-116. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Monk, Ray. (2005). How to Read Wittgenstein. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

- O'Connell, D. C., & Kowal, S. (2005). Uh and um revisited: Are they interjections for signaling delay? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 34(6), 555-576.
- Purnell, T. C., & Yaeger-Dror, M. (2010). Accommodation to the locally dominant norm: A special issue. *American Speech*, 85(2), 115-120.
- Saito, H., & Beecken, M. (1997). An approach to instruction of pragmatic aspects: Implications of pragmatic transfer by American learners of Japanese. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 363-377.
- Sanchez, T. (2008). Accountability in morphological borrowing: Analyzing a linguistic subsystem as a sociolinguistic variable. *Language Variation and Change*, 20(2), 225-253.
- Shi, D., & Zhu, Z. (1999). The Influence of English on the Written Chinese Syntax in Hong Kong. *Wai Guo yu/Journal of Foreign Languages*, 4(122), 2-11.
- Tottie, G. (2011). Uh and um as sociolinguistic markers in British English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 16(2), 173-197.
- Tracy, Karen. (2002). Talk and Identity. *Everyday Talk: Building and Reflecting Identities*. New York & London: The Guilford Press pp. 17-20
- Tran, G. Q. (2007). The nature of pragmatic and discourse transfer in compliment responses in cross-cultural interaction. *Linguistics Journal*, 2(3), 167-205.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yuan-shan Chen, Chun-yin, D. C., & Miao-Hsia Chang. (2011). American and Chinese complaints: Strategy use from a cross-cultural perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 253-275.
- Zhu, H. (2011). A probe into Chinese learners: negative cultural transfer in EFL. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 212-215.