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Abstract

With China’s rapid growth and economic power, its language has gained popularity among non-Chinese speakers, and the demand for Chinese language education has increased. However, the increased interest in Chinese language education is not reflected in the amount of research conducted in the area of Chinese as a second language (CSL) and Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) (Kecskes, 2013). Furthermore, Duff et al. (2013) noted that most of the studies conducted in the area of CSL and CFL drew from a cognitive orientation and called for studies from a social perspective.

In an attempt to fill this gap, the present study adopted an ethnographically-oriented approach that aimed to study the relationship between language learning and identity construction. This 10-week ethnographic study that focused on three CSL learners at an Intensive Mandarin Learning program located in Northern Taiwan. The theoretical framework for this study was a sociocultural integrative approach that combined Vygotskian (1978) sociocultural theory and Schieffelin and Ochs’ (1986a, 1986b) language socialization theory, which sees one’s identity as developed through both co-construction in social interactions and active internalization. The research questions for the study are as follows: (1) What are the culturally produced artifacts (dialogue, concepts, belief systems, ideologies, etc.) available in the environment that serve as either constraints or affordances to learners’ identity construction? (2) How identity is simultaneously formed through the learner’s active internalization of the cultural resources available in the environment and co-constructed with others in social interactions in the second language (L2) community?
To provide insight into the research inquires, the study utilized Fairclough’s three-tier critical discourse analysis (CDA), and adopted narrative-based analysis and thematic analysis from Josselson (2014) and Gibson and Brown (2011). Through the analysis of multiple sources of data including classroom observations, audio-recordings of classroom interactions, audio-recorded semi-structured interviews, and observational field notes, the study identified several cultural artifacts that had the potential to serve as symbolic means that form learners’ identity. However, not every cultural resource acted as a mediated tool. The study discovered three main available cultural resources that act as symbolic means and mediated language learners’ identities: the language ideologies developed in the teacher’s classroom instructions and interactions, the social interaction and dialogue with native speakers in various contexts, and learners’ personal history and life experience.

In response to the second research question, one of the key findings in this study was that language learners can form their desired identities in one context, while in another context their identities may be contradictory to the desired identities. Another important finding was that native speakers beyond the classroom context often given the participants’ identities as language learners, and the second language learner identity could be simultaneously present with a contrasting identity. The other key finding was that language learner’s investment in the classroom activity could be maintained by their active renegotiation of the connection between the classroom activity and her desired identity.

The study concluded by providing implications on L2 pedagogy that suggests teachers should recognize L2 learners’ language needs and desired identities. Teachers
should also develop classroom activities that address L2 learners’ communicative needs, which would serve to develop their communicative competence in specific areas. Further, teachers should be aware of the language ideologies constructed in the classroom and allow room for negotiation of other possible linguistic ideologies that are present in the larger social world.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction

1.1 Background: The Growing Trend of Chinese Language Education and the Need to Understand Chinese Language Learning from a Social Orientation

With China’s rapid economic development in the past years, Chinese has gained popularity and relevancy due to non-Chinese speakers’ interests in learning the language in order to gain access to business opportunities (Duff et al., 2013). The high demand for Chinese language education is evidenced by booming Chinese language institutions around the globe such as the Confucius Institute, which was established in 2004 and now has around 500 Confucius Institutes worldwide (“About Confucius Institution,” 2014).

However, Kecskes (2013) stated that the increased interest in Chinese language education is not reflected in the amount of research conducted in the area of Chinese as a second language (CSL) and Chinese as a foreign language (CFL). He also argued that a strong research background is needed for CSL research. In addition, within the studies of Chinese language education, Duff et al. (2013) noted that most CSL/CFL studies investigated second language acquisition (SLA) from a cognitive orientation instead of from a sociocultural perspective, such as investigating the acquisition of Chinese orthography (Cao et al., 2013; Chang, Xu, Perfetti, Zhang, & Chen, 2014; Guan, Liu, Chang, Ye, & Perfetti, 2011; Peng, Li, & Yang, 1997; Shen, 2005; Zahradnikova, 2016), examining the acquisition of Chinese grammar structures (Wang & Feng, 2014; Xiong, 2013; Xu, 2013; Yao, 2014), and exploring the acquisition of Chinese tones (He, Wang & Wayland, 2016; Rohr, 2014).
In response to Duff et al.’s (2013) request to investigate Chinese language learning from a sociocultural perspective that considers the social, cultural, and affective characteristics of language learning instead of focusing on the acquisition of linguistic elements, Kecskes (2013) raised the issue of the lack of a research base for CSL/CFL studies. Also, since the call for the “social turn” (Block, 2007; Norton Peirce, 1995; Firth & Wagner, 1997) in SLA, the issue of identity has become a topic of interest and has led to a rise in identity research in second language learning. However, there are not many CSL/CFL studies that examine the relationship between language learning and identity construction. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to contribute to CSL/CFL studies from the social perspective and fill the gap in CSL/CFL studies by investigating CSL learner identity development.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The present study examines the cultural resources available in the CSL learners’ environment, and how these cultural artifacts serve as meditational means that form the CSL learners’ identity. Cultural artifacts in the present study are understood within Vygotskian SCT that artifacts refer to both physical and symbolic (e.g. language, beliefs, ideologies, etc.) tools, which are used to mediate individuals’ relationship with the world and with oneself (Lantolf, 2000). The artifacts (both physical and symbolic) are human cultural constructions that mediate human mental activity, and they are considered historical for they existed before their users, and are transformed by the users as they are passed down to the next generation of users (Lantolf, 2000). Different from the physical tools that are directed outwards with the purpose of changing the natural environment, symbolic tools have bi-directional nature that they simultaneously can be directed
outwards to others and can be directed inwards organizing one’s own mental functions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). The theoretical framework that guides the study is based on a proposed sociocultural integrative approach that combines Vygotskian (1978) sociocultural theory (SCT) and Schieffelin and Ochs’ (1986a, 1986b) language socialization theory (LST), which sees one’s identity as developed through both co-construction in social interactions and active internalization. The present dissertation argues that the two theories could compliment each other with respect of exploring the relationship between L2 learning and its influence on language learners’ identities formation. There are some key notions in SCT that serve to compliment LST including mediation, internalization, and genesis. As a theory of mind, SCT places great emphasis on the role of culturally produced symbolic artifacts and how they serve as mediational tool that mediated ones’ identities. Furthermore, SCT’s notion of internalization serve to compliment LST lack of explanation on the agentive role that the newcomers play during the process where they are socialized into new practices. SCT highlights one’s agency in which an individual is not viewed as a passive receiver of the knowledge provided to them as is, but who is agentive and able to transform and have control over the given knowledge. Moreover, SCT is a genetic approach that foregrounds the importance of considering individuals’ genesis (history) in understanding their identities construction processes. However, SCT is believed to have ignored the element of power relations in its theoretical underpinnings (Deters, 2011), while LST acknowledges the importance of examining the inequality of power and knowledge and its influence on the novices’ social interactions. In addition, LST recognizes the critical part that ideologies may contribute to novices’ interactions with others while gaining the ability to participate in the new
community. The present study believes that through the combination of SCT and LST, the integrative sociocultural approach serves as a conceptual framework that is able to understand how the elements of social interactions, the process of language socialization, power relations, and personal history come into play during the construction process of language learners’ identities.

In the past decades, for the studies that investigated the language learners’ identities from the social perspectives examined how the language learners’ negotiated their identities while gaining access and participation in the target language community (McMahill, 1997; Kinginger, 2004; Morita, 2004; Kim 2013; Vasilopoulos, 2015), however, the ways in which how language learners actively change the sociocultural environment are not sufficiently discussed. Through utilizing the proposed integrative approach, the present research aims to provide insights regarding the relationship between the second language learners and the culture worlds by placing emphasis on the bi-directionality between the two that the language learners are changed by the socially and culturally constructed artifacts available to them in the sociocultural environment, at the same time, language learners also transform the artifacts while gaining control over them. Also, the study aims to contribute to the existing research on L2 learners identities and language socialization through examining the relationship between L2 learner agency and language ideologies formed in the classroom, in which the L2 learners do not merely passively receive the language ideologies presented to them as is but are active agents who internalize the language ideologies with the goal of forming their identities. In addition, the study hopes to shed lights on the importance of developing L2 learners critical reflexivity toward the target language regarding what is considered as valued or
unvalued ways of speaking in Mandarin, and how the use of critical reflexivity could help them making sense of the larger sociocultural world and the language classroom as they construct their desired identities.

### 1.3 Organization of the Remaining Chapters

This dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter two presents a review of selected identity theories within the broader sociocultural domain and introduces a sociocultural integrative approach in understanding the relationship between the language learner and the larger social world. The third chapter discusses the purpose of the study and describes the data collection and data analysis procedures, and how the investigation of the study is inspired by the researcher position. Then, the chapter provides a description of the research site and the participants. Chapter four analyzes the teacher’s classroom instructions and uncovers the ideologies and language ideologies constructed in the classroom discourse. Chapter five examines data taken from language learners’ interviews to find out language learners’ identity formation process. The sixth chapter first revisits the research questions and then provides a further discussion on the collected data. Then I discuss the advantages of the study guided by the proposed sociocultural integrative approach, as well as the theoretical and practical limitations of the dissertation. Finally, I provide suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2:

Review of Literature

2.1 Identity Research in SLA and the Larger Sociocultural Domain

As discussed previously, the study of identity and language learning has received increased attention in the field of SLA, and theories within the broader sociocultural domain become the theoretical framework of choice in identity research. Many scholars have provided an overview on theories of identity (Jackson, 2008; Miller & Kubota, 2013; Deters, 2011; Noels, Yashima & Zhang, 2011), and in this section I will continue the discussion by examining selected theories that are placed under the larger sociocultural framework. The selected theories are language socialization theory, poststructuralist theory, community of practice theory, sociocultural theory, and identity negotiation theory. I first discuss how the notion of identity is conceptualized in each theory, and for each theory I review selected identity studies on ESL/EFL adult or young adult language learners. I then provide a discussion on the similarities and differences among the selected theories. Finally, I propose a sociocultural integrative approach that serves as the theoretical framework for my investigation on the CSL learners’ language learning experiences and their construction of identities through the learning processes.

2.2 Language Socialization Theory: Identity as Constructed through Social Interactions

2.2.1 Theoretical Interpretations on LST and Identity

As a branch of linguistic anthropology and developed by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a, 1986b), language socialization theory (LST) was and has become an important theory in SLA research (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo 1986a, 1986b; Watson-Gegeo &
Nielsen, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). LST understands language as integral to one’s social development, thus the theory concerns the “socialization through the use of language” and “socialization to use language” areas of socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b, p. 163). Language socialization is “an interactional display (covert or overt) to a novice of expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting...through their participation in social interactions, children come to internalize and gain performance competence in these sociocultural defined contexts” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, p. 2). There is a criticism that the term “socialization” is unidirectional and that it is overly deterministic in that novices are only involved in the process of reproducing cultural knowledge by imitation without transformation (Prout & James, 1997; Rogoff, 2003; Zentella, 2005). In response to this criticism, Ochs and Schieffelin (2014) noted that their use of “socialization” in “language socialization” was based on Sapir’s (1933) works Language and Culture, Genuine and Spurious (Sapir, 1924) that emphasizes an individual’s consciousness, creativity, and emotions while he or she engages in a cultural activity, as well as sees language as “a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists,” (as cited in Mandelbaum, 1958, p. 15). In other words, language socialization is the process through which language socializes a novice into particular identities through social interactions with those who are more knowledgeable with a particular social group’s systems of knowledge and social order. However, the novice is not a passive recipient of the knowledge but an agentive individual that also shapes the meaning of interactions with other members in a community (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Language socialization theory focuses on the ways in which novices perceive the “context of situation” in relation to the “context of culture” that goes beyond the focus of other
language acquisition research, which typically centers on novice-expert conversation without considering the role of ideologies and semiotic resources in the larger sociocultural context that influences the novice’s interactions with others (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014, p.1). Different from LS, second language (L2) socialization is:

a process by which non-native speakers of a language, or people returning to a language they may have once understood or spoken but have since lost proficiency in, seek competence in the language and, typically, membership and the ability to participate in the practices of communities in which that language is spoken. (Duff, 2014, p. 564)

Duff (2014) understood L2 socialization as the socialization in languages beyond one’s dominant language in diverse contexts including second, foreign, bilingual, or multilingual. As in first language (L1) socialization, L2 socialization refers to the process in which novices with less proficiency in the language are mediated by an expert who is more proficient in the target language and culture (Duff, 2014). Duff (2014) noted it is important to examine L2 socialization with L1 socialization because sometimes it is difficult to decide which language should be regarded as one’s L1 and L2.

Moreover, the process of learning a language is considered a part of a larger process in which an individual becomes a person in a society (Ochs, 2004), and linguistic construction is viewed as a central indicator for one’s social identity. Therefore, Ochs (1993) described social identity as constructed by linguistic structures and stance-taking practices in social interactions. Ochs (1993) believed that individuals perform particular social acts (e.g. making requests) and stances (e.g. epistemic attitudes) to construct their social identity. However, it is important to point out that individuals may also use social
acts and stances to construct their interlocutor’s social identity. Furthermore, Ochs (1993) argued that the relationship between language and social identity is not a direct one but is mediated by the interlocutor’s cultural knowledge regarding the conventions for the verbal acts and stances, and the ways in which these acts and stances serve as cultural resources in forming particular social identities.

2.2.2 Studies on Identity Research in SLA from LST Perspective

The common theme of identity studies in SLA from a LST perspective is to explore the ways in which language learners construct their identity during the process of socialization into particular ways of speaking or acting. Morita (2004) investigated the academic discourse socialization processes of six L2 Japanese female graduate students in a Canadian university. This longitudinal study focused on examining the ways in which L2 learners negotiate competence and their identities in order to gain membership in the L2 classroom community. The data included student self-reports, interviews, and classroom observations. The study drew on the various theoretical perspectives of language socialization, community of practice, and activity theory. Morita’s (2004) central insight is that L2 graduate students construct their identities based not only on their sense of competence as a member of the classroom, but also on their sense of how other students may perceive them. Morita also found that an individual could negotiate different identities based on different classroom contexts. One of the participants, Rie, reported that she viewed herself as a valuable member in one class where she was able to provide insightful comments, however, in another class she believed she was marginalized and ignored. Furthermore, when she displayed her agentive self by stating she had trouble understanding the class content due to instructor’s speed of delivery, the
instructor’s response positioned Rie as a student with a deficit (having a language barrier). Based on the findings, Morita (2004) concluded that the identities the L2 graduate students constructed were situated and at once shaped classroom participation and were shaped by it. Also, Rie’s example demonstrated that the L2 students’ identities were co-constructed and negotiated by both the individual and other members of that community.

Language socialization approach understands the socialization process as bidirectional in that the novice is not only a passive recipient of social knowledge but is also an agentive actor who contributes to the meaning of interactions (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b). Tamly’s (2008) study highlighted the multidirectionality of the language socialization process in relation to language learner identity construction. Talmy (2008) described how English as a Second Language (ESL) students constructed an oppositional ESL student identity that significantly affected the official classroom process at a multilingual public high school in Hawaii. The study explored the multidirectionality of the language socialization process by focusing on the socializing interactions between *oldtimer* ESL students and the *newcomer* teacher. The data for this study included observational field notes, audio-recordings, artifacts, and interviews. The old-timer ESL students identified in the study are defined as people who are familiar with local culture and institutional practices, and who see themselves as different from the newcomer or lower L2 proficiency students. Talmy (2008) argued that the ESL institutional curriculum and practices constituted and produced a particular identity for the ESL students in the institution. The study found that the local ESL students’ constant resistance to participating in the institutional-produced identity of ESL students influenced the
curriculum and classroom practices. The social interactions between the newcomer teachers who attempted to socialize learners into the school-sanctioned ESL student identity and the ESL students who resisted participating in the school-sanctioned identities, resulted in the construction of an alternative ESL student identity that influenced the structure of the teachers’ classroom instructions.

The LST perspective also focuses on how language learners’ identity is shaped through the negotiation of power in social interactions. Kim (2013) examined the process of language socialization of Korean adult ESL learners in a United States ESL program. The study looked at learners from diverse backgrounds to see how the English learning experience influenced their socialization, and how they negotiated their emerging identities as “New-Comers” during the process of gaining social membership in the target language community. Kim (2013) argued that most Korean adult ESL learners had experienced “identity loss” because they had a professional identity in Korea before moving to the United States where they experienced the identity of a “new comer.” This change in identity caused the learners to struggle and had a significant impact on their socialization process. The data collected for this study was comprised of interviews and classroom observations. There were four participants (two females and two males) in the study. The two female learners (Jia and Mirae) were university students in their early twenties, and the two male learners (Dongseok and Hyungsoo) were businessman in Korea and were in their mid-thirties.

In his interview, Dongseok, who came to the United States to pursue his doctoral degree, revealed how his English skill influenced his role as a “new-comer” in the English language community and discussed the discrepancy between his professional
identity in Korea and the “new-comer” identity in the United States. Dongseok also engaged in arguments with a younger Arabic student, Amid, who pointed out areas for improvement on Dongseok’s presentation. Kim (2013) believed the arguments were caused by the new value system in the ESL classroom which were different from the Korean value system where people who are older are treated in particular ways. It is this kind of cultural difference with which Dongseok may have struggle during his socialization process in the American ESL classroom.

Hyungsoo was also a businessman in Korea, whose Korean company sponsored him to go to America to study English. Unlike Dongseok who would explicitly react to other students when he was not treated the way he expected with the goal of maintaining his identity as an older, professional business man, Hyungsoo’s way of protecting his identity was to avoid conflict and to have no further social engagement with others. Jia, who was the youngest student in the ESL class, reported that her American roommate had treated her unfairly in terms of household chores duty, and she believed her lack of English skill had limited her ability to negotiate the situation with the roommate. Mirae was different from the other Korean students who spent most of their time with their Korean classmates. Mirae strategically sat closer to her Arabic classmates, because she expressed that she came to the United States not only with the goal of acquiring English ability, but also to learn about different cultures from other international students. Kim’s (2013) study showed that by moving into a new language community, learners often experienced the negotiation of power and their sense of self within the new social context, and their sense of who they were was shaped through their learning experiences and social interactions with others.
Zappa-Hollman and Duff’s (2015) study drew on the notion of individual network of practice (INop) and the theoretical frameworks of language socialization theory (Duff, 1995, 2003, 2010; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b), community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and social network theory (Milroy, 1987). This study examined how Mexican undergraduate students from Multi-Campus Mexican University (MCMU), who traveled to Western Canadian University (WCU) as exchange students for a few months, were socialized into a new academic discourse through symbolic and material resources. The data source was comprised of biographical and academic data (academic majors, TOEFL scores, grades, etc.), semi-structured interviews, writing logs, tables that showed key people in the students’ social networks, and documents.

The study focused on Liliana, Raquel, and Isabel. Liliana was a fourth-year student at MCMU and she spent the summer term in WCU. Her INoP revealed that her closest friend, Natalia, who was her classmate in MCMU, served as Liliana’s emotional and academic support and played an important role in Liliana’s socialization into the new academic discourse. Their discussions and comparisons of the positive and negative qualities of their instructors at WCU and MCMU, mediated their process of socialization.

Different from Liliana’s INoP that consisted mostly Mexican students, Raquel’s INoP was more diverse in that she was able to interact with people from different cultural backgrounds, which she thought would be a positive experience. However, her experience of working with two Asian students was less than ideal because she found them to be too commanding. Finally, similar to Liliana, Isabel’s INoP revealed the affective and academic support from her friend Nelda who worked with her to understand WCU’s academic discourse, and Isabel’s academic socialization was formed through the
completion of group projects. Isabel faced challenges regarding the mastery of academic English discourse as her assignments were critiqued as having too many language errors. Since the idea of finding someone who was proficient in English to revise her assignments threatened Isabel’s writer’s identity, she sought assistance from a non-Mexican Anglophone speaker instead of from someone who was highly proficient in English. Zappa-Hollman and Duff (2015) argued that INoP analysis offers a more holistic view in terms of the social worlds in which the learners participate, and in combination with language socialization framework, one is able to investigate the social interactions in the learners’ INoP and how these social interactions constructed knowledge and facilitated learners’ socialization into particular academic discourse. Moreover, the study also illustrated that social interactions with peers played a significant role in co-socialization and identity formation.

In short, language socialization perspective considers identity as co-constructed by agents in social interactions, and identity research in SLA from this theoretical approach often focuses on investigating the language-mediated social interactions between the novice and the expert, and how the socialization processes influences the novice’s identity.

2.3 Poststructuralist Theory: Identity as Discursively Constructed

2.3.1 Theoretical Interpretations on PST and Identity

Poststructuralist perspective has significant influence on issues of identity and language in the field of SLA (Block, 2007; Swain & Deters, 2007). From the standpoint of poststructuralist theory (PST), identity, or in PST’s term “subjectivity,” is perceived as constructed and defined through language (Norton, 2014). Weedon (1997), who works
from a feminist poststructuralist tradition, considers language as central during the
construction of one’s sense of self. Weedon (1997) stated, “Language is the place where
actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political
consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of
ourselves, our ‘subjectivity,’ is constructed” (p. 21). According to Norton and McKinney
(2011), Weedon uses the term “subjectivity” to imply a sense of identity fluidity, and to
suggest the relational characteristic of identity that “one is either subject of a set of
relationship” (p. 79) or “subject to a set of relationships” (p. 79).

Language has a prominent role in PST conceptualization of identity development.
Influenced by Weedon’s (1997) view on the aspect of language in the formation of
identity and Bourdieu’s (1977) perspective that “…language is worth what those who
speak it are worth, so too, at the level of interactions between individuals, speech always
owes a major part of its value to the value of the person who utters it” (p. 652). Norton
and McKinney (2011) discussed the intricate relationship between language and language
learners’ identity, stating, “…language itself is not only a linguistic system of signs and
symbols, but also a complex social practice through which relationships are defined,
negotiated, and resisted” (p. 77). Moreover, according to Pavlenko (2002), PST considers
“language as an array of discourses imbued with meaning” (p. 283) and Foucault (1972)
considered the term “discourse” as “practices that systematically form the objects of
which they speak” (p. 49). Thus, language is viewed as “a site of identity construction”
(Pavlenko, 2002, p. 284). In addition, other than language being taken as significant, PST
theorists also consider the relationship between the individual and the larger social world
as central in the process of one’s identity formation. Therefore, Norton (2000) viewed
identity as “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 5).

Norton developed three interrelated concepts that serve to explore the relationship between language learning and identity development. With the goal of complimenting Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) concept of motivation that aims to signal the relationship between language learner identity and language learning commitment, Norton Peirce (1995) proposed the sociological construct of *investment*, which provides a way to investigate learners’ different desires to participate in social practices. Norton and McKinney (2011) suggested that the construct of investment should be understood through Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) notion of *cultural capital*, which refers to symbolic elements such as knowledge, values, and language that characterize different social classes and functions as currency for individuals to navigate in the social world. Norton Peirce (1995) argued that when learners invest in a new language they expect to have a return of gaining access to a broader extent of symbolic resources that will lead to the increase of their cultural capitals.

Norton also developed the notions of *imagined community* and *imagined identities* that are developed in close relation to the concept of investment and are often utilized in identity research in SLA from a SCT perspective. First coined by Anderson (1991) and then developed by Wenger (1998), Norton (2001) extended the concept of imagined communities with the goal of enhancing our understanding on L2 learning and its influence on language learner identity. The construct of imagined communities is defined by Norton and McKinney (2011) as “groups of people, not immediately tangible and
accessible, with whom we connect through the power of imagination” (p. 76). That is to say, the language learners desire to gain membership in the imagined communities during the process of acquiring a target language. Norton and McKinney (2011) believed that the concept of imagined communities allows us to understand the relationship between learners’ association with the imagined communities and its influence on learners’ learning processes. Moreover, Norton (2014) argued that “an imagined community assumes an imagined identity” (p. 62) and imagined communities might be more influential on learners’ identity than the real communities in which they participate (Norton, 2013).

In response to Gass’ (1998) call for a theoretical conceptualization that captures the relationship between learner’s identity and the ways in which one’s identity influences acquisition of language, Norton (2013) contended that PST is a comprehensive theory that overcomes the dichotomous distinction between the language learners and the larger social context. It also considers the ways in which relations of power play in one’s process of gaining access to the target language community that may have significant influence on a language learner’s learning opportunities. These definitions present the key concepts on how identity is constructed from a poststructuralist perspective, wherein language allows an individual to engage in the negotiation of a sense of self in relation to the larger social.

2.3.2 Studies on Identity Research in SLA from PST Perspective

Focusing on the identity of immigrant women in Canada, Norton’s influential series of articles (1997, 2000, 2013) and a special issue of TESOL quarterly (31(3), 1997), discussed how language learner identity influenced their investment in learning
the target language. Drawing on Weedon’s (1987) notion of subjectivity, Norton (1997) explored the disconnection between language classroom practices and a learner’s imagined identity and its influence on the learner’s investment. Norton (1997) explored this through the story of Mai, one of five participants from the longitudinal study of immigrants in Canada. She shared her frustration toward the content of the ESL course, which focused on individual presentations of learners’ experiences in their home countries. Norton (1995, 1997, 2000, 2013) argued persuasively that Mai’s lack of investment in participating in the ESL course was because the teacher neglected to incorporate classroom activities that would provide opportunities for the learners to critically reflect on the past by using their present experiences in the new country. Norton (1997, 2000, 2013) further discussed how the teacher’s method, while considering the immigrants’ past experiences as an important part of their identity, caused Mai to struggle to connect her imagined identity to classroom practices because it only focused on one aspect of her identity (ethnic identity). Norton (1997, 2000, 2013) concluded that although Mai was a highly motivated language learner, she had little investment in the language practices of this given classroom, which limited in her opportunities to have access to a wider range of symbolic or material resources.

With the goal of understanding how language not only reflects and but also creates position in society for language learners, Siegal (1996) explored the significance of language learner subjectivity and the acquisition of sociolinguistic proficiencies in a second language through the case study of Mary, a white woman in her mid-forties studying Japanese in Japan. The purpose of this study was to investigate the discursive construction of identity by looking at the interactions between the language learner and a
professor who was the target language speaker. The data sources of the study were taken out of a larger ethnographic study (Siegal, 1994), which elicited a rich corpus of data including language-learning journals, language learner interviews, field observations, audio-recordings of learners’ Japanese conversational interactions, interviews with native Japanese speaker, and other artifacts (newspapers, magazines). Siegal (1996) argued that based on Mary’s background as a Japanese language teacher and master’s degree candidate back in her home country, she attempted to construct and maintain her professional identity through control over the topics discussed and by not addressing the professor with honorific language. Mary’s attempts to position her identity as a researcher with nearly equal status to the professor by showing her knowledge in the professor’s research area, affected her pragmatic competence in the target language. The study analyzed the ways in which language learner subjectivity is co-constructed through language use in social interactions. Mary’s case demonstrates that the language learner may face conflicting needs when on one hand she wants to use the language in pragmatically appropriate ways to present herself as a hardworking language learner, and on the other hand wants to maintain face due to her professional background.

Influenced by Norton’s (2000, 2001) study of immigrant women in Canada, Kinginger (2004)’s longitudinal study investigated the negotiation and reconstruction of identity of an American woman, Alice, studying French as a foreign language in her home country and as a second language abroad in France. The data collected for this study included interviews, personal journals, and emails exchanged between the author and Alice. Thematic analysis was employed in this study.
The purpose of this study was to understand how Alice’s personal history and language learning experiences influenced her motivation and investment in L2 learning, which led to the reconstruction of her identity. During Alice’s study of French in college in America, Alice constructed an imagined France where she was able to attain cultural consciousness and fulfill the goal of becoming a language educator. However, throughout her sojourn abroad in France, she encountered struggles both with acquiring the target language and with gaining access to participate in French classrooms. To resolve the issue of lack of speaking practice in the classrooms, Alice turned to informal settings to practice her French, such as residence halls and dormitory rooms. The study discusses Alice’s shifting motives during her language learning process as she has encountered difficulties in achieving higher proficiency in L2, struggled with immersing herself into the L2 community, and, eventually, overcoming these challenges to become a “great student” who is pursuing a graduate degree because of her persistence. In short, Kinginger’s (2004) study identified the dynamicity of identity that is in constant change based on the learner’s history, motive, and investment in the language learning process.

Kramsch’s (2009) influential book “The Multilingual Subject” explored the subjectivities of young adult language learners in institutional settings. Focusing on language learners’ experiences, Kramsch (2009) examined former language learners’ published language memoirs and testimonies, spoken and written testimonies of language learners (journals, oral surveys, oral interviews, classroom discourse), and online data (chat room conversations, text messages, and telecollaboration projects). This data allowed Kramsch (2009) to investigate language as symbolic power and its influence on learners’ construction of self. Kramsch (2009) argued that new subject positions are
created through language learners’ control of the symbolic forms, thus subject positions are not merely “social realities” (p. 7) but they are “symbolic” (p. 7) as well. The term “symbolic” represents two aspects: (1) the objective, conventional representations of realities, and (2) the subjective realities constructed by the symbolic forms, which include “perceptions, emotions, attitudes, and values” (p. 7).

The purpose of Kramsch (2009)’s book is to demonstrate how multilingual subjects use symbolic forms to create new subject positions and to negotiate different realities. Through analyzing language learners’ multilingual experiences from various sources of data, Kramsch (2009) was able to explore how learners as sign users and/or receivers developed the signifying self; how the foreign language with unfamiliar “foreign sounds, shapes, rhythms, and intonations” (p. 22) influenced the embodied self; how the process of learning the foreign language that is often perceived as the language of other created the subject-in-process, which depicts the struggle experienced by language learners that want to master the target language but do not want to lose their native language self; how language learners use the target language to position themselves as the more powerful others; how multilingual writers organized their multilingual experience and constructed themselves as multilingual narrators; and, finally, Kramsch (2009) discussed how computer-mediated communication served as a way for multilingual subjects to engage in the co-construction of the self through dialogue with others in online chat rooms.

The close connection between one’s identity and language can be identified in Vasilopoulos’ (2015) study. Vasilopoulos (2015) examined the relationship between L1/L2 identity construction and negotiation, as well as language learning/use in the
Korean EFL context. English is considered a global language in Korea and English language ability is a highly valued skill. The participants of this study were ten young adult Korean students who were fluent in English and who, for at least four years, had studied in English-speaking countries or had received all-English instruction at schools in Korea. The data sources were comprised of semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaires. The data was analyzed using inductive and interpretive analysis with the goal of understanding language learners’ experiences and beliefs regarding their language learning and use.

Participants revealed that the opportunities to use English in Korea were limited and that it was only used in academic contexts at language institutions. And, even at language institutions, it was viewed as unnatural and inefficient to use English with other Koreans even for students majoring in English. The participants reported that they were often viewed by their peers as different. In responding to this identification, the participants would choose not to speak in the classroom so that the other students would not view them as showing off their English ability. When in public situations where they could not avoid using English, one of the participants, Allan, shared that he would modify his English with a Korean accent to avoid drawing people’s attention.

However, sometimes English was used to separate oneself from others and to establish a sense of authority and form different relationship with others. Esther, who worked as a part-time English instructor, used English to construct an authoritative identity when interacting with her adult students. She expressed that when using English, she was able to be more casual with students who were older than she was, while in Korean she had to be polite. Dan shared how his English skills constructed an English
speaking Korean identity and that when he was traveling in Japan, people treated him with more respect because of it. Vasilopoulos’ (2015) study showed the challenges the English proficient participants faced when they returned to their L1 context, and how they developed strategies to conceal their English skills, while at the same time engaging in the process of negotiating their bilingual identities.

In summary, PST argues that subjectivity/identity is discursively constructed, “diverse, contradictory, dynamic, and changing over historical time and social space” (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 417). This allows the researcher to see the different subject positions one constructs or how position in the L2 impacts one’s learning and interactional opportunities (Pavlenko, 2002). Identity research in SLA conducted from the PST perspective primarily focuses on the ways in which language learners construct their subjectivity using language.

2.4 Community of Practice Theory: Identity as Formed through Social Participation and Non-Participation

2.4.1 Theoretical Interpretations on COP and Identity

Inspired by anthropology and social theory (Bourdieu, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978; Foucault, 1980; Giddens, 1984; Lave, 1988), Lave and Wenger (1991) developed the community of practice (COP) theory, which is a situated learning theory that understands learning as located in “the relation of participation” (Wenger, 2010, p. 1) between the individual and the social world. COP focuses on the process in which “learners acquire knowledge and skills as they move toward fuller participation in the practices of a language community, a process that results in changes in their relationships with old timers and in the learners’ identities” (Noels et al., 2011, p. 55). In other words, learning is viewed as a process of social and personal transformation in a COP, and through direct
participation in a community, members will collectively define and negotiate what constitutes as legitimate in a given context (Wenger, 2000). According to Wenger (1998), “participation refers not just to local events of engagement in certain activities with certain people, but to a more encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities” (p. 4). Therefore, “participation shapes not only what we do, but also who we are and how we interpret what we do” (p. 4).

The construct of identity is one of the integral aspects in the social theory of learning and is viewed as the pivot between the individual and the social world (Wenger, 1998). Wenger (1998) argued that the COP perspective considers the “lived experience of the identity while recognizing its social character—it is the social, the cultural, the historical with a human face” (p. 146). One of the central constructs in COP is the process of legitimate peripheral participation, whereby newcomers participate in the COP at the peripheral of the community. This participation is legitimate in a sense that the newcomers are also participating in and performing tasks in the COP (with guidance from experts) just as the experts do, however their participation is peripheral because they are only responsible for a small part of the task (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The issue of participation is the central concept of COP in that through participation we are able to define ourselves. It is important, however, to point out that non-participation is considered a source for an individual’s identity formation as well. Because it is through the practices that we do not participate that allow us to understand what we are not. Thus, Wenger (1998) contended that one’s identity is formed by both participation and non-participation.
In understand identity formation process in a given context, Wenger (1998)
suggested three modes of belonging: *engagement, imagination*, and *alignment*.
Engagement refers to the active involvement in the negotiation of meaning in a world in
which one acts and interacts. Imagination is “a process of expanding our self by
transcending our time and space and creating new images of the world and ourselves” (p.
176). Finally, alignment is the process that connects time and space through which
individuals are linked by the coordination of actions and each individual becomes part of
a larger whole. Each mode creates relations of belonging that form one’s identity across
time and space (Wenger, 1998). In short, COP emphasizes the process of newcomers
acquiring knowledgeable skills through interacting with old timers and participating in
practices within a COP. It is through this process that individuals may negotiate the
meaning of their experience and relationship with the social world and reconstruct their
identities.

### 2.4.2 Studies on Identity Research in SLA from COP perspective

As discussed, COP theory centers on the ways in which one’s identity is formed
through participating in a particular community of practice. McMahill’s (1997) study
shows how a group of EFL Japanese women participate in a feminist discourse
community and established their feminist identities. McMahill (1997) studied two adult
EFL classes in Tokyo, Japan that combined language learning with the learners’ interest
in feminism. In these classes, McMahill (1997) identified a female discourse community
of resistance to sexism and was able to identify through the interview data of organizers
and instructors three main assumptions in the discourse. The first assumption was that the
acquisition of English could empower women to become more active in the social world.
The second was that women from different backgrounds could share their beliefs and engage in critical reflections regarding gender roles in Japanese society while creating a “counter-discourse.” Third, the classroom discourse focused on feminist consciousness-raising which served to validate the learners’ experiences and in turn place women in the position of power.

The study used the questionnaire to focus on the experiences of learners and compared the assumptions made by the organizers and instructors with the learners’ experiences. The questionnaire revealed the ways in which classmates were viewed as role models who encouraged learners’ self-affirmation and independence, as well as how the instructors’ feminist discourse changed how the learners viewed themselves – going from “just a housewife” to a person with interests who is able to participate in other activities. McMahil (1997) argued that the feminist EFL classes fostered a feminist consciousness-raising discourse that placed women in a position of power and formed their feminist identities, and in turn, influenced women’s action beyond the classroom.

Warriner’s (2010) study examined the lived experiences of three adult female refugee ESL learners (Alma, Sheida, and Ayak), and investigated how a teaching curriculum with the primary goal of preparing adult immigrants learners to participate in a workplace COP may have influenced learners in achieving to become a full participant in one COP but remain to be on the peripheral of the other COP. Warriner (2010) noted that while two of the participants utilized their previous work experience to gain access and fuller participation in the local workplace COP, they also limited other opportunities of learning and possible access to other COPs. The data for this study included field notes, documents, audio-recorded interviews, and informal conversations.
The learners’ interviews revealed their acceptance of a program that used a teaching curriculum focused on the importance of obtaining GEDs and of achieving high test scores to gain employment opportunities. Through these practices, the learners expected and were expected to obtain particular social identities. Alma, a single mother of two, revealed how her employment in a convenient store helped her to construct a competent convenient store worker identity. She progressed from being unable to move from the peripheral of the L2 community because she was unable to communicate even after graduating from the ESL program, to becoming a fuller participant of the COP due to her improved English skills and excellent work performance. Shieda was able to gain access to the local workplace COP despite her caseworker’s warning of the unlikely chances for her to acquire a job. However, her experience showed that even though she had mastered the skills and knowledge to become an expert of the COP, the low-skill and minimum-wage nature of the employment meant that her status in the workplace COP did not change.

Finally, Ayak, a mother of two young children, did not think the job applications she completed at the ESL program provided her with any job opportunities. Therefore, she went to the airport and applied for a job in person, and was asked to come back for further training. Ayak’s narrated experience on taking the initiative to apply for job and the subsequent interactions between her and the employer served to construct her identity as “a resourceful mother, contributing mother, and dependable worker” (p. 27). Even though Ayak was happy to have received the job, at the time of the interview she reported that she wanted to find “a better job.” Warriner (2010) argued that from the situated learning perspective, the three participants’ experiences showed the importance for
newcomers to “claim the right to speak” (Norton, 2000) in order to engage directly and increase their status in the COP. Therefore, Warriner (2010) argued that the type of participation the ESL program focused on a local workplace COP that relied on low-skill, minimum-wage, and part-time labor could not be successfully used in other COPs that required a higher level of skill and offered long-term employment.

Drawing on Lave and Wenger’s situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), Giroir’s (2014) study examined the narrated experience of two adult Saudi Arabian males, Musa and Alim, who studied in an intensive English program at a university in the United States. The study focused on the process in which the two ESL learners renegotiated their access to the target language community as novices in English and as learners from a politicized group, and how the negotiating process construct their identities as they move from peripheral to full participation in the L2 community. Moreover, the study aimed to understand the relationship between the individual and the larger social structures by examining how the post 9/11 narrative influenced ESL learners’ experiences. The data for this study consisted of classroom observations, interviews, and student-designed oral photo narratives.

The narrative of eighteen-year-old Musa implied that he had undergone a transformative process from his previous self to a self who became more open to different communities by spending time in the building’s lobby meeting new people instead of staying in his dorm room and interacting only with people who spoke his L1. Musa started out with a discursive stance based on post 9/11 discourse. After the ESL program, he transformed his identity and was able to move from a peripheral role to a full participant in the L2 community. Alim, a twenty-six-year-old, had a discursive stance
focused on the racial discrimination he faced in relation to the 9/11 discourse. He was able to use the post 9/11 discourse as a cultural resource and discursively refigure his subject position in relation to the target language community through interactions that were based on the negative post 9/11 discourse. Through this renegotiation of self, he was able to transform his identity and move from the peripheral to a full participant in the L2 community. Grioir (2014) argued that in a social world where certain powerful politicized discourses serve to marginalize language learners, it is important not to overlook the agency of learners. Both Musa and Alim demonstrated how they were about to reconstruct themselves discursively in the social world as well as how their agency allowed them to become fuller participants in the L2 community.

In short, COP theory understands identity as developed through the process of learning and participating in which one gains access to a community of practice. One’s identity is formed through the process of participation and the negotiation of multiple memberships (Wenger, 1998).

2.5 Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory: Identity as Developed Through Mediation and Internalization

Vygotskian sociocultural theory (SCT) is a psychological theory that “emphasizes Vygotsky’s insistent focus on the relationship between individual’s physiological aspects and the social and culturally produced artifacts that transform the individual cognitive or mental functions” (Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2015, p. xiv). In other words, SCT offers a framework that does not separate the cognitive from the social context, instead “it recognizes the central role that social relationships and culturally constructed artifacts play in organizing uniquely forms of thinking” (Lantolf, 2004, p. 30-31). The goal for SCT research is “to understand the relationship between human mental functioning, on
the one hand, and cultural, historical, and institutional setting, on the other” (Wertsch, 1995, p. 56), which highlighted Vygotsky’s inclusion of aspects of culture and history when studying higher mental functions.

History, or what Vygotsky referred to as *genesis*, plays an important role in SCT research in that it centers on examining the origin and the process of the development of human higher order mental functions instead of the product. Culture is another significant aspect that represents SCT’s focus on the influence of the culturally organized semiotic means and the social relationships that mediate development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). And the semiotic means “arise as a consequence of participation in cultural activities...in which cultural artifacts...and cultural concepts...‘interact in complex, dynamic ways with each other and with [biologically endowed] psychological phenomena’ (Ratner, 2002, p. 10)” (as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 59).

According to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), SCT understands mediational means as historical in that they not only predate their users but they are also developed by the users with each use. And language is considered the most significant auxiliary tool or symbolic means due to its “double role.” Kozulin (1986) stated:

Language and speech occupy a special place in Vygotsky’s psychological system because they play a double role. On the one hand, they are psychological tool that helps to form other mental functions; on the other hand they are one of the functions, which means that they also undergo a cultural development (p. xi-lvi).

(As cited in Swain, Kinnear, & Steinman, 2015, p. xiv)

The central construct for SCT is *mediation*, which is “the creation, and the use of artificial auxiliary means of acting---physically, socially, and mentally” (Lantolf, 2011, p.
and is “the process through which humans deploy culturally constructed artifacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e. gain voluntary control over and transform) the material world or their own and each other’s social and mental activity” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 79). Furthermore, the mediation process is considered bi-directional in that it forms the single system between the individual and the environment through the culturally constructed mediational means (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Thus “through mediation the social and individual are brought together in dialectical unity” (Swain et al., 2015, p. 2).

Another core construct of SCT’s theory is internalization, which is considered the central element in the development of higher mental functions (Kozulin, 1990). Internalization is “the process through which higher forms of mentation come to be” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 13). At first, the goal-directed activity of the individual is mediated by externally formed mediating artifacts, then, with the appropriation of the mediating artifacts, the individual gains control over his or her higher mental functions (Lantolf, 2000). However, Vygotsky emphasized that “internalization was not a transmission process whereby the internal is merely a duplicate of the external…but that the process was transformative” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 155). Individuals are therefore considered active agents who are capable of transforming knowledge when participating in social practices (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

The other key concept in SCT is the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Swain et al. (2015) pointed it out that scholars have phrased the construct of ZPD differently, in that John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) discussed it as metaphor; van Lier (2000) called it affordances; Swain and Lapkin (1998) described it as an opportunity for learning; and
Holzman (2002) named it as the distance between being and becoming (Swain et al., 2015, p. 20). Regardless of the different descriptions attached to ZPD, they all captured the central idea that it is used to describe the space where “the collaborative construction of opportunities… for individuals to develop their mental abilities” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 17) takes place. Vygotsky (1978) defined ZPD as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). In other words, ZPD is the difference between what a novice can accomplish independently and what the individual can achieve through social interactions with the guidance of an expert (Lantolf, 2000).

Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development has heavily influenced SLA research (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 2000; Thorne, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), however, the notion of self is not fully developed in Vygotsky’s work. There exist multiple theoretical conceptualizations on how Vygotsky might construe identity based on his ideas of the self and his notions on semeiotic mediations, internalizations, and higher mental functions (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007). In the rest of the section I first present an overview on the different theoretical interpretations of the SCT perspective on identity. Then, I provide studies that examined L2 learner identity from SCT perspective.

2.5.1 Theoretical Interpretations on SCT and Identity

Marchenkova on the parallel between Bakhtin and Vygotsky

Marchenkova’s (2005) wrote a chapter on the parallel between Bakhtin’s cultural and literary theory, and Vygotsky’s (1978, 1986) developmental psychology theory that
focused on language, culture, and the formation of self. Both Bakhtin and Vygotsky identified the primary role of dialogue in the formation of the self, construed the self as dynamic, and saw the self as open to other selves (Marchenkova, 2005). Furthermore, Marchenkova (2005) suggested that from the SCT perspective, the self is perceived as dynamic because, as one participates in learning processes, one is also transformed by it. Moreover, based on Vygotsky’s theoretical conceptualization of the self, both the role of the expert and language are viewed as crucial in one’s formation of self. Most importantly, Marchenkova (2005) points out that Vygotsky (1978, 1986) viewed the formation of self as “formed through the internalization of its sociocultural environment” (p. 183). Thus, in order to understand the construction of self, it is central to understand the roles expert, language, and interactions play during the learning process.

**The heuristic development of self: A Bakhtinian-Sociohistoric view**

Based on the approaches of Bakhtin and Vygotsky, Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain (2003) offered a theoretical framework that understands the construct of identity as:

- a concept that figuratively combines the intimate or personal world with the collective space and cultural forms and social relations...identities are lived in and through activity and so must be conceptualized as they develop in social practice...identities as psychohistorical formations that develop over a person’s lifetime, populating intimate terrain and motivating social life...They are important bases from which people create new activities, new worlds, and new ways of being. (p. 5)
Holland et al. (2003) believed that by combining Bakhtin’s dialogic approach and Vygotsky’s genetic approach, one could construct a processual understanding of identity. This integrated approach focuses on “the development of identities and agency specific to practices and activities situated in historically contingent, socially enacted, culturally constructed ‘worlds’” (Holland et al. 2003, p. 7).

Holland et al. (2003) argued that the Bakhtin and Vygotsky combined approach provided the conceptual tools to the theorization on the construction of identities that are perceived as “always forming” (p. 8) With the goal of overcoming the conceptualization of suturing, which describes the relationship between the individual and the discursively-formed position, Holland et al. (2003) developed the metaphor of codevelopment. Codevelopment captures “the linked development of people, cultural forms, and social positions in particular historical worlds” (p. 33). Holland et al. (2003) contended that the basic process for identity formation is through the mediation of the cultural resources such as:

- the signs or markers of culturally constructed identity, whether they be the display of particular skills, the enactment of certain motives, the cultivation of ways of speaking, the use of certain expressions, the display of certain emotions, or the wearing of distinctive clothes. (p. 282)

At first these cultural resources are behavioral routine, then they are signs used to affect others, and finally the means enacted to direct one’s own sense of self and in turn mediate one’s action in a social context.
Pollard’s model of learning and identity

Pollard (1993) developed a model of learning and identity through integrating social constructivist approach and symbolic interactionist approach. Pollard (1993) drew on interactionist principles that highlight the role of social context in the construction of self to understand the relationship between self and others, and combined it with the social-constructivist model of the learning and teaching process that emphasizes the role of the adult who is a “reflective agent” (p. 185) that provides instruction and support to the child, and the child would appropriates the adult’s guidance to develop control over his or her learning. With the combination of the two approaches, Pollard (1993) developed a model of learning and identity that represents the “recursive nature of experience” (p. 186), wherein contextual factors influence learning outcomes and, in turn, construct the identity of a child. In this perspective, different factors in the social environment, including contextual factors, self-confidence, and the learning outcome shape identity.

Sociocultural theory and Erikson’s notion of identity

Penuel and Wertsch (1995) suggested an integrative sociocultural approach to understand the process of identity formation that incorporates different elements of Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural perspective on development and Erikson’s view on identity. Penuel and Wertsch (1995) acknowledged that the topic of identity was never been explicitly discussed in Vygotsky’s work, but they contended it would be beneficial to provide interpretations on Vygotsky’s possible theorizations on identity development based on his discussions of mental development.
Penuel and Wertsch (1995) argued that Erikson’s (1968) view on identity focused more on individual choices instead of the sociocultural aspect of the identity formation process. They based this theory on Erikson’s (1968) definition of identity as “a subjective sense of an invigorating sameness and continuity” (p.19) and his view on the process of identity formation as making choices among the principles of “fidelity, ideology, and work” (Penuel & Wertsch, 1995, p. 87). In order to also consider the role sociocultural processes play during one’s identity formation, Penuel and Wertsch (1995) incorporated Vygotsky’s theorization on the development of human mental functioning in that sociocultural influences were considered the source of development, which served as a conceptual tool that complemented Erikson’s identity theory. Penuel and Wertsch (1995) found three main themes in Vygotsky’s theory on individual development useful in understanding identity formation, which were the use of the genetic method to understand the development of individual mental functions, the belief that the origin of individual mental functions is social, and the idea that culturally constructed tools and signs mediate all higher mental activity.

Penuel and Wertsch (1995) believed that even though both Erikson and Vygotsky considered the relationship between individual mental functioning and sociocultural processes as dynamic, the two theorists placed emphasis on opposite ends of the pole in their discussions. Penuel and Wertsch (1995) suggested that Vygotsky focused on the social origins of individual mental functioning, while Erikson focused primarily on the individual choices one makes to form a coherent identity. Therefore, Penuel and Wertsch (1995) saw the value of integrating aspects of Erikson and Vygotsky and presented a mediated-action approach. The mediated-action approach in examining identity
formation suggested four points for identity research: (1) identity should be studied within its context and activity; (2) cultural and historical resources are considered potential affordances or constraints in the identity formation process; (3) the basic unit of analysis is mediated action; (4) Erikson’s domains of identity should be used to understand how individuals utilize available cultural resources.

Penuel and Wertsch (1995) argued that the sociocultural approach understands the process of identity formation occurs through the dynamic relationship between the sociocultural process and the individual functioning of human action. Based on the integrative sociocultural view of identity, Penuel and Wertsch (1995) discussed the dynamic quality of identity formation process, which they argued it should be seen “as shaped by and shaping forms of action, involving a complex interplay among cultural tools employed in the action, the sociocultural and institutional context of action, and the purposes embedded in the action” (p. 84). This paper presented a mediated-action approach to identity formation that aims to give equal attention to social processes and individual mental functioning.

Sociocultural theory and Mead’s notion of the self

To further Penuel and Wertsch’s (1995) conceptualization on the integrated sociocultural perspective on identity formation using Erikson’s notion of identity, Holland and Lachicotte (2007) discussed how Mead’s (1934, 1982) concept of identity as emergent and produced through social interactions is commensurable with Vygotsky’s understanding of the development of personality. Holland and Lachicotte (2007) argued that both Mead and Vygotsky view the role of social interactions as offering affordances and constraints on one’s identity formation. However, Vygotsky focused more on how an
individual mind develops, while Mead emphasized the result of the self through the *I-me* dynamic. Despite the difference in their analytic primacies, Holland and Lachicotte (2007) proposed that both Vygotsky and Mead focused on active internalization, internalized self-other dialogues, and the semiotics of behavior in relation to the formation of self (p. 105).

Inspired by Baldwin’s conceptualization of *imitation* (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007, p. 106), Holland and Lachicotte (2007) understood *active internalization* as a “productive pattern of imitation” (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007, p. 106). In other words, the internalization process is not simply a copying another’s social behaviors, but a process in which one constructs their own patterns based on the models provided by society (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007).

Another concept closely related to active internalization is that of the *dialogic selves*, which suggest that through active internalization, “one develops an inner sense of the collective meanings and social judgments that may meet one’s behaviors” (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007, p. 106). Holland and Lachicotte (2007) argued that the theme of the dialogic self-other relationship is shared by both Vygotsky and Mead. For Vygotsky, it is the difference between *sense* and *meaning*, in which sense means the personal sense of the word and meaning indicates the collective meaning of the word. In Mead’s work, it is the concept of an *I-me* self-system where *I* is both the active agent and the observer, and *me* is the internalized social roles positioned by the society.

The third concept shared by the two theorists is the *semiotics of behavior*, which focuses on the transitivity of symbolic behavior (Holland & Lachicotte, 2007). To Vygotsky, signs are first used in social interactions with others, and then are internalized
to become tools directed to the self. Mead also stressed the idea of transitivity in the
semiotics of behavior in that an individual’s behavior is not only an incentive for the
other, but also for the self. Holland and Lachicotte (2007) contended that through the
integrated approach of Vygotsky and Mead theory on identity, identity research would be
able to focus both on the outcome of identity and on the ways in which identity is formed
during the developmental process.

Besides the discussion on the compatibility between Mead’s notion of the self and
Vygotsky’s understanding of personality, Holland and Lachicotte (2007) also presented
the key concepts of Vygotsky’s theory relating to identity formation and development.
First, Holland and Lachicotte (2007) suggested Vygotsky’s concept of semiotic
mediation serves to provide a lens to understand the ways in which individuals construct
their versions of social identities through mediational means, which in turn gain active
control over their behaviors. This process of an individual internalizing cultural resources
and mediating his or her behavior suggests the individual’s agency during the process of
identity formation.

Then, Holland and Lachicotte (2007) made a connection between Holland’s
concept of figured worlds and Vygotsky’s notion of self-organization. According to
Holland and Lachicotte (2007), the notion of self-organization describes the process of
humans using symbolic means to detach from the immediate context and enter the
imagined world, and within that imagined world create new rules and meanings.
Moreover, people must learn to control their desires related to the immediate context and
attend only to the desire of the role in the imagined world. Holland and Lachicotte (2007)
noted that it is the self-organization ability that allows individuals to participate in
different culturally constructed figured worlds. Furthermore, the individual would use mediational means to self-organize his or her emotions, views, and ways of acting to perform certain roles in different figured worlds that later become identities. Holland and Lachicotte (2007) proposed the concept of median identity, which conceptualizes identity as:

culturally imagined and socially recognized types – social and cultural products – that are actively internalized as self-meanings (treating one’s own behavior reflexively as symbolic) and serve as motivation for action. (p. 134)

2.5.2 Studies on Identity Research in SLA from SCT Perspective

Pavlenko and Lantolf’s (2000) study demonstrated the importance of studying language learners’ personal narratives to understand the identity formation process. Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) drew on Sfard’s (1998) participation metaphor (PM) of second language learning that considered language learning as “a process of becoming a member of a certain community, which entails the ability to communicate in the language of this community and act according to its particular norms” (p. 155), and argue that the PM approach allows one to investigate the “how” in SLA, including the ways language is used in different contexts and the ways in which one acts to show affiliation. The study proposes narrative as a legitimate and informative form of data that allows for the subjectivity of the participants. The data used in this study are the autobiographical works of adult bilinguals who learned their L2 as adults.

Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) argued that personal narratives written in a second language create a site where L2 learners’ identities are reconstructed, and where there exists an internal conflict between the self that was constructed in the past that have a set
of social relationships and conventions that are different from the present. Drawing on Penuel and Wertsch’s (1995) definition of self “as a coherent and dynamic system” (p. 163) that emerges when one participates in new discursive practices of a culture. The purpose of the study was to investigate the processes of reconstruction of the self when one moves from the discursive practices of the native culture to participate in the activities of another culture. By analyzing the narrative works of adult bilingual authors, the authors identified two phases of identity reconstruction. They also proposed a *self-translation metaphor* that states that during the process of learning a second language, one would experience “an initial phase of continuous loss” (p. 162) and then “second phase of gain and reconstruction” (p. 162). The first phase involves one’s loss of agency in the world due to a lack of linguistic means. The reconstruction of the self is achieved through the appropriation of others’ voices that would lead one to the creation of a new voice and self. Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) also pointed out the center role that agency and intentionality play in the construction of new identities is that if one chooses not to negotiate new discursive practices in the new culture but instead only learns the L2 for functional use, then the process of self-translation will not occur.

Based on the metaphor of self-translation (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000), Marx’s (2002) study focused on the appropriation of accent and the (re)construction of identity in second language and culture acquisition through an analysis of first-person experience narratives. Marx (2002), whose L1 is Canadian-English, provided a narrative of the events involved the process of moving to her L2 (German) environment and then returning to her L1 (English) environment after becoming a legitimate participant in the culture of the L2. The study centered on issues of identity and the experience of the
accent appropriation in the L2, and the changes in the L1 accent. Marx (2002) argued that past studies on identity research in SLA mainly focused immigrants whose goal was to stay in the L2 environment, while she provided an account of a language learner who had no intention of remaining in the L2 context, and planned on returning to the L1 environment. The data for the study is comprised of comments made by friends and professors in Germany and diary entries that were written mostly in the L2.

Marx presented the progression of her self-translation process in six stages: displacement, beginning stages of loss, progression towards a native speaker accent in the L2, construction of a L2 identity and the attrition of the L1, re-entry into the C1 (Culture of the L1), and reconstruction and renewal of the L1. In the stage of displacement, Marx stated that, as a Canadian, she had often been mistakenly identified as an American because of her English accent when speaking German. Marx believed it was this misrecognition that had led to the appropriation of an alternative accent for her L2. In the second stage, beginning stages of loss, Marx reported that in order to avoid being viewed as an American, she not only began to change the way she dressed but also she started to develop a French accent in German (French is her second foreign language). However, in stage three, Marx changed her goal to adopting a German native speaker accent with the purpose of being viewed as a competent participant in the C2 community. During stage four, after two years of being in Germany, Marx could successfully pass as a native speaker of German in short conversations. However, she started to have difficulties when writing or speaking in her L1. In stage five, when she returned to Canada, she reported that she had developed an accent in her L1. She argued this was an indication of the “foreign” identity that she had developed in the C2, and thus having an accent in her L1
indicated a preservation of her “foreign” identity. The last stage, the reconstruction and renewal of her L1, occurred when she moved to the United States from Canada. Once in the U.S., English once again became the language with which identified, and she noted that she “returned to being a native Canadian” (p. 276). Marx (2000) analyzed the ways in which her linguistic and cultural identities were reflected in her accents, and she argued that the changes in her accents reflected her attempts to connect the L1/C1 to the L2/C2. Through the framework of self-translation, she perceived this as her attempt to unify identities.

Drawing on Vygotsky’s semiotic analysis and the notion of role (Vygotsky, 1989), Kramsch’s (2000) study considered language learning “as a dialogic process of sign making” (p. 133) through which language learners undergo a construction of self and others through signs. The dialogic process refers to Bakhtin’s (1986) construct of dialogism, which stresses the idea that “every utterance is a response to other, prior or potential utterances” (Kramsch, 2000, p. 139). Thus, one’s utterances not only respond to the present interlocutor, but to past utterances, and to potential utterances (Kramsch, 2000). From the perspective of semiotic theory, Kramsch (2000) understands one’s acquisition of another language as a way of creating and interpreting linguistic signs, and those signs are “indexical, iconic, or symbolic” (p. 140). The study was conducted in two intermediate-level ESL writing classes at UC Berkeley and examined the acquisition of meaning. It involved a of twenty-six participants and was comprised of students from East-Asian and Latin-American countries. Class A had twelve foreign-born students and one American-born student, while class B had ten American-born and three foreign-born students.
The twenty-six students were given a short story by Robert O. Butler (1992) called *Crickets*, about a Vietnamese-American father named Ted and his interaction with his son Bill. In the story, Ted tried to introduce his son to a game that he enjoyed as a little boy in Vietnam. The goal of the game was to capture two types of crickets and engaging them in fights. However, Ted realizes that his son does share the same excitement about recreating the game. After reading the short story, the students were asked to provide a summary of the story in around five sentences. The goal of the exercise was to make students aware of the semiotic choices they produced, how the semiotic choices could create meanings, and how readers could interpret those.

The students first wrote their summaries on a notecard and then six to seven students were asked to rewrite their summaries on the blackboard in order to study changes in the summaries. Kramsch (2000) believed that a summary represents a group of textual signs that the students constructed for the reader and their process of choosing among the semiotic signs becomes apparent through the task of writing the summary. The study found that with the change from reading the text, to writing a summary on a notecard, to then rewriting on the blackboard, the students’ experienced an increase in consciousness regarding how the imagined or real readers may perceive their construction of meaning for the story. Also, the study discovered that regardless of the students’ limited English ability, the summaries showed that they utilized a wide selection of semiotic signs to create meaning.

Furthermore, the students were also asked to read their summaries to the class for class discussion and interpretation. In the class discussion, especially where the students were asked to provide their reasons behind the semiotic choices they made, the study
presented that the students first resisted the role of *responsible narrator*. However, as the teacher’s encouraged the students’ interpret their own semiotic signs, the students became *creator[s] of signs* who were able to create a semiotic world of signs that were associated with the students’ own experiences. Kramsch (2000) argued that the teacher’s encouragement to use signs to create meaning and interpret the story, the students were able to experience “the pleasure of constructing themselves as authorial or discursive selves” (p. 149).

Lantolf and Genung (2002) adopted activity theory as a framework to uncover how changes in material circumstances affected PG, a Chinese language learner’s, motives and goals in the classroom, which in turn influenced her ways of thinking and being in the classroom. The study argues the importance of an individual’s history in shaping human activity. Since PG is a multilingual speaker of different languages, she was able to construct an identity as a successful language learner based on her language learning history. However, the rules of interaction in the Chinese language classroom (highly-controlled, teacher-fronted) appear to have stark contrasts in comparison with what PG anticipated according to her previous language-learning environment (open, learner-centered). This change in material circumstances greatly impacted PG’s motives and goals and caused her to go from a successful language learner to receiving a passing grade.

Drawing on Vygotskian’s SCT, Sfard’s (1998) *participant metaphor* (PM) and *acquisition metaphor* (AM), and Norton’s (2000) notions of investment and imagined communities, Lee (2014) investigated language learning experiences and their influence on the identity negotiation processes of three Korean ESL students who studied in an
Intensive English Program (IEP) in the United States. The three Korean participants (Mina, Jisun, and Seungho) were all learners who had studied in the IEP for at least a semester prior to the study, and, at the time of the study, they all planned to go back to Korea in a year. Lee’s (2014) study employed grounded theory as method of analysis and the data source was in-depth semi-structured interviews.

In the interviews, all three participants revealed their motivation for learning English was to increase future employment opportunities. Lee (2014) contended that the language learners’ motivations for learning English and imaginings regarding the target language community served to mediate their learning experiences and negotiations of identity. In terms of the participants’ expectations of interacting with native speakers, all three participants discussed their frustrations regarding limited opportunities to engage with native speakers. Even though the IEP was located in a university, the language learners reported that they felt they were guests of the university because they were not granted full access to the campus. And, based on the information on their ID cards, the IEP students were categorized as guests, and this appeared to separate the IEP students from the other university students.

This isolation and lack of interaction with native speakers resulted in the language learners having trouble gaining access to the target language community and difficult in developing an identity as a legitimate member. Mina revealed that she attempted to increase her exposure to English and interactions with native speakers by moving into a dorm with three native speakers. However, her roommates often neglected to inform her about dormitory related issues, thereby denying her identity as a full member of the community.
Similarly, Seungho reported that his roommate often excluded him, and he faced impatience from the cafeteria workers due to his lack of English skill, and he felt he was constantly identified as an Asian who was not proficient in English. Jisun shared that students in the IEP were not respected because some teachers did not provide quality instructions, and that the students’ opinions on the issue were ignored by the program. Jisun believed they were ignored because the teachers did not think they were capable of expressing their feedback on the teaching due to their low English proficiency. The experience of exclusion and disrespect caused Mina to seek emotional support from other Koreans that mediated Mina’s identity as a foreigner. Jisun, on the other hand, created opportunities to expose herself to English by overhearing native speakers’ conversations and her limited English skills led her to identify herself as a “language learner.”

Seungho’s strategy to overcome the issue of limited access to native speakers was to engage with other IEP students who were not Koreans. He believed this forced him to use the target language. Lee’s (2014) study demonstrated how language learners’ identity as non-native speakers impacted their self-confidence and, in turn, limited their language development.

SCT perspective understands identity as constructed through one’s internalization of the cultural environment. Narratives that focus on personal stories, such as reflective journals and interviews, are the data sources that SCT finds valuable in understanding one’s identity development and learning processes. Therefore, narrative analysis and narrative inquiry are considered the primary methods of research (Swain et al, 2015; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000).
2.6 Identity Negotiation Theory: Identity as Established Through Symbolic Communication with Others

2.6.1 Theoretical Interpretations on INT and Identity

Building on social identity theory and relational dialectic theory, identity negotiation theory (INT) was developed by Ting-Toomey (1999, 2005, 2015a, 2015b), and the theory identifies the importance of competent cultural communication through which one is able to negotiate and develop verbal and nonverbal behavior in the target language community and achieve desired identity outcomes. INT is considered one of the contemporary sociocultural perspectives by Jackson (2008) who suggested INT’s view on identity as in consonance with Bakhtin (1981, 1984, 1986) and other sociocultural theorists. Ting-Toomey (2005) referred to identity as “reflective self-images constructed, experienced, and communicated by the individuals within a culture and in a particular interaction situation” (p. 217) and as “an individual’s multifaceted identities of cultural, ethnic, religious, social class, gender, sexual orientation, professional, family/relational role, and personal image(s) based on self-reflection and other categorization social construction processes” (Ting-Toomey, 2015a, p. 1).

One of the key constructs in INT is negotiation, which is defined as “the exchange of verbal and nonverbal messages between the two or more communicators in maintaining, threatening, or uplifting the various socio-cultural group-based or unique personal-based identity images of the other in situ” (Ting-Toomey, 2015a, p. 1). In other words, INT understands one’s identity as co-constructed among interlocutors through linguistic and semiotic means in social interactions. Ting-Toomey (1999, 2005, 2015a, 2015b) argued that negotiation plays an important part in an individual’s intercultural
communication competence and that one should be mindful of one’s inter-cultural communication, through which one is able to achieve identity attunement.

Another key concept is *mindful identity attunement*, which is inspired by both Eastern and Western philosophers and theorists (Kabat-Zinn, 1994; Langer, 1989, 1997), and is “the intentional development of culture-sensitive knowledge and interpersonal responsiveness concerning cultural membership and personal identity issues in self and others, the cultivation of mindfulness, and the behavioral practice of appropriate, effective, and adaptive communication styles” (Ting-Toomey, 2015a, p. 7). The construct of mindful identity attunement focuses on the importance of an individual being sensitive to the beliefs and values of a particular culture in order to achieve mindful communication and, in turn, obtain one’s desired identity. Moreover, the process of mindful identity attunement is developmental, and in order to participate in identity reconstruction, one needs to be open to changing his familiar ways of viewing the world (Ting-Toomey, 1999, 2005).

2.6.2 Studies on Identity Research in SLA from INT Perspective

Collie, Kindon, Liu, and Podsiadlowski’s (2010) study examined how young Assyrian refugee women from Iraq living in New Zealand negotiate issues on identity and engaged in *mindful identity negation* (Ting-Toomey, 2005) during the process of adapting to a different cultural and linguistic environment. Taken from a larger participatory action research study with 60 young women, the participants for this study included six young women named Gina, Esther, Lisa, Joanna, Laura, and Kelly. The data collection was based on the ethnographic approach and included individual and focus group interviews as well as participant observations. The study undertook a thematic
analysis and identified three themes that represented what the participants regarded as key elements of their culture as well as their perceptions toward Iraq and New Zealand.

The first theme that emerged from the interviews is “Iraq as a beautiful place of happy memories…and fear and hardship” (Collie et al., 2010, p. 212). The participants’ discussion on Iraq often shifted from positive to negative portrayal, and Collie et al. (2010) argued that this change of construction of Iraq in the young Assyrian women’s descriptions represents their multiple identities and how they negotiate among them. The contrasting views also represent the uncertain attitudes they have against their country of origin. The second theme is “New Zealand as a place of opportunities…and discrimination” (Collie et al., 2010, p. 213). The participants disclosed how New Zealanders would associate the Assyrians with the stereotypes related to Middle Eastern people when they learned that Assyrians were from Iraq. The participants reported that they would often react by informing the interlocutors that they were Christians with the goal of differentiating themselves from Muslim-Iraqis. The interviews revealed that the young Assyrian women were aware of the stereotypes New Zealanders had toward them, which led them to constantly attempt to disrupt or resist, and Collie et al. (2010) understood these participants’ anticipation and disputation toward the potential reification of stereotypes as mindful identity negotiation. The final theme is “New Zealand as a threat to the continuity of Assyrian culture” (Collie et al., 2010, p. 215). The participants revealed the constant negotiation of the discrepancies between Assyrian and New Zealand cultures. On the one hand they wanted to engage in New Zealand’s activities and adopt some of its culture, and on the other hand they wished to retain the Assyrian culture. Collie et al. (2010) believed that the ways Assyrian women positioned
themselves and were positioned in the new cultural context is a continuous process through which the participants were aware of the identity of their interlocutors and provide their response accordingly. It was through this careful positioning that the participants were able to maintain positive relationships with others.

2.7 Comparing the Theoretical Conceptualizations

This section focuses on analyzing the differences and similarities among the various approaches. I see all five approaches (PST, INT, LST, SCT, and COP) share a common view that identity is conceptualized not as a fixed entity but as dynamic, multiple, and shifting. They all acknowledge the role language, social interactions, and social contexts play in the identity formation processes. However, the differences among the perspectives could be found in terms of the emphasis each perspective placed on the recognized elements regarding its role in the process of identities’ formation, as well as other aspects that one perspective considers while the others do not. Among the five theories, PST focuses on the role of language in the identity formation process in that language and identity are considered as mutually constitutive (Norton & McKinney, 2011), while LST considers language and identity as having an indirect relation that is mediated by the individual’s knowledge with the specific set of acts and stances associated with certain identities and it is through social interactions that one’s identity is formed (Ochs, 1993). INT believes that one’s identity is expressed through both language and nonverbal messages. In the SCT perspective, language is considered an important cultural artifact that mediates one’s behavior and the construction of identity (Swain et al., 2015). And the COP framework considers language as one of the central properties for an
individual to display his identity as a legitimate member in a given community (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

In addition to the significant role of language on the formation of one’s identity, PST also places an emphasis on the relation of power in the social context and its impact on language learner identity. According to Norton (1997), the differences in one’s access to power and privilege will influence one’s understanding in terms a relationship with the larger social world. Although PST also recognizes the socialization process (Pavlenko, 2002) and its impact on one’s identity, as in LST approach, PST does not make it a primary focus. Furthermore, while PST considers the social aspect of L2 learning and identity, it lacks the psychological aspect (Block, 2007) that SCT, as a theory of mind, offers. In alignment with PST, which understands the significant role of language in the process of one’s identity construction, INT understands identity as formed through communication with others. However, INT also considers nonverbal messages as equally important as the verbal means in that identity is constructed through symbolic communication. COP stresses the significance of social participation, which states that it is through an individual’s increased participation in the target community that one is able to move from the peripheral to a more legitimate participation in the community and to form a new identity. Similar to PST, which emphasizes the role power relation plays in the formation of identity, and responding to the common critique that COP lacks an acknowledgment of the implication of inequality, COP contends that it places issues of power at the center of the theory. Wenger (2010) argues, “learning and power implies each other,” (p. 8) in that what makes an individual a competent and legitimate member of a community has to do with questions of power.
The LST, SCT, and COP approaches all recognize the role of a more knowledgeable other and they highlight the influence of the social interactions between expert and novice on the construction of identity. However, LST pays more attention to how one’s identity is negotiated through social interactions in a particular community. SCT focuses on the ways in which an individual internalizes socially and culturally constructed symbolic means in a given context that constructed one’s identity construction and impact one’s behavior, and COP emphasizes the importance of gaining access to participate in a community. In addition, SCT, as a genetic approach, considers the sociocultural history of an individual as a vital factor in understanding his or her identity developmental process. Thus, LST perspective stresses the process through which interactions with an expert socialize a novice into a particular identity, while SCT highlights the developmental process by which the individual mind is internalized or mediated by the cultural resources in the environment as well as the historical aspect of an individual. And COP focuses more on the individual’s role as a social participant in that through increased participation in the target community, one can learn the skills and knowledge to become a certain person.

2.8 A Sociocultural Integrative Approach for L2 Identity Research

This section represents an attempt to combine SCT and LST as an integrative approach and aims to inform the present study and achieve a deeper understanding regarding the relationship between L2 learning and language learner identity construction. Before I proceed to present the integrative approach of SCT and LST, I first discuss the theoretic compatibility between the two theories. Lantolf and Thorne (2006)
acknowledged the commensurability between the broader sociocultural theory that focuses on socialization and Vygotskian sociocultural theory:

There exists a general use of the term ‘sociocultural’...in general reference to social and cultural contexts of human activity...is concerned primarily with socialization and the discursive construction of identities (e.g., gender, foreigner, native, worker, child, etc.) and is certainly theoretically commensurate with the intellectual project we develop in this volume (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 2).

In Duff’s (2007) article, she presented the origins and the essential principles of each theory and argued that they are theoretically compatible based on several commonalities in terms of language learning. First, both of the theories have “social, cultural, interactional, and cognitive orientation to language learning” (p. 312). Second, the two theories both acknowledge the importance of one’s participation and social interactions in culturally organized activities in connection with learning and development. Finally, both SCT and LST pay attention to the social interaction of the expert who guides and assists the novice during his or her process of learning and development. In sum, the two theories share a conceptual structure that emphasizes the role social interactions play in one’s development, whereby the novice is able to learn, develop and transform through participation in an activity with the guidance of the expert (Duff, 2007).

Now I turn to discussing how SCT and LST could complement each other in terms of understanding the relationship between L2 learning and identity construction. Even though both theories understand identity as constructed through social interactions, they have different focuses. SCT is a theory of mind that emphasizes the mediation of
culturally and socially produced artifacts on the development of an individual’s mental activity. An individual constructs his or her identity mediated by symbolic resources such as social interactions or dialogue with others, and in turn actively controls his or her own behavior (Swain et al, 2015). In other words, SCT centers on understanding the role of mediational means or cultural tools available in the context and how mediation of an individual’s mind shapes one’s identity. Language socialization theory, however, places its emphasis on the process of socialization, wherein the expert or more knowledgeable others in a community socialized the novice into social practices, values, and ideologies of a community through social interactions.

Furthermore, even though language socialization theory acknowledges the bi-directionality and interactional process (Pontecorvo, Fasulo & Sterponi, 2001) between the expert and the novice in that the novice is not a passive learner in the socialization process, the process of how the novice actively shapes his or her identity is not sufficiently addressed. SCT’s core concept of internalization could help in explaining the process in which the novice actively reconstructs his or her identity. From SCT’s notion of internalization, Vygotsky stressed that internalization is not a transmission process that views individuals as passive recipients of cultural knowledge, but that the process is “a transformative and reciprocal process whereby the person transforms what is internalized and through externalization potentially impacts the self and the community” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 158). In other words, internalization is a process about “making something one’s own” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 162). Therefore, one’s identity is mediated through active control and internalization (developing new conceptual understandings of L2 cultural models) of the socially and culturally constructed
mediational means (dialogue/interaction with others, knowledge, ideologies, language) available in the environment (Swain et al., 2015).

Moreover, SCT provides a lens that places the historicity of an individual and its impact on that individual's identity as one of its primary focuses. However, it is argued that SCT lacks a discussion on power relations in its theoretical conceptualization (Deters, 2011) while LST recognizes the asymmetry of knowledge and power between the expert and novice, and the issues of social inequality in the interactions of socialization (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2014). Incorporating the two theoretical conceptualizations serves to provide a framework that not only takes the elements of language, social interactions, and social context into account, but also considers factors such as power relations, sociocultural history, and agency in understanding the process of language learner identity formation.

In this study, identity is construed as simultaneously socially and discursively co-constructed through interactions with others, it is both shaped by others and actively shaped by self through mediational means and cultural tools, and its formation could be constrained or afforded by cultural and historical resources of the larger social world. Moreover, within this sociocultural integrated approach, identity is conceptualized as developed through social practices, and serves to motivate actions and mediate behaviors. The integrative approach of SCT and LST aims to understand the socializing process of how language learners adopt the social rules, ideologies, and language use in the L2 community, to examine the ways in which language learners as active agents internalize the mediational means and co-construct identities with others, and explores the cultural and historical resources available in the social contexts and how they serve as affordances
or constraints during one’s identity formation process. Finally, it is important to note that
LST in the study is utilized as a theoretical frame instead of a methodological approach.
Chapter 3:  
Methodology  

3.1 The Theoretical Approach to and Goal of the Study  

3.1.1 Understanding L2 Identity: An Integrative Approach  

With the goal of understanding the relationship between second language learning and language learner’s identity formation, this study is guided by an integrative approach that combines SCT and LST. Both SCT and LST recognize that learning and identity formation occur through social interactions with more knowledgeable others. However, SCT focuses on the roles history and internalization play in one’s identity construction, while LST is concerned primarily with the socialization process and the power relations between the novice and the more experienced others. The sociocultural integrative approach to second language learners’ identity construction considers the roles that language, social interactions, sociocultural history, social contexts, and power relations play during an individual’s identity formation. This integrative approach understands language learners as active social agents whose identities are mediated by social and cultural resources (dialogue with others, ideologies, social positioning, learning experience, etc.) and are actively constructed through one’s internalization of the cultural resources, which could serve as constraints or affordances to one’s identity construction. In other words, identity formation is a process that occurs through the enactment of cultural resources in a social world (Holland et al., 2003).  

3.1.2 Language Ideology  

One cultural resource that the study aims to uncover is the language ideologies constructed through teachers’ discursive practices and social interactions in and beyond
the language classroom context. This section provides a brief discussion on the
definitions of language ideology and situates the present study on the critical strand for
the investigation of the language ideologies available in the language learners’ social
environment.

The notion of ideology

Among the many definitions of ideology, Woolard (1992) summarized four
recurring features on conceptualization, which are that ideology is perceived as
ideational, ideology is often presented as universal truths that serve the interest of a
particular group of people, ideology is an aspect that relates to distortion and
rationalization, and ideology is closely linked to the legitimation of social power and
maintenance of unequal social relations. Furthermore, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994)
identified the neutral view and the critical view – two major strands on the concept of
ideology. The neutral view understands ideology as cultural conceptions, while the
critical view considers ideology as ideas that serve the interest of and maintains power for
a particular group of people. This distinction between the critical ideological analysis and
neutral ideological analysis is referred to as The Great Divide (Woolard, 1998).

The conceptualizations of language ideology

Language ideology has been defined in various ways. Silverstein (1979), who
placed both speakers’ beliefs on language and the rationalization effect of language
ideologies on language structures as central concerns, defined the notion as “sets of
beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of
perceived language structure and use” (p. 193). Silverstein’s (1979) seminal work
changed the attitude of North American linguistic anthropology toward investigating
language users’ feelings about language. Where the research of language and social interaction once regarded them as “misleading and disturbing” (Boas, 1911, p. 67), they are now recognized as an important elements in understanding the relationship between language and society. Highlighting the sociocultural aspect, Irvine (1989) described language ideology as “the cultural systems of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interest” (p. 255).

Influenced by Silverstein (1979), Rumsey (1990) viewed language ideology as “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of the language in the world” (p. 346).

Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) and Woolard (1998) discussed the relationship between language ideology and identity, and emphasized that language ideologies are not only about language but that they “envision and enact links of language to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology” (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 56) and, because of these links, language ideologies “underpin not only linguistic form and use, but also the very notion of the person and the social group…” (Woolard, 1998, p. 20). Drawing on Woolard and Schieffelin’s (1994) notions on language ideology, which understood the concept as the mediating link between language and the social world, Piller (2015) understands it as:

beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language that are socially shared and relate language and society in a dialectical fashion: Language ideologies undergird language use, which in turn shapes language ideology and, together, they serve social ends, in other words the purpose of language ideologies is not really linguistic but social. (p. 4)
The critical view of language ideology

The critical view considers language ideologies as value-laden, naturalizing, processual, indexical, effective, and multiple. Blackledge (2005) suggested that language ideologies are not only about one’s perspectives toward the language but also the values connected to the language use:

individual speakers’ attitudes to their languages, or speaker using languages in particular ways. Rather, they include the values, practices and beliefs associated with language use by speakers, and the discourse which constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national and global levels. (p. 32)

The focus of speaker’s conceptions about language and how these conceptions are interest-laden is also discussed in Kroskrity’s (2010) definition on language ideologies as “beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structures and use, which often index the political interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation states” (p. 192).

Besides the value-laden feature, drawing on Eagleton’s (1994) view, Spitulnik (1998) suggested “language ideologies tend to be naturalizing and universalizing, disguising the conditions of their own production and their intimate and often strategic ties to power, interest, and the creation of cultural value” (p. 228). Spitulnik (1998) argued that social values, which serve to maintain power for certain groups of people, are often hidden behind seemingly neutral discursive interactions. This naturalizing or neutralizing feature of language ideologies are regarded as central to the ideological processes that “drains the conceptual of its historical content, making it seem universally and/or timelessly true” (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 58). Other than the naturalizing
aspect, Spitulnik (1998) also contended that ideologies of language should not be seen merely as a shared linguistic background of a social group that is ideational, but that is processual (Spitulnik, 1998). Taken from Saussure’s (1959) notion of relational value and Voloshinov’s (1986) notion of social evaluation, Spitulnik (1998) developed the concept of language valuation and evaluation, which focuses on ideology as a process in that “different social values and referents come to be associated with languages, forms of speaking, and styles of speaking” (p. 227). Briggs (1998) also discussed the processual nature of language ideologies that they are created and legitimated during the production of discourse. Thus, language ideologies are seen as discursively constructed and justified during social interactions, instead of predetermined by established cultural conceptions and language uses (Briggs, 1998).

In addition to the naturalizing and processual aspects of language ideology, Silverstein (1996, 2003) discussed the indexical aspect of ideology through the theory of indexical order, specifically second-order indexicality that focuses on the speaker and suggests a correlation between a linguistic form and a group of individuals. Moreover, language ideology is also viewed as “active and effective” (Woolard, 1998, p. 30). Woolard (1998) contended that it is important not only to identify the ideologies, but that it is necessary to analyze the efficacy of linguistic ideology, that is, to analyze its transformative effect on the social world. The effects of language ideology that scholars discuss the most are the legitimization and maintenance of the social powers and interests of certain social groups. Fairclough (2003) suggested that language ideologies are connected to social relations of power and “ideologies are significant element of processes through which relations of power are established, maintained, enacted and
transformed” (Fairclough, 2013a, p. 26). Furthermore, Irvine (1998) stated that language ideology, instead of being only a “culture of language” (p. 89), also “suggests a connection with those power relations and interests that are central in a social order” (p. 89). Moreover, Blackledge (2005) viewed the effect of language ideologies as creating and maintaining social differences and manifesting the belief that certain language varieties are more valued than the others. Additionally, Gal (1989) also understood language ideologies not as “a neutral system of ideas but rather as the way in which meaning, and thus language, serves to sustain relations of domination” (p. 359).

Finally, language ideology is seen as multiple. Many scholars have moved away from Saussurean’s perspective that “language exists in the form of a sum of impressions deposited in the brain of each member of a community, almost like a dictionary of which identical copies have been distributed to each individual” (Saussure, 1959, p. 19), and now discuss the multiplicity of language ideology. Briggs (1992) conceptualized ideology of language not as a circumscribed set of beliefs but as “multiple, competing, contradictory, and contested” (p. 398). Field and Kroskrity (2009) argued, similar to Bakhtin’s (1984) theorization on the multiple voices of speakers, that language users also contain multiple language ideologies. Moreover, it is considered as beneficial to understand language ideologies as plural, which captures the potentiality of different beliefs produced by the multiplicity of social divisions in a speech community that serve as indications of membership for particular communities (Field & Kroskrity, 2009). Piller (2015) also noted that even though language ideologies are constructed and repeatedly reconstructed for the power of a particular social group, they are not fixed entities. The
social function of language ideologies suggests that they are instead “multiple, fractured, contested, and changing” (p. 5).

Based on the brief overview on the conceptualizations and critical view of language ideology, this strand of research focuses on the social aspect of language that sees language ideologies not as neutral but interest-laden which serves to maintain particular social structures, and it provides a framework to understand the dialectical relations between language and society (Woolard, 1992). And through this conceptualization of language ideology, I aim to identify the teacher’s expectations and beliefs on language use, to uncover the ways in which ideologies related to language and language learners that are produced and/or reproduced in the teacher’s metalinguistic discourse as well as through social interactions with learners in the classroom, and to examine how they serve as mediational means that could be affordances and constraints in the learners’ identity formation processes. Following Woolard (1998), I use language ideology, linguistic ideology, and ideologies of language interchangeably in the present study.

3.2 Research Questions

The research questions that guided the study are as follows:

1. What are the culturally produced artifacts (dialogue, concepts, belief systems, ideologies etc.….) available in the environment (classroom, workplace, on the street, etc.) and how these can serve as constraints and affordances to learner’s identities’ construction?

2. How can we understand learner identities as simultaneously formed through the learner’s active internalization of the cultural resources available in the
environment and co-constructed with others through social interactions in the L2 community?

The first research question addresses the importance of identifying cultural and historical artifacts that are potential mediational means in the L2 classroom interactions and serve as affordances and constraints to the process of an individual’s formation of identities. The second research question focuses on investigating the process in which learners’ identities are formed both through social interactions with others, and through active internalization of the symbols available in the social world.

3.3 Data Collection and Data Analysis

3.3.1 Ethnographic Data Collection

The data comes from a 10-week ethnographic study from early April 2018 to the end of June 2018 at an Intensive Mandarin Learning Program in Northern Taiwan. The study used the main instruments of classroom observations, observation field notes, documents, audio-recorded semi-structured interviews, and audio recordings of the classroom interactions. The researcher observed and audio-recorded every class that took place from Monday to Friday, 11 AM to 1 PM, and for a total of 73 classes (approx. 146 hours). My role in the classroom was primarily as an observer-participant in that most of the time I was a silent observer, and only participated in activities or provided opinions when asked by the teacher. Eight students participated in the research, however, the present study focused on the story of three students. In order to maintain the anonymity of the participants, each student either provided a pseudonym of their choice or was given.

Selected interviews and classroom data were transcribed (see Table 1 in Appendix for transcription symbols). After each classroom observation, field notes were completed
along with the researcher’s reflections. In addition to the observations, semi-structured interviews were conducted three to four times (at the beginning, middle, and near the end of the quarter) with each student-participant, and each interview lasted from thirty minutes to two hours per interview. A summary and reflection of the interview was recorded after the interviews. Except for the teacher, who requested to be interviewed via E-mail because of her demanding schedule, semi-structured interviews with the student participants were completed in person and were audio-recorded.

3.3.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The study utilized Fairclough’s three-tier critical discourse analysis (CDA) to uncover the hidden ideologies and values embedded in the teacher’s instructions. According to Woolard et al. (1998), in order to examine what is considered as the standard forms, one should first identify what linguistic features are accepted as standard and discover the semiotic processes that construct the linguistic ideologies as a representation of collective thinking. (p. 40) Thus, for the present study, I utilized Fairclough’s CDA to uncover the teacher’s ideological interpretations toward certain language use and investigated how these ideological interpretations affect and construct different “social groups, identities, and social relations” (Woolard, 1998, p. 41).

The goal of CDA is to denaturalize the ideological representations that form the “orderliness” (Fairclough, 2013a p. 31) of social interactions. Fairclough (2013a) argued that to achieve the objective of denaturalization, one must analyze the relations of “how social structures determine properties of discourse and how discourse in turn determines social structures” (p. 30). Fairclough’s three-dimensional analysis understands the dialectical relationship between social structures (languages) and social events (texts) as
mediated by social practices (orders of discourse). Social structures represent a set of possibilities, and social events are the end products of a set of possibilities that are mediated by the network of social practices. Therefore, to understand the relationship between languages and texts, one must examine the orders of discourse. The orders of discourse are “the intermediate organizational entities” (Fairclough, 2011, p. 120) that control linguistic variation and it includes the elements of discourse, genre, and style. Discourse is the linguistic element of social practices that figures in three main ways, which correspond with the three elements: ways of acting (genres), ways of representing (discourses), and ways of being (styles).

Furthermore, Fairclough (2013a) considered social institution as a complex network of order of discourse that provides “alternative sets of discoursal and ideological norms” (p. 42). Fairclough (2013a) believed that it is important to understand that each institution provides a frame that is “simultaneously facilitating and constraining the social action (here, specifically, verbal interaction) of its members…every such institutional frame includes formulations and symbolisations of a particular set of ideological representations…” (p. 41). Therefore, through the analytical framework of CDA, one can identify the existing ideological frames and the processes in which the frames are employed or constructed in the discoursal events. However, it is important to note that events should not be viewed as merely an effect of the social structures, and social structures are not the sole place where ideology is located. Fairclough (2013a) contended that ideology is invested in a range of linguistic levels and is located “both in structures which constitute the outcome of past events and the conditions for current events, and in events themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structures” (p. 58).
Placing great emphasis on considering the interrelations of social structures and discursive events, Fairclough’s CDA (2013a) allows systematical exploration on discursive practices and allows one to see how ideologies produce and reproduce relations of power, as well as how ideologies mediate the relations between structures and events.

3.3.3 Narrative-Based Analysis and Thematic Analysis

Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) argued that first-person narratives serve as an important source of data that could reveal certain aspects of human activity, and they believed that through personal stories one can understand the history and the learning trajectory of an individual that third-person observations cannot capture. A narrative is viewed as a space where identities are reconstructed through the negotiation of conflicts between monolithic ideologies and one’s actual participation in the target discourse communities (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000). Moen (2006) believed that narratives allow us to see the movement of one’s developmental process, and when narratives are examined within the SCT framework, the relationship between the individual who has unique cultural historical backgrounds as well as the social context are considered.

The study adopted narrative-based analysis and thematic analysis adapted from Josselson (2014) and Gibson and Brown (2011) with the goal of understanding participants’ narrated experiences on language learning and processes both in the classroom and in other social contexts. According to Mishler (1999) and Emerson and Frosh (2004), the aim of narrative analysis is to “working out and working through discursive themes across interviews” (Gibson & Brown, 2011, p, 128). From classroom interaction data, the researcher uncovered the teacher’s ideologies regarding her
understanding and beliefs on the definition of standard Mandarin, the ideal language learners, and the desired language use. The researcher used the following process: First, the researcher read her field notes and highlighted the sections on the teacher’s instructions and social interactions regarding ideal language usages, forms, and behavior of the language learners. Next, the researcher went back to the audio-recordings and transcribed the highlighted events. Then, the researcher read the transcriptions and wrote down potential codes that represented the highlighted event. Last, the researcher combined or edited the codes into larger categories.

The themes that emerged from the interview data were developed through four phases of coding process: During the first phase, the researcher did several overall readings of the interview transcriptions and the researcher’s reflection notes for the interviews to gain an overall picture of the data. Then, in the second phase, the researcher paid attention to the descriptions on self-experiences and the narrators’ interactions with others. At the same time, the researcher highlighted information and wrote down notes and memos as initial codes. In the third phase, the researcher reorganized the initial codes by grouping the different narrated segments into larger categories and merging codes that had similar features. During the fourth phase, the researcher created a list of themes for each student participant based on the interrelationship among the codes developed in the previous stages. However, it is important to note that the coding processes were not linear (Braun & Clarke, 2006) but recursive in that during the theme development, the researcher constantly moved back and forth among the stages.
3.3.4 Researcher Position

The motivation to investigate the relationship between language learner identity and language learning experience, and to examine the research questions described in this chapter, emerged from my own experience as a second language learner of English throughout the different phases of my life. I was born and raised in Taiwan, where English is viewed as a valued foreign language that everyone is expected to acquire, thus, my parents created many opportunities for me to study in the United States. This provided me with the experience of learning English in an immersion environment while at the same time negotiating my role as a newcomer to the L2 community. My first experience attending school in the United States was in 1989 when I was in kindergarten, and I was told that I cried every time I entered my kindergarten class, sometimes to the point where that the teachers had to contact my parents to take me home. This experience reveals the emotional aspect one may experience during the process of adjusting to a new social and cultural world. The second time I was in the U.S. was in 1994, when I spent a year as an elementary school student. During the first day of class, the teacher asked all the students to make self-introductions and requested that everyone share their favorite food. However, I only knew two words related to food at that time: “pizza” and “apple.” Even though these were not foods that I enjoyed, I used them as my answer in order to participate in the activity. I felt the answer did not represent me, and this is the first time I experienced a disconnect between myself and the language. Despite the limitations imposed because of my English proficiency, I did make friends. However, upon reflection, most of my friends were also English as a second language (ESL) students or students who were no longer required to attend ESL classes and had moved into the
mainstream classroom. It always seemed like there was a separation between the native English speakers and I.

Then, during 11th grade, I had a third opportunity to study in the United States for a year. Before school began, I took an English proficiency test and the school decided that I did not need to attend ESL classes. And, based on my previous experience of studying abroad, I was confident that I would make the best out of a year spent as a student in an American high school. Unfortunately, to my dismay, I struggled to make friends, and without the ESL classes, I did not have access to the friendship of other international students to fall back on. I was able to understand the English spoken by my teachers and peers most of the time, but I felt that I could not express myself accurately or freely, and I could not be the person I wanted to be.

In 2011, after completing my bachelor’s degree in Taiwan, I came to the U.S. again for my master’s degree in TESOL. During those two years of study, I made many great friends in the master’s program who were both native speakers of English and peers from other countries. However, most of my close friends were people who had the same L1 as I did. In the two years that I worked on completing my master’s degree, I felt confident and comfortable regarding my English language skills and how it managed to express and present who I was during both social interactions and classroom discourses. I considered myself part of the community of the TESOL program. However, I was also aware of the separation between the English native speakers and myself in that most of my interactions with native speakers remained in the classroom.

Finally, during the fall of 2014, which was the first semester of my Ph.D. study, I experienced the challenge of participating in group discussions. I felt I lacked the right
words to use and right things to say. To put it another way, I felt I did not possess the discourse for the Ph.D. community. I started to observe how others phrase their words and how they presented their thoughts with the goal of adopting the expected discourse. And through pair work, I was able to develop relationships with the native speakers, and, different from my experience in the master’s program, the interactions with the native speakers went beyond the classroom context. These relationships were formed both by native speakers who reached out to me and by me as I become more in control of English in different contexts and gained a sense of belonging.

It is the experience as a L2 learner that caused me to recognize that my relationship with L2 had a great impact on my role in the L2 environment and that the social interactions with the native speakers influenced how I viewed myself. However, it is important to note that during the process of studying in the U.S., I was not active in creating opportunities to interact with native speakers, but instead used other strategies to negotiate my desired role as a legitimate Ph.D. student. Therefore, I wanted to know the relationship between language learning experiences and language learners’ identity formation. Additionally, I wanted to investigate how second language learners’ identities are shaped by others, or actively negotiated by one’s self.

As briefly described in the data collection section, my role in the classroom was mainly that of an observer. As the only Taiwanese in the classroom, there were occasions when I was assigned the role of representing the Taiwanese discourse community. The teacher, who was from Beijing, would invite me into the discussions regarding commonly used terms in Taiwan, positioning me as a source for answers on Taiwan’s language usages. However, this positioning created a separation between the teacher and me, even
though we were both native speakers of Mandarin. Our different accents and language usage in Mandarin created a sense of a distinction. I remember one incident when the teacher was discussing commonly mispronounced sounds that Taiwanese people tend to make, and she jokingly said, “Taiwanese is wrong.” She then used her left hand to cover the left side of her mouth, pretending to say it as a secret even though the volume of the utterance was for the class. After the comment, every student in the class turned toward me, wanting to see my reaction I smiled and did not say anything. It was incidents like these that made me more aware of the potential bias I have as a researcher, in that what I perceived as normal and legitimate may not have been for some of the others, and how my presence in the classroom may have influenced the teacher’s practices. For example, she may have changed the ways she presented her knowledge regarding the ideal Mandarin. I overcame my subjectivity with introspective reflexivity through constant reflection in the field notes and journals I wrote after interviews, which served to sensitize me to the bias and presumptions that I hold.

3.3.5 The Research Site and Participants

The study took place at an intermediate level 2 CSL class in a university-affiliated Intensive Mandarin Learning Program (IMLP) in northern Taiwan. The IMLP is located at the heart of a city in northern Taiwan that has over twenty years of history, and most of the learners came from North East and South East Asian countries. The IMLP offers both group classes and individual classes, and the group classes are small, containing no more than fifteen students. The class used for the present study had total of ten students, and eight students participated. The study focused on three student participants based on their
difference in nationality including Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese. And the three nationalities also represent the three nationalities that are available in the class.

Karen

At the time of the data collection, Karen, who is a Korean woman in her mid-thirties, had lived in Taiwan for two years. Karen started learning Mandarin in Korea when her job at the time expected her to acquire Mandarin skills for simple social interactions. During her first two years in Taiwan, as a mother of three children, her schedule did not allow her to attend any formal Mandarin institution that requires learners to follow a structured schedule. Therefore, Karen’s Mandarin learning at that time relied on tutoring sessions at home. After her youngest child was old enough to be placed in daycare, Karen decided to enter the IMLP with the purpose of advancing her Mandarin ability and meeting new people from other countries.

Cindy

Cindy, who was in her early twenties, had studied in the IMLP for about eight months at the time of this study, and she had no prior experience in learning Mandarin before coming to Taiwan from Vietnam. As an employer of her family’s seafood company, she reported that her family saw the important role Mandarin played in effectively communicating with Chinese business people. Cindy had been assigned the task of learning Mandarin to become an interpreter who could assist her family’s company in conducting business in China.

Keiko

Keiko, a Japanese woman in her mid-thirties, decided to learn Mandarin after a business trip to Taiwan, when she met some Taiwanese people who were able to
communicate in both Mandarin and Japanese and that motivated her to acquire Mandarin as her second language. Keiko had lived and learned Mandarin in Taiwan for nearly a year at the time of the study, and, even though she was in Taiwan, she was working at a Japanese entertainment company while growing her skills in Mandarin. She had done translation work and had served as an interpreter who went on business trips to China for the company.

Teacher

The teacher, who came from Beijing, had taught Mandarin since 2005. Prior to teaching in Taiwan, she had taught Mandarin in the UK for a few years. She moved to Taiwan when she married her husband who is Taiwanese. She considers the role of a teacher in the classroom as a “tool” to be utilized by the learners to facilitate and assist the students’ learning, and to allow the students to become the “host” of the classroom who are able to speak freely and confidently.

A day in the intermediate-level CSL class in IMLP

The class begins at 11:10 AM, and some students start to arrive and stand in the hallway close to the entrance of the classroom around 10:55 AM, waiting for the previous class to end. As more students arrived, they greet each other and form a small circle in the hallway and plan trips to new restaurants in the city after the class or for the coming weekend. Around 11:00 AM, the students stop their chatting and begin to approach the classroom, however, today the teacher is not in the classroom and there is a message left on the white board that reads, “Class is moved to Rm. XXX.” The students start rushing to the changed classroom; some take the elevator and some decide to use the stairs.
As the students go into the classroom, they greet the teacher loudly in Mandarin and say to the teacher, “Hello, teacher.” The teacher greets them back one by one, briefly and softly. The classroom where the class most often takes place has three columns of long desks that are suitable for two students. The column closest to the entrance has only two rows of desk while the other two columns have four rows of desk. The classroom being used today appears usually serve as a conference room and is filled with three columns of theater seats and each has four rows. The column at the very end of the room has only one seat in each row, while the column in the middle has four seats, and the column closest to the door has two seats. The ceiling has a fluorescent light that intersects with air conditioning outlets. In the months of April to June in Taiwan, the temperature outside ranges from 82 to 89 degrees Fahrenheit which forms a great contrast to the temperature in the classroom that is usually kept at 71 to 75 degrees Fahrenheit.

There is a white board at the center front of the class and a digital podium standing on the left side of the white board facing the students. There are handouts, workbooks, and personal belongings that the teacher placed on the desk closest to the digital podium where the teacher often stands. Even though the students do not have assigned seats, they still go to their regular seats and pull textbooks and pencil boxes out of their bags. At 11:05 AM, students who have other classes before this one start to arrive, and the students inside can hear their laughter and joyful chatting in the hallway. Cindy enters the classroom and greets the teacher loudly, and the other students turn their attention to her, waiting for what she has to say or share with the teacher. By 11:10 AM, all the students have arrived, and the teacher starts the class punctually.
The teacher returns the test sheets from yesterday to the students, and starts going over the questions and says, “Everyone selected the correct answer for this question.” She then asks the whole class to read correct answers to the fill-in-the-blank questions. The class now fills with the sound of the students, with some who are slower than others and some who are louder than the rest. One student only seems to move her mouth but no sounds come out. When Keiko, who sits closest to the podium, reads the term 現代人 xian4 dai4 ren2 or, ‘modern people,’ she pronounces the 4th tone as the 1st tone, and the teacher calls out her name and reminds her to stress the 4th tone while swinging her hands down to demonstrate the downward sound of the tone.

After reading through a few more answers on the test sheets, Keiko mispronounces the /ü/ sound as /u/ for the word 去 qu4, ‘u4 / and the teacher stops again and says “qu4, ü ü ü,” emphasizing the /ü/ sound while exaggerating the shape of the position with her mouth when making the sound. Keiko then repeats the word several times until the teacher is satisfied with the result. The reading is often interrupted with these brief one-on-one sessions, and the other students wait silently while staring at the whiteboard or at their textbooks. When Keiko successfully produces the sound, the teacher reminds the whole class, “Students need to find time practicing the tones on their own.”

Around 11:30 AM, the teacher asks the students to turn to the vocabulary section in their textbooks and picks up where they left off in the previous class. For each new term, the teacher first demonstrates the correct pronunciation and the students repeat it, then the teacher provides the definition by using the term in a sentence, and, as with the demonstration of the term, the students repeat the teacher’s sentence. It is now 11:45 AM,
and, after the teacher goes over all the terms for the chapter, the class moves on to the grammar section that includes four new sentence structures. The teacher reads the descriptions and rules on how the new sentence structure is used and its purpose. As the teacher reads the descriptions in the textbook, she notices that the textbook uses the interrobang “?!?” for rhetorical questions, and she asks the students to cross off the exclamation mark, saying that no matter how strong of an emotion a person wants to convey, one should still choose to use one type of punctuation, and it is considered incorrect to use two punctuations at once.

Then the teacher asks the students to complete the exercise under the newly introduced structure in pairs. One of the pairs start to work on the exercise together, and when one student is still thinking, the other speaks out the answer, and is then ready to move on to the next question. Another pair of students works in silence without much discussion. With only four practice questions in the textbook, the teacher decides to give extra practice by creating four new questions on the white board and asks the students to complete them. Five minutes before 12:00 PM, the teacher starts to ask for the answers. She selects one student from each pair and asks them to share their answers with the entire class. The students answer the questions successfully, and the teacher says, “You guys are really good, it looks like I shouldn’t have worried, hahaha.”

It is now 12:00 PM, time for the class to have a short ten-minute break. The teacher reminds the student that in the beginning of the second period there will be a listen-and-write test, and she goes to the door and props it open for the break. She then turns back to her podium and brings her thermal with her out to the hallway to fill it up at the water fountain. Some students go out to the restroom or to stretch their legs, and some
review the content of the textbook for the test. In the middle column of desks, three Korean female students stay in their seats. Two of them sit side by side at one of the long desks while the other sits at the desk in front of them. She turns sideways to face them, and they begin to chat in Korean in a low volume.

On the left column of desks, two female students, one Japanese and the other Vietnamese, share what they did during the weekend in Mandarin. One student asks the teacher the difference between two measure words that are used to describe cars, and the teacher replies that one is used to describe fancier cars and the other is used to refer to common cars. Then the teacher asks for my opinion on the student’s question, and I respond that I think one is for larger cars and the other is for smaller ones. The teacher concludes that people have different ideas as to the word choices based on where they grew up.

At 12:10 PM, students are asked to put away their textbooks and the teacher distributes blank sheet of papers to the students. The teacher then begins to read sentences that contain the recently learned terms, and after she reads them once, she reminds the students to mark the tones for each words, and to put punctuation, saying “Remember to put down the punctuations for each sentence, unless you are people from ancient China.” The teacher reads each sentence three times with about thirty second intervals, and when the students are write down their answers, the teacher walks around the room. She reads a total of seven sentences. After the teacher has read the last sentence for the final time, she collects the papers. She looks at some students’ test papers while she collects them, and she reminds one of them by saying, “There is no particle of ‘people,’ no particle on the left.” The student stares at the test sheet and quickly erases
the miswritten word and after the word it is rewritten, she looks at the teacher, and the
teacher says, “Now it is correct,” and collects the paper. As the teacher collects the test
paper from another student, who only writes in simplified Chinese, she asks, “Would you
like to change? It is better to know how to write in both.” The student shakes her head
and smiles shyly.

Around 12:25 PM, the class continues to look at the grammar structure for
rhetorical questions. The teacher asks the students to take out the handouts for the current
chapter and reminds the students that they must be mindful when using rhetorical
question because it may sound impolite. Then the teacher decides to form the students
into groups to finish the grammar exercises on the handout orally instead of writing the
answers down. The teacher says, “It is easier for you to practice Mandarin while chatting
right?” The students start to speak in groups and the room is filled with voices of students
practicing while the teacher corrects the students’ pronunciations. By 12:40 PM, the
teacher begins to call on each group to read the answers to the whole class. When one of
the students presents her answer with a good pronunciation, the teacher compliments her,
“It was spoken wonderfully.”

At 12:50, with ten minutes left before the end of the class, the teacher asks the
students to turn to the page on the handout with a list of questions that are related to the
chapter in the textbook and asks the students to use the questions to chat in Mandarin.
While the students talk, the teacher walks up and down the aisles to listen to their
conversation and interjects when she identifies distinctive mistakes regarding their word
choice, grammar, and pronunciation. A student asks, “What is the opposite of 一分錢一分貨 ‘you get what you pay for’?” The teacher laughs and says, “Why do you need to
know the opposite of that? Let me think, it would be that stuff that is cheap does not necessarily mean it is bad quality.” At 1:00 PM, the teacher announces that it is time and they are allowed to leave. The students start collecting their belongings and begin to leave the classroom individually or in groups. When the students pass by the teacher, each of them nods and thanks the teacher.
Chapter 4:

Language Ideologies in the CSL Classroom

4.1 Ideologies and Fairclough’s CDA

Schieffelin et al. (1998) consider the educational institution to be an influential setting where the formation and perpetuation of linguistic ideologies transpire. In this chapter, adopting Fairclough’s CDA (2013a), I examined the cultural conceptions of language available in the classroom discourse to see how it serves to maintain particular social relations, social roles, and power. The teacher’s linguistic discourse in the classroom could be viewed as not only serving to construct but maintain ideologies about language. Therefore, classroom practices contribute to establish linguistic ideologies that function as a guide for the students to discern what is considered legitimate ways to speak, think, or act in the social world, while excluding and delegitimating competing ideologies or other language forms. My goal was to understand the processes through which linguistic ideologies are developed and distributed, and how they are linked to the maintenance of power for certain groups of people. I first identified the underlying linguistic ideologies the teacher produced or reproduced during the linguistic practices in the classroom. Then, I analyzed the potential effects and functions the identified linguistic ideologies have in creating or maintaining certain power relations and social roles in the social world beyond the classroom.

4.2 Ideologies and Language Ideologies Constructed in the CSL Classroom

4.2.1 Ideology on the Characteristics of Successful Language Learners
The characteristics of successful language learners are ideologically formed through the teacher’s instructional practices and the desired characteristics include cooperation, perseverance, and diligence. The teacher often delivered her beliefs on how the students were expected to act in combination with the explanation of the definition of the new term.

The characteristic of cooperative

One of the identified characteristics that the language learners were encouraged to adopt was cooperation during the teacher-student classroom interactions. As excerpt 1 illustrates, while the teacher discussed the new term 配合, ‘to cooperate,’ the teacher also constructed the ideology on a valued quality that language learners need to acquire, i.e., in order to become successful they need to cooperate with the teacher in the classroom because the teacher is considered “more experienced” and knows the best way for the students to learn.

Excerpt 1

1 T: …上課的時候你們要配合老師，因為你自己大概不知道怎麼樣學得更好，還不
2 知道，老師的經驗比較多，所以我觉得你应该要這樣=這樣=這樣((Laughter))然
3 後我覺得你大概兩三個月後你就進步了，恩所以這是配合…
4 ‘… during the class you should cooperate with the teacher, since you probably do not
5 know what are the better ways to learn, don’t know yet, the teacher has more
6 experience, so I think you should do this=this=this ((Laughter)) and then I think you
7 will progress about two to three months after, mm so this is cooperate…’

Excerpt 1 illustrates the ways in which the dominant value or belief is often embedded in the teacher’s explanation of the meaning of new words, and this time the class encountered the new term 配合 ‘to cooperate.’ Through providing an example in explaining and demonstrating the meaning and use of the term, the content of the example appears to be embedded with an underlying belief and the ideal roles the teacher
and the students should play in the classroom is constructed. The teacher began explaining the definition of the term by incorporating the new word 配合 ‘to cooperate’ into the sentence in line 4, “during the class you should cooperate with the teacher” with the modal verb “should,” which implies a sense of command from the teacher, and also indicates the necessity of acquiring this particular trait for the students in order to be successful in language learning. In lines 4-6, the Chinese grammatical structure of cause and effect “since…so…” is employed to develop the casual relation in which the cause or identified issue is the students’ inability to find an efficient way to learn, and the effect or implied solution is “to cooperate with the teacher” who “has more experience.” In addition, the comparative word “more” serves to further emphasize the difference of knowledge between the teacher and the students regarding learning strategy.

In lines 6-7, the teacher ended the explanation with a prediction statement, “then I think you will progress.” The connector “then” suggests the causal relation between cooperating with the teacher and being able to advance one’s ability in Mandarin. Finally, the modal verb “will” indicates a sense of assertion and promise from the teacher in terms of the positive result of “progress.” From this excerpt, with the use of causal relation sentences and modal verbs of command and promises, the teacher constituted a particular way of thinking and acting in that the students were encouraged to comply with the teacher in the classroom. In combination with the promised positive outcome associated with the established desired characteristic of cooperation from the students, a power relation between the teacher and the students is formed. In addition, this excerpt also evoked the ideology of “the teacher knows best” and seems to leave no room for negotiation or feedback from the students regarding the class content or teaching method.
of the teacher, which serves to consolidate the social role of students being completely submissive and compliant.

The characteristic of perseverance

The second desired characteristic for ideal language learner is perseverance. The teacher associated the habit of practicing writing Chinese characters to the positive result of acquiring proficiency in general for Mandarin, constructing the belief in the importance of perseverance for Chinese character-writing. Furthermore, the relationship between foreign language learners and Mandarin is created in that if one wanted to become successful in Mandarin, one must practice writing Chinese characters.

Excerpt 2

T: 如果有錯的字，一定要寫啊! 因為你不寫得話(.)外國人(.)如果不寫字，一定學不好中文。寫字的人就一定學得好中文((Laughter))

‘If there is a wrongly written word, must write it down! Because if you don’t (. ) as a foreigner (. ) if one doesn’t practice writing characters, one definitely wouldn’t be able to learn Chinese well, the people who do practice writing characters will definitely be able to learn Chinese well ((Laughter))…’

Excerpt 2 shows the teacher’s emphasis on the importance of practicing writing Chinese character in that it serves as a crucial element for the outcome of one’s language learning. In line 3, the teacher introduced the central role of practicing writing Chinese characters by opening with the conditional clause, “If there is a wrongly written word,” and following it by an imperative clause, “must write it down!” The conditional relation of the two clauses suggests a demand from the teacher, and with the use of modal verb “must,” a sense of necessity is created for the students to follow the demand of rewriting the wrongly written characters. In lines 3-5, the teacher uses the causal relation through the deployment of the conjunction “Because” together with the conditional “if” in the clause, “Because if you don’t,” which creates a sense of warning. Interestingly, before
announcing the result, the teacher specifically points out “as foreigner,” separating the foreign language learners from the native speakers. Then, the result of not practicing writing characters suggests that one “definitely wouldn’t be able to learn Chinese well.” The adverb “definitely” expresses the teacher’s high commitment to the claim that one would not be able to learn Mandarin without practicing writing characters.

Lines 4-6 outline the strategy of legitimation categorized as *Mythopoesis* (Fairclough, 2003), which is, “legitimation conveyed through narrative” (p.98), and can be found in the structure of the teacher’s narrative, in which the learning outcome would be bad if one “doesn’t practice writing characters,” and the learning outcome would be good for “the people who do practice writing characters.” As suggested by Fairclough (2003), this type of narrative has the characteristic of a cautionary tale. The characteristic of a cautionary tale could also be seen from the lack of elaboration and specificities in the teacher’s lecture regarding the connection between practicing writing characters and success in learning Mandarin. Notice that in the excerpt, “learn Chinese well” is used twice, however, which language skill would benefit from practicing writing characters is not explicitly discussed. The positive result of language learning is only discussed in a general manner. Furthermore, the verb 寫 ‘to write’ and the verb-object compound 寫字 ‘to write’ Chinese characters’ are used repetitively, functioning as an emphasis on the particular action, consequently, placing a particular importance on the value of perseverance.

The characteristic of diligence

Excerpt 3 shows how classroom instructions index the teacher’s beliefs about the importance of diligent behavior for language learners to become proficient in speaking
Mandarin. When the teacher emphasized the significance of repetition for learning Chinese tones, she also made the connection between the characteristic of diligence and success in speaking Mandarin was also established.

Excerpt 3

((Getting ready to play a children’s song on tones))

T: 如果你真的希望你的中文說得好，聲調一定要苦練。因為最少每個字要說六十幾次, 那個中文專家研究的說, 三十幾次你聽得懂, 說六十幾次你自己才會說。所以一定要一直重複，重複乃學習之母，就一直重複重複，好大家跟我來念念…

‘If you truly wish you could speak good Chinese, tones must be diligently practiced. Because each word needs to be spoken at least sixty-plus times, that Chinese expert says, thirty-plus times you will understand the word when you hear it, and it has to be spoken sixty-plus times that you will be able to speak it yourself, so it must be repeated over and over again, repetition is the mother of learning, just repeat and repeat, alright everyone read with me…’

This excerpt illustrates the dominant value the teacher placed on the importance of repetition and diligence in language learning. In line 4, the teacher created a conditional relation by using the “if…, (then)…” structure where the If-clause, “If you truly wish you could speak good Chinese” sets out the desired result, and the main clause, “tones must be diligently practiced,” is the condition. The use of adverb “truly” indicates that only the students with a high level of commitment towards the goal of speaking Mandarin well would be willing to diligently practice tones. In other words, the conditional sentence suggests that those who do not diligently practice tones do not genuinely want to speak better Chinese. The modal verb “must” not only implies the degree of certainty but also a sense of necessity for the students to “diligently practice” tones in order to speak better Chinese. Then, the teacher elaborated her statement on the importance of diligence through providing an approximate number of times that one would need to practice speaking a word with the causal sentence in line 5: “Because each word needs to be spoken at least sixty-plus times.” To reinforce the given number as an
established fact, in lines 5-7 the teacher employed the rhetoric of indirect reporting (Fairclough, 2003), which is the summary of what is said or written, with the clause, “Chinese language expert says…” and the use of intertextuality which includes the voice of an “expert” implies a sense of institutional authority that further legitimizes the teacher’s belief on the effects of diligence.

In line 8, the teacher used a Chinese idiom 重複乃學習之母 ‘repetition is the mother of learning,’ a proverb that is often regarded as conventional wisdom, and in the present excerpt, it functions as a summary that the desired way of learning is though repetition. Furthermore, according to Obelkevich (1987), “people use proverbs to tell others what to do in a given situation or what attitudes to take towards it” (p. 44). Proverbs, then, are viewed as “strategies for situation with authority, formulating some part of a society’s common sense, its values and ways of doing things” (Obelkevich, 1987). With the incorporation of expert knowledge, the repetitive use of the word “repeat,” and the employment of a Chinese proverb, the teacher constructed the belief about the significance of diligence as one of the valued characteristics that language learners must acquire in order to be a successful language user. The ideology on the characteristics for successful language learners constituted and encouraged in the classroom served to maintain a particular social role for the students (compliance, perseverance, and diligence) and created the social relationship with the teacher that students should be compliant to the teacher because the “teacher knows best.”

Avoid making the same mistake more than twice

Through the classroom instructional practices, not only was the ideal language learner identity constructed, but sometimes the desired learning process was also created
as the class encountered new words or phrases. In the example that follows, the teacher explains the new term 犯错, ‘to make mistake, but she also shares the cultural value on the ideal learning process, which is that students are expected not to make the same mistake more than twice.

Excerpt 4

T: 所以我們常常說同樣的錯不要再犯第二次，聽得懂吧？…同樣的錯你不能再犯第二次，也可以這樣講啦 “再一再二，不可以再三再四”就是你可以犯錯，我們的程度是兩次可以接受，比方說，你每次說再 jian1 ((should be in the 4th tone)) ‘So we often say do not make the same mistake twice, understand?…you cannot make the same mistake twice ((types on the screens)) alright, may not make the same mistake twice. It can also be said like this “once again twice again, must not be a third and a forth” means you can make mistake, our limit is twice that can be accepted, for example, every time you say Zai4 *jian1((should be in the 4th tone))’

Cindy: ((Laughter))

T: 好，你今天說再 Jian1，明天再 jian1，後天你再說再 jian1 就要打屁股了。應該是再 jian4 是吧？((Laughter)) 所以我們常常就是給你一次錯的機會，兩次錯的機會，但三次四次就不能原諒了對吧？… ‘Ok, today you say zai4 *jian1, tomorrow zai4 *jian1, the day after tomorrow you say zai4 *jian1 again then spanking is needed. It should be zai4jian4, right? ((laughter)) so we often time would give you the chance of making the mistake once, making the mistake twice, but it is unforgivable for the third time the fourth time, right?’

In this excerpt, the teacher constructed the ideology that it is considered undesirable for a student to make the same mistake more than two times. In line 5, the teacher started by using the exclusive “we” referring to herself and to other native Mandarin-speakers, which indicates a sense of authority towards the concept “do not make the same mistake twice” and functions as a propositional assumption that this particular belief is well-known. Together with the adverb “often” and the verb “say,” the teacher implies that this belief is not only well-known in the native speaker community but that it is commonly used. The teacher’s use of multimodal illustration through typing
the belief into a word document and projecting it onto the white board in front of the classroom served as an indication that this particular belief is important.

In line 7, after typing the belief onto the white board with verbal repetition, the teacher provided a near idiom-like saying, “once again twice again, must not be a third and a forth,” as an alternative way to express the same concept. The intertextuality of including a near idiom expression further legitimizes this particular concept as a statement of fact. In line 8, the teacher then interpreted the idiomatic expression in a literal way when she explained, “you can make mistake, our limit is twice that can be accepted.” With the use of the possessive pronoun “our,” she implies a sense of agreement among native speakers towards this particular statement, and the word choice of “limit” acts as an existential assumption, which implies that there is a “limit” for one’s level of tolerance towards others’ mistakes.

In line 9, the teacher elaborated on the concept of not making the same mistakes by including one of the student’s, Cindy’s, frequent mistakes in the instruction, which is the mispronunciation of the word 見 jian4 in 再見 zai4 jian4, ‘goodbye,’ which should be in the 4th tone. The teacher intentionally pronounced it in the 1st tone, jian1, which served as an exemplification on the target concept. The teacher created a hypothetical situation in line 11 with the mistake. Interestingly, the teacher narrated the situation in a story-telling manner, adhering to the basic structure of the idiomatic saying introduced in lines 7-8, which was that it is acceptable to make the same mistake of saying jian with the 1st tone today (once) and tomorrow (twice). However, as indicated in line 15, if one continues to make the same mistake the day after tomorrow (the third time) one will receive the punishment of “spanking.” Here, it is important to point out that the teacher’s
choice of the expression “spanking” created a tone that is normally used on children as a warning towards unfavorable actions. It is also interesting because the students in the classroom were all adults between 25-35 years old, so it is unlikely that the teacher would perform corporal punishment on them. Therefore, the suggestion of corporal punishment functions as a humorous way to emphasize the undesirableness for students to make the same mistake.

Furthermore, taking the idiom-like expression literally, that the first two times making the same mistake is acceptable as long as one does not make that mistake for a third time, the expression functions as an exaggeration that emphasizes the message behind this particular way of doing things. The teacher ended with the rhetorical question, “but it is unforgivable for the third time the fourth time, right?” that has the effect of persuading the students to accept the belief that it is viewed as unacceptable for one to make the same mistakes too many times.

4.2.2 Language Ideology on Speaking Politely and Respectfully

Influenced by Irvine’s (1989) definition on language ideology that “the cultural systems of ideas about social and linguistics relationships together with their loading of political and moral interests” (p. 255), Dunn (2013) suggested recently that the concept of politeness in the politeness theory is regarded as a form of language ideology. Thus, the analysis of politeness as a type of language ideology uncovers how the teacher’s instructions and evaluations on politeness serve as a way that promotes particular ways of being. In this section, the students were taught to speak in particular ways that the teacher viewed as polite.
The view on politeness formed in the Chinese language classroom serves as the ideal language use that shapes the students into a certain presentation of self which is established as the desired way to communicate with others in the Chinese language context. The teacher’s metapragmatic discourse not only constructs language ideologies but also serves as a means for language socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b) whereby the students model the teacher, and are taught the correct language patterns and are socialized into particular cultural beliefs and desired ways of being from the more knowledgeable other.

The polite way to ask others to speak first

In the following excerpt, the teacher discusses the appropriate ways to request another person speak first during classroom discussions or to nominate oneself to do so.

Beside the instruction on the use of the politeness marker “please,” the teacher pointed out the difference between speaking in a children’s and adult’s manner, and the students were expected to speak in an age appropriate way.

Excerpt 5

T: 這個::如果兩個同學一起練習的話，你要請那個同學說(.)(.)你先請”(.)(.)
阿你先請”(.)(.)如果說自己就不用說“我先請”((laughter))就說“我來”(.)(.)就可
以了(.)(.)對自己不用那麼客氣(.)(.)你要:: “你先請”:: “我先來”::阿這樣的，如
果說，“我先”，好像聽起來像小朋友的感覺，“我先=我先(.)(.)你先=你先”(.)
阿是不是？“你先請::我先來”::阿這樣子，好了嗎？懂了嗎？待會兒你們就用
一下...

‘Now::when two of the students are practicing in pairs, and you want to ask the other
student to go first (.)(.) you need to (.)(.) “you go first please”(.)(.) ah “you go first please” if
you are telling the other person that you want to go first you don’t have to say, “I will
go first please” ((Laughter)) just say, “I will go first” (.)(.) that will be fine (.)(.) you
needn’t treat yourself as polite as to others (.)(.) ah (.)(.) you need to:: “you go first please::
I will go first”::((adding the dummy verb 來)) as such, if you say, “I first” ((without
the dummy verb 來)), it seems to be sounding like a child, “I first=I first (.)(.)((without
the dummy verb 來)) you first=you first” (.)(.) right? “you go first please:: I will go
The excerpt occurred after the students had been practicing new grammatical structures in pairs, and the teacher overheard the students negotiating who should go first, and the students’ use of language did not adhere to the ideal Chinese cultural norms. Therefore, as shown in this excerpt, the teacher instructed the students on the desired ways to communicate with others, and one of the important ways is to speak appropriately in terms of the degree of politeness and one’s age.

Lines 6-7 illustrate the importance of expressing respect for others and the teacher explains the proper way to ask the other person to go first is to add the politeness marker “please” after the request sentence “you go first” in “you go first please.” In line 7, the teacher used the verb “need,” which serves as a modal marker that implies the obligation and the necessity for the students to follow the suggested way of using language. Lines 8-10 show the teacher’s beliefs on exhibiting politeness by contrasting how one should treat oneself with how one should treat others by utilizing the word 請 ‘please.’ 請 ‘please’ is a causative verb that functions as the highest form of formality and politeness in asking others to do something. The teacher reminded the students that one should use the causative verb 請 ‘please’ when asking others to go first, however, if one is volunteering to speak first, the causative verb should not be used because “you needn’t treat yourself as polite as to treating others.” The teacher’s discourse constructs a politeness ideology based on the importance of showing respect for others while being humble.

Also, the teacher created a language ideology regarding the appropriate ways for an adult to speak. In lines 11-12, the teacher utilized the conditional semantic relation “if you say, I first ((without the dummy verb 來 ‘come’)), it seems to be sounding like a
child” as a way to legitimize the belief that the way the students were speaking was considered childish and was undesirable. Then, the conditional semantic relation is followed by an elaboration in lines 12-13 when the teacher reenacted how the students speak “I first=I first (.)((without the dummy verb 來 ‘come’)) you first=you first” as a way to emphasize the students’ inappropriate use of language. In line 13, the teacher ended the reenactment with the rhetorical question “right?” to further make her point. Also, the teacher’s use of the imperative verb “say” before the demonstrations of the correct language usage could be considered “a powerful language socialization technique (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984).” This excerpt shows the ideological function of the teacher’s metapragmatic discourse on the appropriate ways to negotiate taking turns during classroom discussions that is viewed as polite as well as an acceptable way for adults to speak.

The polite way to interrupt others

As the class comes to the new term 打擾 ‘to disturb/to interrupt,’ the teacher introduces the desired language use that displays a high degree of politeness when one is asking for a favor of others. Excerpt 6 shows the production of politeness ideologies through the teacher’s evaluation regarding specific language use that the foreign language learners are expected to perform.

Excerpt 6

((on the word “打擾” to disturb/to interrupt))

1 T: …打擾就是去麻煩別人，所以你要問別人，請別人幫忙的時候，都先說這句，
2 比較有禮貌，說 “對不起可以打擾一下嗎？” 恩打擾完了以後就說 “啊不好意思
3 打擾你了!”((Laughter))聽起來怎麼這麼客氣？…
4 ‘…To interrupt means to trouble someone, so when you want to ask someone, asking
5 someone for assistance, always start with this sentence, it is more polite, say “I am
sorry could I interrupt you for a second?” mm after the interruption you then say “ah sorry to interrupt you!” ((Laughter)) why does it sound so polite?...

During the introduction of new terms, instead of only providing definitions for the term, the teacher would often give out examples on how the terms are commonly incorporated into daily conversation. In this example, the teacher’s demonstration manifested the linguist ideology of politeness on the desired way of asking someone for a favor. Excerpt 6 occurred when the class encountered the new word 打擾 ‘to interrupt/to disturb,’ and the teacher instructed the students on the ways to utilize the new term so that they would sound more polite when requesting attention or assistance from others. The imperative clause in line 5 “always start with this sentence,” along with the fact that the teacher a native speaker and the more knowledgeable other, implies a sense of tradition or norm that legitimize the teacher’s statement and leaves no other alternatives. In addition, the use of adverb “always” serves to emphasize the high degree in which the term is suitable for all occasions. In line 5, after stating that the term should be used whenever asking something of someone, the teacher uses the evaluative statement “It is more polite,” in which it is assumed that being polite is desirable Therefore, using the term 打擾 ‘to interrupt/to disturb’ when asking for assistance is considered good.

In lines 5-7, incorporating the target word, the teacher moved on to the demonstration of the preferred ways to begin and end a communication with others, which functions as an exemplification of the appropriate placement of the words with the goal of teaching the students how to exhibit politeness in the situation where one needs to initiate and end a request for a favor. In line 7, the use of the rhetorical question, “why does it sound so polite?” functions as an evaluative statement on the high degree of politeness of the demonstration and works as an elaboration on how this type of speech is
The teacher’s cultural conceptions about polite language are also produced.

**The polite way to turn down an invitation**

Under the concept of politeness there also exists the idea of declining an invitation politely. This excerpt expresses that one of the central elements of speaking politely is closely related to speaking in a way that is considerate of the listener. In other words, the speaker should put the receiver’s perspective into consideration. The teacher’s guidelines on this particular discursive form suggest the intricate degree of politeness one should adhere to depending on the relationship among the interlocutors. Below, the teacher explicitly discusses the appropriate way to decline an invitation that is used among people who have a closer relationship.

**Excerpt 7**

T: …“不了”，好同学把“不了”划下来，“不了”划下来，underline please，它的意思 1
2 是，“不了”的意思是比較熟悉的人之間拒絕，說不要的時候，比較客氣的，這 3 4 是一種習慣用語，比較客氣。比如說“不”，這個就不客氣，”你再吃一點吧” “不”((Laughter))這樣聽起來不客氣。“不了”，後面解釋為什麼，“我已經吃飽了”。 5 所以這是很好的，我們常用的，這個要到高級班才學到。懂了嗎？“跟我們一起去吃刨冰吧?” “不了，我下午還有事”這樣子比較客氣，聽起來也比較舒服… 6 ‘…“no” ((no+ modal particle “le”)), okay students underline “no” ((no+ modal particle 7 “le”)) underline please, it means, “no” ((no+ modal particle “le”)) is a refusal that is used between people who are more close, 8 when saying no, it is more polite, this is a common usage, it is more polite. For 9 example, “no” ((no without particle “le”)), this is impolite, “have some more food” “no” ((no without particle “le”)) ((laughter)) this sounds impolite. “no” ((no+ modal 10 particle “le”)), provide an explanation after, “I already ate.” So this is very good, we 11 use it often, this is learned in the advanced classes. Understand? “Come to have some 12 shaved ice with us?” “no+ particle, I am busy this afternoon” this is more polite, it 13 sounds more comfortable…’

Excerpt 7 occurred while the teacher was leading the students in reading dialogue in their textbook. The example of 不了 ‘no+ modal particle’ in the textbook was used as
a standard negation, whereas 不 ‘no’ was used to negate an action in the future, and 了 was a modal particle used at the end of the sentence. 不了 ‘no+ modal particle’ was used in the textbook when the speaker declined to spend more time at someone’s house. What should be noted in this particular example is that the meaning would remain the same without the use of the particle 了, thus, the function of the particle, as suggested by the teacher, is to sound more polite. In lines 7-8, the teacher began by telling the students to “underline” the words 不了 ‘no+ modal particle,’ instilling a sense of importance regarding this particular language use. Then, in line 10, the teacher stated 不了 ‘no+ modal particle’ was “more polite,” using the comparative phrase to differentiate the desired usage from other possible usages, and positive values are assumed through the word “polite.” After the evaluative statement, the teacher uses the authorization strategy to legitimize the target usage as a custom use of language that is “common.” In lines 11-12, the teacher used “no” twice without the particle 了, and each time she followed it with an explicit negative evaluation that demonstrates this particular usage is impolite. Moreover, the teacher laughed after the second time she used the impolite language. The laughter not only suggests but also emphasizes the undesirable quality of using “no” without the particle. Together, the positive and negative demonstrations serve as exemplifications that enhance the constructed values of what is polite/desirable and what is impolite/undesirable.

In line 13, the teacher then used the imperative clause “provide an explanation after” to instruct the students to add an explanation after saying 不 ‘no.’ The imperative clause expresses that it is necessary for the students to follow the stated structure in order
to be regarded as someone who is polite. The teacher uses another explicit evaluation after she demonstrated the structure of refusal, “so this is very good.” The adverb “very” indicates the teacher’s positive evaluation toward the desired structure of “no+ particle 了, reason/explanation.” In lines 15-16, the teacher demonstrated the usage again, however, this time she presented a mock conversation between two speakers, and ended with the explicit evaluation stating “it sounds more comfortable.” The word choice “comfortable” suggests the importance for the speaker to be considerate of how the listener may perceive his or hers words, and the speaker’s responsibility to make sure the listener is not offended by the rejection. In this excerpt, the teacher’s positive perception towards the language pattern for polite refusal “no+ particle 了, reason/explanation” is constructed, and the teacher’s notion of what is appropriate is grounded in classroom interactions.

**Avoid using rhetorical questions to the teacher**

One of the language patterns that the teacher advised students use with caution is the rhetorical question structure, which has the possibility of exhibiting a hostile attitude toward the listener. In the example below, the teacher not only reminded the students to be cautious when using the rhetorical structure 哪裡…？‘How would…?’ She also warned the students that the structure should not be used with her because of their status differences and, regardless of their age, the students are expected to speak to the teacher in a certain way. Excerpt 8 shows how a linguistic practice forms certain ideological perspectives and in turn, how language ideology serves as a means to create social differences.
Excerpt 8

((on the rhetorical question structure 哪裡…? How would…?))

T: w我自己覺得很不客氣，請同學小心用。比方說“你昨天怎麼沒有來？” “我哪裡知道要上課”((Laughter))你不可以這樣跟老師說話，聽起來很不禮貌，不客氣，或者語氣比較強…

‘…I personally think it is very impolite, please use it carefully. For example, “why didn’t you come yesterday?” “How would I know there is class” ((Laughter)) you cannot talk to teacher like that, it sounds very ill mannered, impolite, and more aggressive in tones’

Excerpt 8 illustrates the teacher’s discussion on the potential to sound impolite when using the rhetorical question structure. The teacher used an affective evaluation with the verb “think” in, “I personally think it is very impolite” and marked the evaluation as subjective by stating, “I personally…..” Even though the negative evaluation is subjectively marked, because of the teacher’s role in the classroom as the one with expert knowledge in the target language, it is likely the students will view her perspective as authoritative and universal. In addition, even though the teacher placed the adverb “please” at the beginning of the clause “please use it carefully,” which usually functions as a polite request, because of the teacher’s authoritative role in the classroom, the request becomes more of a demand. Moreover, the teacher elaborated her point of view through an exemplification in lines 4-5, when she presented a simulated teacher-student dialogue and incorporated the rhetorical question structure into the mock student’s response. The teacher laughed immediately after the simulated dialogue, which serves as a nonverbal communication that presents a negative evaluation. This also suggests the student’s response in the simulated dialogue is considered both unlikely and inappropriate. Furthermore, just as modeling correct language use can serve as an important means for socializing newcomers to a community (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b),
the teacher’s mock dialogue serves as a negative example to caution students to use certain language structures.

In lines 5-6, the teacher’s proscription of the language structure is established through the negative forms of the modal verb “cannot,” which implies that a student should not use the rhetorical question structure in communications with a teacher. Again, in lines 6-7 the teacher provided several explicit negative evaluations of the rhetorical question structure, such as, “it sounds very ill mannered, impolite,” to emphasize its undesirable effects. The teacher’s discourse on what is considered impolite and how a student is expected to communicate with the teacher serves to maintain a certain student-teacher social relation. The teacher, the native speaker and authority figure in the classroom, has the power not only to construct the desired language patterns but also the language structures that the students should not use. Through the vivid mock dialogue and the evaluations on the different language uses, the teacher delivered the knowledge of linguistic rules, and at the same time, constructed and maintained particular social roles for the teacher and the students.

Using others’ words when replying to a question is desirable

In the following excerpt, the teacher instructed the students regarding how a direct answer to a question can indicate greater respect. The meaning of directness in this excerpt is letting the other person feel that his or her question was properly answered. The way to let the other person know their question was properly answered directly and respectfully, is to include words in the answer that were originally used in the question.

Excerpt 9

1  Karen: 這幾個房間都差不多，你要住哪一間？
2       ‘These rooms are about the same, in which one do you want to stay?’
Emma: 既然都差不多，什麼房間都無所謂

‘Since they are about the same, it does not matter what room.’

T: 好( ) “什麼房間” 也是一個 question word，或者你就說 copy 他的問題就好了，

“住哪一間都無所謂”。恩( ) 如果是我們話我們大概會 copy 他的，有點尊敬的意
思，就我不需要自己再說一個新的， “你要住哪一間?” 就接著馬上接著他 “住哪
一間無所謂”，你如果說 “你要住哪一間?” “什麼房間…” 好像就沒有直接回答他
的問題的感覺，就是有一點好像( ) 那個如果是我的話，大概就會用他用過的字，
比較尊敬他…

‘Okay( ) “what room” is a question word, perhaps you should just copy her question,
“it does not matter which one to stay.” Mm if it were us, we were probably copy hers,
it shows a sense of respect, I don’t need to say something new, “which one do you
want to stay?” then immediately reply her “it does not matter which one to stay.” If
you say, “which one do you want to say?” “what room” it seems like you did not
directly answer her question, it just seems a little( ) if it were me, probably will use the
words she used, more respectful to her…’

This excerpt transpired when two students presented their answer from a
simulated dialogue where the second speaker needed to provide a response to the first
speaker’s question by using the term 無所謂 ‘it does not matter.’ After hearing Karen
and Emma’s simulated dialogue, the teacher first commented on Emma’s answer using a
metalanguage “question word,” indicating a sense of expertise and professional
knowledge in the target language. Then, the teacher used the probability adverb “perhaps”
to hedge in her correction of Emma’s response, as well as softening the sense of
command by using the modal verb “should” in “perhaps you should just copy her
question.” After the suggestion to copy words from the person who posed the question,
the teacher models the ideal response, “it does not matter which one to stay.” The use of
hedging softens the teacher’s critique and allowing the students to be more accepting of
the desired ways of responding.

Interestingly, in line 12, the teacher shifted from using first person singular
pronouns, which expresses her personal opinion, to using the plural pronoun “us” and
“we,” which serves to deliver her evaluation as a collective truth. The pronoun “us” in the
conditional clause “if it were us” creates an us-you relationship in that the “us” refers to the we-community of the native speaker, and the implied “you” refers to the language learners. After constructing the sense of separation between native speakers and language learners, the teacher used the exclusive “we” to refer to herself and all the other native speakers of Mandarin, which separates the student from the native speaker, thus serving to legitimize and give authority to the teacher’s suggestion that it is more proper to “copy” the words of the first speaker in one’s response.

In line 13, the teacher added that repeating the words of others “shows a sense of respect.” This statement serves as an implicit positive evaluation where “showing respect” has an assumed value that people would desire to do so. And at the same time, it suggests that if someone does otherwise, that is, use different words to respond, it would likely lead to the perception that one is disrespectful. In lines 14-16, the teacher elaborated on the reason behind why Emma’s answer may be taken as rude in that the teacher used the lower modality verb “seems” to lead to the direct critique, “you did not directly answer her question.” The verb “seems” plays the role of distancing the teacher from the judgment, making the expressed criticism seem universal and timeless instead of personal opinion. At the same time, it softened the impact of delivery, making it more acceptable and persuasive to the student. Finally, in lines 16-17, the teacher ended her feedback by providing a response similar to what she had used at the beginning, including “probably will use the words she used” followed by a positive evaluation, “more respectful to her.” This echoing response functions as an emphasis on the desired language use in this particular situation.
The polite way to end a telephone conversation

The teacher discussed the cultural differences between Mainland China and Taiwan in terms of how to end a telephone conversation. When teaching the new word ‘to hang up,’ the teacher pointed out that what is acceptable to say to end a phone call in Mainland China is inappropriate in Taiwan because the word ‘to hang up’ could also mean “die.” Different from other concepts of politeness that focus on language use, the teacher noted that in Taiwan it is viewed as more polite to use a non-verbal behavior and wait for the other person to hang up and end the conversation first.

Excerpt 10

((on the new word ‘to hang up’ ))

T: …那“掛電話”就是電話結束以後我們說 “掛電話”，恩那個大陸人都說 “我掛了”，
可是在台灣那個 “我掛了”，就是 “我死了”((Laughter))的意思。所以每次我跟我
媽媽打電話的時候，我說 “媽媽，我掛了”然後我先生就會笑((Laughter)) 那台灣
人怎麼說？ “就先這樣，再見”。台灣人比較有禮貌，會等對方先掛電話，等一
下，然後自己再掛…
‘…“Hang up the phone” is used when a phone conversation ends we would say “hang
up the phone,” people in mainland China says “I am hanging up”, but in Taiwan “I am
hanging up” means “I am dead” ((laughter)) so each time when I am on the phone with
my mother, and I say “Mom, I am hanging up” then my husband will laugh ((laughter))
What do Taiwanese say then? “That’s it for now, good bye.” Taiwanese people are
more polite, will wait for the other person to hang up the phone, wait a little bit, then
hang up the phone…’

As shown in the excerpt, the teacher addressed the desired way of behaving
regarding nonverbal communications such as telephone etiquette. The teacher suggested
that to be considered polite during a phone conversation, one should wait for the other
person to hang up the phone first. The notion of “presupposition” (Machin & Mayr, 2012,
p. 153) refers to “meanings that are present as given” (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 153). In
lines 10-11, the teacher used the phrase “Taiwanese people are more polite,” which
suggests an assumption that all Taiwanese people are alike without variation. The teacher
also implied a difference-relationship, separating herself from the “Taiwanese people.”

Moreover, the teacher’s use of the comparative adjective “more polite” serves as an explicit evaluation in which the positive value is assumed with the term “polite.” The teacher’s instructions constructed concepts of politeness regarding how to behave in order to be viewed as a polite person including not only the exact words to use to correctly hang up a phone, but also the correct non-verbal behavior of waiting for the other person to hang up the phone first.

4.2.3 Language Ideology on Speaking Pleasantly

The ideological belief that it is important to speak pleasantly has two main areas, one that focuses on the actual combination of sounds that words formed, and the other that centers on the refinedness or crudeness of the words used. Within each area, I have presented two examples. For the area of pleasantness that refers to sounds, there is an example of the maintenance of balance and rhythm in the combination of the sounds in spoken sentences. For the area of pleasantness that pertains to the refinement of words, there are examples of avoiding combinations of words that have similar sounds, and words that are considered too informal.

Maintaining balance and rhythm

As suggested by Woolard (1998) that language ideologies are not simply about language itself, but also has links to aesthetics. In the example below, the teacher stressed a rhythmic way to structure Chinese language patterns when speaking to sound more “pleasant” to the ears of the listeners. The characteristic of rhythm in language patterns is also linked to the comprehensibility of one’s speech in that the teacher believed to speaking rhythmically could help others to understand the spoken content more easily.
More specifically, the teacher stated it was the responsibility of the speaker to form speech in ways that are both pleasant and easy to understand for the listener.

Excerpt 11

((On the grammar “other than…is”))

T: ...剛剛我們也說“除了就是”，前面如果是一個音節，就是一個字，後面也一個字，如果前面兩個字，後面也兩個字。聽起來比較有節奏，除了吃就是睡，除了吃飯就是睡覺...恩所以兩個字兩個字(三個字三個字(這樣聽起來比較好聽，聽的人也容易懂，容易記住你說的話...)

‘...We were saying earlier “other than…is,” if it has one syllable for the beginning, it means one word, the end has one word as well. If the beginning has two words, the end has two words as well. It sounds more rhythmic. Other than eating is sleeping, other than having a meal is taking a nap...mm so two words=two words( three words=three words(.) this way sounds more pleasant, easier for the listener to understand, easier to remember what you said.’

Excerpt 11 occurred when a student constructed an unsatisfactory sentence incorporating the new grammar structure “other than...is,” and the teacher’s feedback reveals the importance of constructing a parallel sentence that is rhythmic in order for the receiver to understand the speaker’s message easily as well as for the speaker to sound more pleasant. In lines 6-8, the teacher began the instruction on the preferred way to use the target structure through the employment of two conditional relation sentences “if X..., Y...” In each conditional sentence, the main clauses are without modal verbs, which imply a sense of demand. In line 8, even though the phrase “it sounds more rhythmic” does not use evaluative markers, the positive value is assumed by the use of comparative adverb “more,” the adjective “rhythmic,” and the conditional sentences. What followed were the teacher’s modeling of the desired language structures that work as exemplifications and help emphasize how these structures are perceived as desirable in lines 8-9, “Other than eating is sleeping, other than having a meal is taking a nap.” In lines 10-11, the teacher used the explicit evaluative statement “this way sounds more
pleasan,” suggesting the high degree of desirability toward the modeled way of speaking. This particular way of speaking is reinforced by the elaborations on the positive effects a rhythmic sentence brings, such as, “easier for the listener to understand, easier to remember what you said.’ Moreover, the comparative form “easier” implies the comparative relationship between sentences that have parallel elements and those without. Also, there is an assumed responsibility for the speaker to produce sentences that are pleasant regarding both sound and word choice.

Avoid placing words that have similar sounds together

Avoiding the possibility of confusion or hardship for the listener is also one of the responsibilities of the speaker, thus not only should one produce grammatically correct language but one should also avoid combining words that may potentially result in confusion. The teacher often reminded the students that words that sound similar should not be placed together, because it would result in an odd sound and it would be difficult for the listener to understand the content of the message. In the example below, while practicing the new grammar structure, Satomi provided the answer 白摆了 ‘arranged (the books) for nothing’ using the grammar structure 白(Adv.)+ action (V) which “白 Bai2, in vain” is used to express wasted effort for the action 摆 Bai3 ‘to put/to arrange.’ In this example, the adverb 白 and verb 摆 have the same syllable “Bai” but have different tones. Therefore, even though Satomi’s answer was grammatically correct, the teacher did not think it ideal and that it should be avoided because of the similar pronunciation between the two words.
Excerpt 12

((on the grammar structure 白(Adv)+ action (V), 白 functions as an adverb, indicating an action (V) is to no avail))

1 Satomi: 我剛才把那些書擺好，你又弄亂了，白擺了(Bai2 Bai3 le)
2 I just arranged those books nicely, you disarranged it again, I arranged them for
3 nothing.
4 T: “白忙了”比較好，因為“白擺了”聽都聽不懂，除非就是現在在擺，然後說“噢
5 我白擺了”，也是很奇怪，因為那個聲音太接近，“我白忙了”
6 “Was busy for nothing” is better, because “白擺了 bai2 bai3 le, arranged it for
7 nothing” is incomprehensible, unless you are arranging it at the moment, and then say
8 “oh I arranged it for nothing”, but it is still odd, because the sounds are too close, “我
9 白忙了 bai2 mang2 le, I was busy for nothing”…

The excerpt occurred when Satomi gave an answer to one of the exercise
questions in the textbook and used the target grammar structure of “白+V to no avail.”

The teacher was not satisfied with Satomi’s answer because she used similar sounds for
the two adjacent words in the target structure: the adverb 白 bai2 ‘in vain’ and the verb
擺 bai3 ‘to place,’ where the two words have the same syllable “bai” but different tones.

Based on the teacher’s feedback, it is clear that it is important not only for one to make
sure the answer is grammatically correct, but also that the sound composed by each word
is considered when one speaks. In line 6, the teacher responded to Satomi’s answer by
directly providing the alternative answer “‘busy for nothing’ is better,” using the
comparative adjective “better” to suggest that the teacher’s answer is preferred. The
teacher then explained that Satomi’s answer was undesirable, because it was
“incomprehensible” to the listener. The word choice “incomprehensible” is a use of
exaggeration which serves to reinforce the undesirability of placing words that have the
same or similar syllable adjacent to each other.
In line 7, the teacher tried to provide a context where using the student’s answer was acceptable, however, after she used the language structure, she commented that it was “still odd” in line 8. The adverb “still” suggests that Satomi’s answer is not applicable in any given situation, and the word choice “odd” in describing Satomi’s answer functions as an implicit evaluative comment where negative value is assumed. After the negative evaluation, the teacher provided the reason behind her judgment of incomprehensibility through the use of the conjunction “because” in “because the sounds are too close,” which also serves as an elaboration on the teacher’s previous comments of how it sounds “odd.” The teacher’s classroom discourse constructed the ideology on the particular ways of using language, and this event suggests that in order to speak pleasantly, one must not place words that have the same syllable together, because the listener will not comprehend the message.

**Avoid using repetitive words that create flat sounds**

The previous example demonstrates that placing two words next to each other that have the same syllable, regardless of the tones, may create a sense of unpleasantness regarding the combination of sounds. As excerpt 13 shows, repetitive sounds from words that are close to, but not next to, each other can cause a flat sound that is also unpleasantness to the ear, and should be avoided. Thus, when the students were combining words into sentences, the teacher suggested they avoid placing words that have the same sound too close together.

**Excerpt 13**

((correcting the sentence 比別的比較貴 ‘comparing to others it is comparatively expansive’))
In this excerpt, the class was going over sentences that were considered incorrect and were selected by the teacher from the students’ presentations from a previous class. The teacher started by posing the question, “What’s not good about the fifth one?” She uses “not good” instead of “incorrect” to imply that the sentence is not grammatically incorrect, but still needs correction for other reasons. After posing the question, the teacher did not wait for the students to respond. Instead, she proceeded immediately to point out the parts that require change by saying in line 4-5, “It has 比 ‘compare’ here, and it also has a 比 ‘compare’ here,” referring to the repetitive quality of the sentence. In line 5, the teacher used explicit negative evaluation on the repetitive use of “compare” as, “it sounds like you are talking too flat, not pleasant to the ear.” The teacher uses the verb “sounds” as a hedging that softens her critique. The negative value is first assumed through the comparative adjective “too” and the word choice “flat,” suggesting that talking in a monotonous way is viewed as undesirable. Furthermore, the teacher used the conjunction “so” and “or” to introduce her suggestion to change one “compare” to “more” or “a little more.” These exemplifications serve as the models for the desired ways of speaking, contrasted with the undesired answer provided by the student.

Changing from the style of hedging in her delivery of the suggested way of speaking, in lines 6-7, the teacher’s tone becomes stronger through the uses of the
negative imperative, “do not say…,” which implies a sense of command or warning. In lines 7-8, the teacher’s repetitive use of the phrase, “not pleasant to the ear,” at the end of the instruction indicates a strong emphasis on the undesirability of using the same word twice in the sentence. In this instance, the teacher constructed the ideology that talking in a “flat” mannered will be unpleasant to the listener, and, as a speaker, one has the responsibility to consider one’s tone of delivery when speaking. While the previous three examples in this section focus on the rhythm and sound of spoken sentences, the next two examples center on the sense of refinedness and crudeness that different word choices represent.

Avoid words that may be considered “unpleasant” to the listener

Under the language ideologies of speaking pleasantly, one of the criteria centers on word choices that are unpleasant while others do not. In Excerpt 14, the teacher raised the importance of word choice in that certain words are regarded as sounding “unpleasant” even though they are common in everyday conversation. Furthermore, the teacher’s emphasis on how the word sounds unpleasant to the ear may be an indication of the importance she places on the feeling of the listener and that it is the speaker’s responsibility to be considerate of the listener with his or her word choice.

Excerpt 14

((The teacher is commenting on a student’s answer for the error-correction activity on the error *弄東西熱 ‘literal translation: make thing hot’) )

1 S: 把東西弄熱
2 ‘Make something hot’
3 T: 把東西弄熱，我覺得這也不好聽，“弄”這個字，你就說 “把東西加熱”就好了
4 ‘Make something hot, I feel this sounds unpleasant as well, the word “make,” you just say, “heat up something” that will be fine…’
This excerpt occurred the day after the students’ gave three-minute presentations, and the teacher projected onto the white board the sentences or clauses where the students had made grammatical mistakes. The teacher then asked the students to work in pairs to correct the grammatically incorrect sentences. In the excerpt, one of the students provided the answer 把東西弄熱 ‘make something hot.’ Although it was grammatically correct, the teacher was not satisfied because the answer “sounds unpleasant.”

In line 4, after the student presented her answer to the class, the teacher repeats the student’s answer, signaling that she is deciding on the accuracy of the answer, and the teacher indicated her dissatisfaction with, “I feel this sounds unpleasant as well.” The teacher delivered a subjectively marked explicit negative evaluation (Fairclough, 2003) with the personal statement starting with, “I feel…” and the hedging “sounds.” When combined with the adjective “unpleasant,” the teacher demonstrates the undesirability of how the student’s answer was formed. Also, it is worth noting that the teacher’s use of the verb “feel” could also function as hedging in that it softens the directness of her critique of the student’s answer, and in turn would make the student more likely to accept the information. The teacher continued to explain her reasons behind the undesirableness of the student’s answer by pointing out the unpleasantness stems from the Chinese causative verb 弄 ‘make.’

Then, in lines 4-5, the teacher provided an alternative answer that replaced the word ‘make.’ In doing so, she used the hedging word “just” in “you just say…,” turning her statement from a command to a suggestion. The teacher’s response suggests that there is a difference between sounding “pleasant” and “unpleasant” when speaking Mandarin, and in this specific example, it is the word choice of the Chinese causative verb 弄 ‘make’
that may cause unpleasantness for the receiver. Also, the teacher’s statement implies that, as a speaker, one is responsible for avoiding certain vocabulary in order to speak in a pleasant manner. In this excerpt, the teacher reminded the students to be mindful of word choice because some words may result in unpleasantness to the ear of the addressee. However, the teacher did not go into a detailed discussion or provide an explanation on why the word “make” is not preferable.

The association between speaking elegantly and one’s appearance

As Irvine (1998) drew on Errington’s (1984, 1988) study on the traditional elite, the present study sees the teacher’s instructions as demonstrating her “ideas about subtlety and refinement, on the one hand, and coarseness and vulgarity, on the other” (Irvine, 1998, p. 95). Similar to the discussion in the excerpt 14 where the teacher suggests the students avoid using the verb “make” because, even though it is grammatically acceptable, the word itself is considered “unpleasant to the ear.” However, unlike excerpt 14 where the teacher was vague about the reasons behind the negative evaluation of the verb “make,” in excerpt 15, the teacher does provide an explanation as to why certain word choices are not preferred other than merely stating that some are “unpleasant to the ear.”

In excerpt 15, the teacher evaluated Cindy’s answer of “go and see,” stating that the use of the verb “go” is considered “not elegant.” Interestingly, in addition to commenting on the crudeness of the word choice itself, the teacher also links the reasoning behind the use of crass words to the appearances of the students, and she suggests that crass words do not suit beautiful people like the students. The connection between the word choice and the outside appearance of people constructs not only the
ideology of the importance in speaking pleasantly, but also that one is represented by the words one chooses, therefore, one’s appearance may be perceived badly if crass words are used.

Excerpt 15

T: 恩 "試試看", 對我覺得 "試試看" 比 "刷刷看" 好, "刷刷看" 有點太通俗了, 就是不文雅, 比方說, 你去朋友家你要說 "我要上廁所"=

‘mm “try and see”, yes I think “try and see” is better than “brush and see,” “brush and see” is a little too unrefined, which is not elegant. For example, when you go to your friend’s home and you want to say “I want to go to the bathroom”=

Cindy:=上上((LF))

= ‘go and see ((laughter))’

T: ((Laughter))上上((Laughter))聽起來怎麼那麼不雅

((Laughter)) “go and see” ((laughter)) it sounds so not elegant’

Ss: ((Laughter))

T: 所以要怎麼說? 就是有的時候我們說話要文雅一點, 文雅就是 elegant, 不要太通俗了, 雅的相反就是俗, 你就說雅一點就好了, 我們就雅一點不要太俗了,

所以我覺得你去朋友家你可以說 “我可不可以用一下洗手間?” “用” “用” 可能比較好, 不要說 “上一下你家的廁所”((LF))太通俗了, 有一點不太適合你們這麼漂亮的人

‘So how could it be said? Sometimes we need to be a little more elegant when we speak, “文雅 wen2ya3” is elegant, don’t be too unrefined, the opposite of elegant is unrefined, so you could say “a little more elegant” ((using only the word 雅 ya)). We should be a little more elegant, not too unrefined. So, I think when you go to your friend’s home, you can say “Can I use your washroom?” “use” “use” may be better, do not say “go and see your restroom” ((laughter)) too unrefined, does not suit beautiful people like you all…”

In lines 3-4, the teacher’s explicit evaluation of the comparative adjective “better” suggests that between the two ways of recommending that someone try a new toothbrush, the phrase “try and see” is preferred over “brush and see” because “brush and see” is viewed as “unrefined.” The use of the word “unrefined” assumes the undesirability of using the collocation “brush and see.”

To further elaborate on the desired usage, the teacher provided a scenario where the students are visiting a friend’s house and they wish to use the friend’s washroom.
Before the teacher could finish her sentence, Cindy interrupted her with the answer “go and see” and then laughed, indicating that she may have known her answer was not in line with the teacher’s expectation. In line 9, the teacher began her response by laughing and repeating Cindy’s answer, “go and see,” and then followed it with the explicit evaluation, “it sounds so not elegant.” In the teacher’s evaluation, she used the degree adverb “so” to suggest the sense of “to a great extent” in modifying the adjective “not elegant.” Also, it is important to point out that the teacher did not use the word “unrefined” when commenting on Cindy’s answer, but instead she used “not elegant.” By avoiding the use of a direct negative word to describe the undesirability of Cindy’s answer, the teacher is offering a softer critique.

In line 16, the teacher poses the rhetorical question, “So how could it be said?” This question functions as a way to both bring the students’ attention back to the discussion on the proper way to ask for washroom in a friend’s home and creates a pause for the students to think. The teacher used the inclusive “we” in, “Sometimes we need to be a little more elegant when we speak,” to evoke a sense of alignment between herself and the students, and, as an authority figure, so that the students would be more inclined to agree with the information or values that followed the inclusive pronoun. The verb “need” suggests that the students and the teacher herself are obligated to speak in a way that is regarded as “elegant,” however the teacher also used “a little more” as hedging to soften the statement and makes it seem less like a demand.

In lines 18-19, after the teacher explained the meaning of the two words 雅 ‘elegant’ and 俗 ‘unrefined,’ the teacher repeated a statement similar to the one she made in lines in 16-17 by once again using the inclusive “we” in the sentence, “We should be a
little more elegant, not too unrefined.” Again, the teacher’s particular choice of pronoun in this statement could be a strategy of building rapport to create closeness with her students (Fortanent, 2004; Kamio, 2001). However, her word choice could also play the role of inviting the students to accept the teacher’s value regarding what is elegant and what is unrefined, and in turn, change their ways of speaking.

Interestingly, in lines 21-22, the teacher made a connection between the ways one speaks to one’s exterior appearance in that to speak in an unrefined way “does not suit beautiful people like you all.” This statement creates the ideology that how one speaks should match one’s appearance, and, alternatively, one’s way of speaking could influence how others view him or her. The teacher’s frequent feedback regarding forming sentences that sound pleasant to the ear of the listener suggests that the definition of speaking Chinese successfully not only includes speaking in a grammatically correct way, but is also about creating harmony of sounds and presenting one’s refinement through words.

4.2.4 Language Ideology on Speaking Considerately

One of the ideologies manifested through the teacher’s explicit instructions centers on the importance of showing one’s consideration for others during various types of communication. Excerpt 16 demonstrates a recurring critique from the teacher that the students often failed to understand the true intention behind spoken words, which resulted in the students providing unsatisfactory responses. Excerpt 17 illustrates that one way to speak considerately is to speak in a way that shows one has put the other person’s interest before oneself.
Pay attention to the true intentions behind the words of the other person

The teacher pointed out the importance of showing consideration by paying special attention to understand the true message behind the spoken words of the other person. In the case below, the teacher discussed the answer provided by one student and pointed out that the student’s answer failed to demonstrate the student’s consideration toward the other person’s perspective.

Excerpt 16

("The teacher is unsatisfied with a student’s answer)"

1. T: 陳(.)可以，可能是外國人的想法((Laughter)) "這下子他有運氣了”，恩(.)好吧，還
2. 有別的(.)同學還有別的答案嗎? (3)這個人在說 “我”， “沒有我考得好”，每個人
3. 都比較關心自己，所以這個說話的人也要關心他，恩(.)“不如我”,”沒有我考得
4. 好”，”可是這次比我考得好”，所以你要說 “這下子你要加油了”好嗎？(3)同學，
5. 那個我們有一句話叫 “聽話聽因”，你要聽他的意思是什麼，他的意思是要說(.)
6. 他不是要說那個(.)他不是要說那個小王的好，他是說小王，他是說 “這次我沒有
7. 小王好”，這是要說他自己的，每個人都比較關心自己嘛，你要 “喔:::這下子你要
8. 加油了!”，懂嗎？可以了解嗎？
9. ‘Mm(.)you may say that, perhaps it is from the perspective of foreigners ((Laughter))
10. “now he has the luck”, mm(.) alright, is there any other(.) does any student have
11. another answer? (3) this person is talking about “1.” “does not do better than 1 in tests,”
12. everyone cares more about themselves, so this person who is responding needs to care
13. for him too, m(.) “not better than 1′, “does not do better than 1 in tests”, “but this time
14. he did better than 1′”, so you need to say “now you need to work hard” okay? (3)
15. students, we have a saying that “聽話聽因 when one listens to spoken words, one
16. must listen to the meaning behind”, you need to listen to what he meant, what he
17. meant to say(.) he is not trying to say that(.) he is not trying to say good things about
18. Wang, he is talking about Wang, he is saying that “this time I didn’t do as good as
19. Wang in test,” this is him trying to talk about himself, everyone cares more about
20. themselves, you need to reply “oh:::now you need to work hard!” understand? Can
21. you understand?”

The excerpt occurred during a dialogue practice where a student, who played the role of a second speaker, was expected to provide a correct response to what the first speaker said, whose line was provided by the textbook. In line 9, with the use of the hedging word “perhaps,” the teacher began her feedback by saying, “perhaps it is from
the perspective of foreigners.” The word “foreigner” implies the I-you relationship that separates the teacher from her students, and it also suggests the power relationship between the native speaker/teacher who claims expert knowledge in the correct ways of using Chinese and the student who has the assumed role of the receiver of that knowledge.

Even though the teacher did not provide an explicit evaluation toward the student’s answer, the negative evaluation is implied when the teacher asks for alternative answers, “is there any other (.) does any student have another answer?” In line 11, after no students provided an alternative answer, the teacher provided an explanation by reading the dialogue in the textbook with the intonation that stressed the “I”s, which suggested the key element in the given dialogue was on the pronoun “I”. Then, in line 12, the teacher explained “everyone cares more about themselves,” which is presented as a commonsensical fact. After presenting the commonsensical fact, the teacher used the conjunction “so” in “so this person who is responding needs to care for him too,” creating a causal relationship that the effect of “everyone cares about themselves more” when speaking is that the other person must think and respond based on the other person’s perspective as well. The verb “need” suggests a sense of obligation and necessity that, as a person who is responding, one has the obligation to place the first speaker’s interest first and provide a response that demonstrates one’s care for the speaker.

In lines 13-14, again, the teacher reiterated the line of the first speaker in the dialogue and stressed the “I”s that serve to re-emphasize and make her point. In line 14, the teacher demonstrated the desired response by saying, “so you need to say.” The verb “need” indicates the sense of requirement and demand. After a short pause, the teacher introduced a Chinese idiom 聽話聽因 ‘when one listens to spoken words, one must listen
to the meaning behind,’ to further elaborate on the desired response. An idiom functions as a legitimation of what is viewed as common sense. The teacher uses the idiom to legitimize the obligation of the second speaker to respond in a way that demonstrates he or she paid attention to the implied meaning of the spoken words but also to show his or her concern.

Again, in lines 16, the teacher used the verb “need” to emphasize the necessity to listen to what the other speaker means. And in line 18, the teacher stressed the “I” while reading the dialogue, accentuating the crucial role of the pronoun. In lines 19-20, the teacher repeated the previous statement that “everyone cares more about themselves,” and then modeled the correct response, “oh:::now you need to work hard!” Even though the student’s original response was grammatically correct, it was not a preferred answer because it failed to respond in a way that indicates a focus on the first speaker’s true intentions.

Signal consideration through one’s reply

The concept of speaking considerately also occurred when the class discussed the new word 主人 ‘host.’ Different from the previous example that focused on the importance of listening to the true intentions behind the words of others. Excerpt 17 demonstrates how speaking considerately also refers to avoiding inconvenience to others. As shown below, the teacher shares an idiom-like expression in Chinese 客隨主便 ‘a guest should suit the convenience of the host’ that refers to the ideal reply that a guest should give after a host has offered beverages. The preferred reply not only suggests the ideal way for a guest to behave, but also creates a relationship between a guest and a host in which the guest should be considerate of the host so as not to cause the host too much
trouble. The teacher’s explicit instruction on the desired response suggests that the
Chinese concept of speaking considerately encompasses seeing things from the host’s
perspective.

Excerpt 17

T: 主人，你是主人，客隨主便，客人主人對吧？客人聽主人的方便。比方說 "你要喝紅茶還是咖啡？"
我們都不想要給別人太多的麻煩，你們就說 "啊客隨主便就好了，所以你做什麼方便，我就喝什麼"…

‘Host, you are the host, a guest should suit the convenience of the host, guest (.) host right? guest (.) suit (.) host (.) convenience, this is not an idiom, it is a four-character structure. The guest listens to the host, the guest suits the convenience of the host. For example, “would you like black tea or coffee?” We don’t want to trouble others too much, you just say “ah a guest should suit the convenience of the host, so I will have whatever it is convenient for you to make”…’

When the class learned the new word “host,” the teacher introduced a four-character structure 客隨主便 ‘a guest should suit the convenience of the host.’ While the teacher explained the definition of the four-character structure, the cultural value of the proper way to communicate as a guest is formed. The idiom-like structure presents the underlying message as a culturally accepted norm that has an assumed positive value. In other words, the concept of “a guest should suit the convenience of the host” is considered good and it has an authoritative influence similar to that of idioms, and establishes a socially valued “ways of doing things” (Obelkevich, 1987). The teacher’s use of the inclusive “we” in line 8 suggests a sense of commonality that everyone would avoid inconveniencing others, and a person who provides a direct answer to the question “…black tea or coffee?” risks being taken as impolite. Interestingly, after using the inclusive pronoun “we,” the teacher changed to the plural pronoun 你們 ‘you’ in line 9, separating the one who knows the correct way to respond (the teacher/native speakers)
from those who do not (the students/foreign language learners). At the end of the excerpt, in lines 9-10, the teacher demonstrated the preferred response through modeling the desired answer, “ah a guest should suit the convenience of the host, so I will have whatever it is convenient for you to make.” This excerpt suggests that it is important to not only master the grammatical aspect of speech, but also to adopt a particular way of thinking. This particular example centers on the desired quality of a guest showing a host consideration through the use of a four-character structure 客隨主便 ‘a guest should suit the convenience of the host.’

4.2.5 Language Ideology on Exhibiting Selflessness and Humbleness

How to speak selflessly

The ideology of selflessness is conveyed through the teacher’s feedback on preferred language structure. In excerpt 18 and 19, the teacher commented on the I-statement structure that students often use when providing answers. In excerpt 18, the teacher suggests that the students avoid starting a sentence with the subject “I” because it will likely cause the receiver to feel uncomfortable. And in excerpt 19, the teacher not only provides a negative evaluation of the uncomfortableness an I-statement would likely create, but also discusses that the reason behind the potential discomfort is that one runs the risk of sounding self-centered.

Excerpt 18

((After a student provides her answer that begins with “I”))

1 T: 那個同學，不要一開始就說 “我”，你不要一張嘴就說 “我”，因為有的時候 “我”
2 會在後面…也可以啦！結構上是可以，可是聽起來令人比較不舒服…
3 ‘mm students, do not begin a sentence by saying “I”, don’t always say “I” when you
4 open your mouth, because sometimes “I” will be at the back…It is acceptable!
5 Sentence structure wise it is acceptable, but how it sounds will make people feel a
6 little bit more uncomfortable…’
This excerpt occurred after one of the students provided an answer that incorporated the use of the target grammar structure in an I-statement. In line 3, the teacher began her feedback by using the singular form “student” to call for the class’ attention, even though this usually refers to one student. The teacher may have chosen to begin her feedback and evaluation this way, instead of using the student’s name, in order to avoid embarrassing the student whose answer she was critiquing and to signal that the information was intended for the whole class, not just one student. After the teacher called for the class’ attention, she used two imperative sentences with “do not” when she said, “do not begin a sentence by saying ‘I’, do not always say ‘I’ when you open your mouth.” The imperative sentences create a sense of demand with limited room for questions or negotiations. In the first imperative sentence the teacher reminded the students to avoid using the pronoun “I” at the beginning of sentences, and she stressed the idea by repeating a similar imperative statement immediately after the first one. However, the second time she used a form of exaggeration with the Chinese expression “when you open your mouth,” referring to each time one speaks.

In line 4, the teacher provided the reason for why placing “I” at the beginning of a sentence is undesirable, when she stated that “because sometimes ‘I’ will be at the back…,” so that the students should know there are other parts of the sentence where it is possible to place the pronoun “I.” Then, at the end of line 4, the teacher gave a statement that appears to be contradictory to the previous command statements when she exclaimed, “It is acceptable!” that “sentence structure wise is acceptable” for the student’s answer. However, elaborations were presented through the conjunction “but” that initiates the contrastive relationship between the two sentences, wherein the teacher implies that even
though placing “I” at the start of a sentence is grammatically “acceptable,” it may not be socially acceptable considering it may cause others to “feel a little bit more uncomfortable.” This event constructed the concept that, as a speaker of Mandarin, one not only needs to adhere to grammatical rules, but one also has a social responsibility to avoid making the receiver feel uncomfortable. Moreover, should be noted that at this point the teacher did not specify or elaborate on the reasons behind why using an I-statement might result in others perceiving one negatively.

Excerpt 19

T: …你們很喜歡一張嘴就說 “我就是”聽起來我我我((LF))不要一直說我，一個字開始儘量避免，聽起來很自我…
‘…you all very much like to say “I” when you open your mouth, it sounds like “I= I= I” ((laughter)) do not always says “I”, try to avoid starting the first word with it, it sounds very self-centered…’

In the beginning of line 3, the teacher provided feedback with the use of plural pronoun “you” in Chinese, indicating the feedback was intended not only for the student who gave the answer but also for the whole class. As the previous excerpt, the teacher used the exaggerated expression “when you open your mouth” to describe the high frequency with which the students use “I” to start a sentence. The teacher established the undesirableness of using I-statements by imitating how it may sound in others’ ears as “I= I= I.” The imitation and repetition of the “I”’s emphasizes the negativity associated with this way of speaking.

In line 4, the teacher used the imperative sentence starting with “do not” to create a sense of command for the students to use I-statements as little as possible. However, unlike excerpt 18 where the teacher did not provide an explicit reason behind the negativity of using I-statements, this time the teacher elaborated by stating that the
listener would perceive the speaker as “very self-centered.” The word choice “self-centered” assumes the negative value attached to the use of the I-statement, which is a trait most people would dislike, and, thus, it is a language structure that the students should not use excessively. The teacher constructed the ideology on the importance of not sounding self-centered, which could be related to the collectivistic ideology in Eastern cultures where the trait of selflessness is held in high regard.

How to speak humbly

Other than instructing the students to be judicious in using I-statements so as avoid being perceived as self-centered, the teacher also instructed the students on ways to signal their sense of modesty through particular word choices. Excerpt 20 demonstrates how the teacher’s discussion on new terms serves to create and deploy the cultural idea of modesty and humbleness. In the example below, the teacher suggests that the word “artist” is for art practitioners who are renowned in the art world, while “art worker” indicates people in general who practice art. Therefore, if an artist wants to be seen as a modest and humble, they could refer to themselves as “art workers.”

Excerpt 20

(On the new words 藝術家 ‘artist’ and 藝術工作者 ‘art workers’)

T: 如果沒有那麼有名的，做藝術相關工作，叫藝術工作者。所以比方說，我是一個藝術家，但是我為了很謙虛=很客氣(.) modest, just say “啊我只是一個普普通通的藝術工作者”

‘…If one is not as famous, doing art-related jobs, one is called art worker. So for example, I am an artist, but I wanted to be very modest=very humble (. ) modest, just say “ah I am only an ordinary art worker”…’

This expert demonstrates the teacher’s discussion on how to be modest when describing one’s job. In line 4, the teacher started by defining the new word 藝術工作者 ‘art worker/practitioner’ by using the conditional “if” in “If one is not as famous, doing
art-related jobs, one is called art worker.” Based on the teacher’s definition, any person who is not considered a prominent artist, but participates in art-related works, would be an art worker, and would not use the word 藝術家 ‘artist.’ From the teacher’s explanation, the differentiation is established between the two terms in that the word “artist” is used to refer to experts in art, while “art worker” refers to people who participate in art-related jobs. In lines 5-6, before modeling the ideal language usage, the teacher indicated that the goal of an introduction is to present oneself as “very modest” and “very humble,” which assumes both the positive value of modesty as well as that one would be perceived arrogant if one called oneself an “artist.”

After using speech as a way to construct the desired goal of modesty, the teacher demonstrated how to use language to be humble by saying that even as an artist, one should introduce oneself as “only an ordinary art worker” to show one’s modesty. With the use of the adverb “only” and the adjective “ordinary” before “art worker” in the example language of “only an ordinary,” the teacher further emphasizes the degree of humbleness. According to Eelen (1999), commonsense ideology of politeness includes the category of “metapragmatic beliefs and discourse about politeness” (p. 163), referring to “what they say they do” (p. 163). Taking the notion of commonsense ideology, the teacher’s metapragmatic discourse on modesty constructed a sense of a commonsensical norm towards determining what is modest and what is immodest. In other words, the teacher’s instruction constructed the ideology of modesty in that one should communicate with others in a certain way to be perceived as humble.
4.2.6 Ideology on the Relationship Between the Target Language and the Students

The relationship between the language learners and the target language is also ideologically created through the teacher’s instructions. The relationship is shaped by such elements as a cautious attitude when using the target language, the difficulty foreigner’s experience in learning Mandarin, the role of language learners’ first language (L1) as an impediment, and the importance of mastering correct pronunciation.

Use certain words with caution

The teacher placed great importance on how language learners must be cautious in using certain Chinese words and implied that the students were obligated to understand the cultural knowledge associated with the target language. In the situation below, Sophie provides the answer “went” that is grammatically correct, however it also could be used to mean “dies” and that may lead to miscommunication or to offending the addressee because the speaker did carefully avoid words that have puns relate to death.

Excerpt 21

((on the grammar “說 Verb 就 Verb” as soon as something is mentioned, it happens ))

Karen: 聽說你哥哥突然去美國留學了
            ‘I heard your brother suddenly went to study in the United States’
Sophie: 說去就去了
            ‘As soon as he says he wants to go, he went.’
T: 恩()他說去就去了。這個去這個字要小心，感覺死了，他去了((LF))是不是？“說走就走，說出國就出國，說留學就留學”都可以。恩去=去=去可以，如果說去了，那個像死了的意思，不是那個文法不對，文法對，但是那個()你要了解我們的習慣
            ‘mm(.) “As soon as he says he wants to go, he went.” Now with this word “去 go” must be careful with this word, it feels like he died, “他去了, he+ go+ particle, he went/he has passed” ((laughter)) ((the word “去 go” could also mean someone has passed)) right? “As soon as he says he wants to leave, he left. As soon as he says he wants to leave the country, he left the country. As soon as he says he wants to study abroad, he has gone study abroad.” These all work. Mm go=go=go is okay, if you say “去了 go+ particle” ((could mean both went or passed)), it sounds as someone has
died, it’s not that the grammar is incorrect, the grammar is correct, but that (. ) you
have to understand our habit…”

The modal verb “must” and the admonition “be careful” in line 9 implies a need
for caution, which suggests the language learners have the responsibility to be cautious
when using certain words in certain ways. In line 10, the teacher used an affective
evaluation that began with “it feels…” and undesirability is then assumed with the word
“die” in that a speaker would unquestionably avoid using words in a way that could
mistakenly indicate someone has died. The laughter in line 11 followed by the teacher’s
modeling of how the word choice of “go” could sound odd implies the negative value
associated with this language use. The rhetorical question, “right?” in line 12 serves as a
means to invite the students to accept the reasoning behind the teacher’s critique of the
student’s answer. In lines 12-24, after the rhetorical questions, the teacher consecutively
presented three alternative ways to indicate that one has gone abroad that are more
preferable, implying that using the word “go” would be seen as a last resort.

In lines 15-16, the teacher suggested that, aside from producing grammatically
correct sentences, students “have to understand our habit.” The conjunction “but”
suggests a contrastive relationship between “grammar” and “habit” in which even though
the student’s answer was grammatically correct, it violated cultural norms. The use of the
modal verb “have to” suggests that the student, as a language learner, has an obligation to
understand and adhere to the cultural norms of the target language. The dialogue of
difference is constructed through the teacher’s use of an us-them relationship in which
the possessive “our” indicates the native speakers of Mandarin and the “you” includes all
non-native speakers. To summarize, based on the teacher’s explanations, in order to
become a successful language learner, one must master not only the grammar structures
of the target language, but also the cultural norms associated with the avoidance of certain combination of words in particular circumstances.

One must master the pronunciation of Mandarin to gain access to the L2 community

One of the ideologies regarding the relationship between the target language and the language learners focuses on how language learners must master the linguistic feature of tones in order to be recognized as worthy interlocutors by native speakers. The following excerpt shows that while the teacher comments on the results of an exam on which the student made several tone mistakes and urges them to quickly correct the pronunciation errors, she also develops the different roles, obligations, and power differentials for language learners and native speakers. The teacher’s belief characterizes the unequal relationship wherein language learners have the responsibility to achieve a standard way of speaking in order to be heard, and native speakers of Mandarin are placed in a position of power where they could deny the language learners’ intent to engage in small talk if their pronunciations are not standard.

Excerpt 22

T: …同學看一下，你們錯的字都不是我教你們的對吧？你們的聲調都是以前你們
錯的，所以你們要趕快改啊！不然那個(.)不然說出來的話(.2)都不想聽((laughter)))
你一定要說的標準，我們聽起來才會覺得想跟你聊天…
‘Students take a look, the mistakes that you made are not taught by me, right? Your
tones are the mistakes from before, so you have to correct it quickly! If not (. ) if not
your spoken words (.2) would not want to listen to ((laughter)) you must speak
correctly, so that when we listen we will feel like chatting with you…’

This excerpt occurred at the beginning of a class when the teacher was going over the test from the previous class. In line 4, the teacher began by distancing herself from the students’ incorrect tone answers through the announcement, “the mistakes that you made are not taught by me, right?” This rhetorical question functions as a way for the teacher to
transfer the responsibility of the mistakes to the students. After posting the rhetorical question, the teacher provides the answer, “Your tones are the mistakes from before,” which further emphasizes the students’ responsibility for the pronunciation errors. In lines 4-5, the use of the conjunction “so” introduces the result in, “so you have to correct it quickly!” Furthermore, the modal verb “have to” expresses obligation and the adverb “quickly” implies a sense of urgency. Together, the teacher’s expectation of the students’ obligation and responsibility are introduced and stressed.

After the students’ responsibility and the urgency of correcting pronunciation errors is established, the discussion moved on to the negative result one may encounter if tone errors are not corrected and one’s pronunciation is not perfected. In line 5, the negative conditional “if not” indicates a negative result and suggests a warning that if the students do not correct their tone errors, others “would not want to listen to” their spoken words. Interestingly, the teacher omits the subject pronoun when she delivers the negative effect, “would not want to listen to,” which could function as a way for her to communicate that the stated result is not merely her personal judgment, but a reality accepted by all.

In line 6, the teacher used the modal verb “must” to indicate a high degree of necessity and obligation regarding the learners’ mastery of Mandarin tones when speaking. Then, in line 7, the teacher suggests a positive consequence with the conjunction “so” in, “so that when we listen we will feel like chatting with you.” The two exclusive “we” refer to the teacher and to native speakers of Mandarin, which separates the language learners from the native speakers, and creates an unequal relationship wherein the native speakers are the evaluators and decision makers on whether the
language learners have access to engage in small talk based on if their tone pronunciation is considered standard.

**Mandarin is a difficult language**

The relationship between the language learners and the target language is also ideologically constructed through the teacher’s discourse. In the following excerpt, through the teacher’s narratives on stories of her former student, she establishes that Mandarin is a challenging language to master, and, even for a language learner who is considered highly proficient in Mandarin, there is still cultural knowledge that cannot be acquired.

Excerpt 23

("Teaching the grammar of “別再… 了 stop doing something ”")

T: …你別再學中文了((Laughter))你學不會的((Laughter))以前我教過一個學生，他是

學中文最久的你們猜他學多久？他是一個英國人他學了十八年十八年他說的非

常好可是他很生氣他說有一次他坐電梯的時候他住在菲律賓可是他學中文他說

得非常好的恩然後電梯裡面有一個人說“你的中文大概是小學三年級吧”

((Laughter))他很生氣，對，所以十八年，他中文很好，可是還是有很多不知道的

東西，比方說一個文化的，你要說中國人的被子=被子知道嗎？睡覺時候的那個，

quilt，他不知道那個，外面裡面中間的那個名詞，然後他()我跟他解釋中國人的

被子什麼=什麼樣，他不能明白，沒有見過那個東西，恩所以就是文化的方面

不太容易懂…

‘… “you should stop learning Chinese ((Laughter)) you will not be able to learn it”

((Laughter)) I taught a student before, he has learned Chinese for the longest time.

You guess how long he has spent learning? He is a British, he has learned for eighteen

years=eighteen years he speaks very well, but he was mad that he said there was one
time when he was taking an elevator, he lives in Philippines, but he learns Chinese, he
speaks Chinese very well. Mm and then there was a person in the elevator said, “your
Chinese is about third grade in the elementary school” ((laughter)) he was very mad,
yes, so eighteen years, his Chinese is very good, but there are still a lot of things that
he does not know, take something cultural as example, when you say Chinese
duvet=duvet you know? Something for sleeping, quilt, he does not know, the nouns
for exterior, interior, and the middle, and him(.) I explained to him what does Chinese
duvet look like=look like, he cannot understand, never saw that thing before, mm so it
is the cultural aspect that is not easy to understand…’
The excerpt happened when the class was learning the new grammar structure 別再了‘stop doing something.’ In line 10, using the grammar structure, the teacher provided the example sentence, “you should stop learning Chinese ((Laughter)) you will not be able to learn it.” Even though the teacher’s laughter indicates that the example sentence is meant to be humorous, it could also be considered as ideologically infused with the teacher’s perceptions of the high degree of difficulty that learning the target language entails. In line 11, the teacher began to share the experience of her former student, and she introduced him as someone who has learned Chinese “for the longest time,” emphasizing the amount of time the student has dedicated to learning Chinese. In line 12, the teacher posed a question to the class, “You guess how long he has spent learning?” which serves to build anticipation and direct the students’ attention to the amount of time the former student spent on Chinese. Then, when the teacher finally revealed the answer, she said “eighteen years” consecutively which implies a sense of emphasis. After she stressed the former student’s years spent learning Chinese, the teacher stated the explicit positive evaluation, “he speaks very well.”

In lines 14-15, before going into the details of the former student’s experience in an elevator, the teacher repeated the same positive evaluation, “he speaks Chinese very well,” to emphasize the student’s Chinese ability. In line 16, the teacher revealed what happened in the elevator ride where the former student was negatively evaluated by a native speaker when his Chinese proficiency was explicitly compared to third graders. The contrast is established by the building up of the positive evaluation of the former student’s proficiency as “he speaks very well” and the negative evaluation that even though he had studied for eighteen years and the teacher regarded him as a proficient
Chinese speaker, the native speaker still perceived him as speaking like a child. In line 17, the contrastive relation is employed with the use of the conjunction “but” in, “his Chinese is very good, but there are still a lot of things that he does not know,” and the high degree of difficulty in learning Chinese is portrayed. In line 18, the teacher provided an example of “something cultural” to demonstrate her belief that Chinese is a challenging language to learn.

In lines 19-20, the teacher’s uses exemplification of Chinese nouns for different parts of a duvet to reinforce the portrayal of Chinese as a difficult language to learn. In lines 20-22, the teacher used the connector “so” to indicate a reason-conclusion relationship in the teacher’s narrative that when the teacher explained the concept of a duvet, the former student still “cannot” understand. This leads to the conclusion that even for a student who has learned the target language for eighteen years and is considered proficient in Chinese, the mastering of the cultural aspect of the target language requires much more effort. This excerpt demonstrates how the relationship between Chinese language and the language learners is portrayed in that the Chinese language, especially the cultural aspect is not easy for foreigners to fully acquire.

L1 is considered a source of interference

This excerpt shows how the teacher’s classroom practices can reveal the ideological assumptions on the role of learners’ L1 in the classroom, wherein L1 is viewed as an obstacle that will likely impede the students’ development of the target language.

Excerpt 24

1 T: …然後我還見過一個學生他在台灣住了八年，可是他念初二，你們念初三，他
2 念初二，他上課的時候全都在講英文，我真的想要 “說別再講英文了”((Laughter))
所以他進步的很慢，所以你們一定要忘記自己的語言。一直講英文，所以他住了八年也不能進步還是在初二…

‘…and I have encountered another student who has lived in Taiwan for eight years, but he is still in the level of beginner 2, you are in beginner 3, he is studying beginner 2. When he is in class he is always speaking in English, I really wanted to say, “Stop speaking English” ((laughter)) so he progressed very slowly, so you must forget about your own language. Always speaking in English, so he lived for 8 years and still could not progress, still in beginner 2…’

Following the previous excerpt that began with the grammar structure ‘stop doing something’ and the story of a former student, the teacher shared a story of a different student. In lines 5-6, a contrastive relationship is established with the teacher’s use of the conjunction “but” in “but he is still in the level of beginner 2,” which serves as a contrast with the time frame of “eight years” living in a Chinese-speaking country. In line 7, the teacher used the adverb “always,” which functions as an exaggeration in describing the student’s behavior of using L1 in the classroom. Then, in lines 7-8, the teacher incorporated the new grammar structure to the story when she said, ‘I really wanted to say, “Stop speaking English.”’ The language structure is used in an imperative form that insinuates a command and the teacher’s negative evaluation toward the behavior of speaking one’s L1 in the classroom. In line 8, the teacher used the connector “so,” twice; the first one is used to indicate the negative outcome of “he progressed very slowly” that is caused by the student’s action of “always speaking English,” while the second one functions as a conclusion that “so you must forget about your own language.” Furthermore, the modal verb “must” suggests a strong sense of obligation for the students to “forget about your own language.” In line 9, the teacher employed a cause-result relation in that the student “always speaking in English” leads to the result of limited language progress. In this excerpt, the role of the student’s first language is ideologically constructed as a potential obstacle that needs to be forgotten in the language classroom.
4.2.7 Ideologies on the Relationship Between the Teacher and the Students

As Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) suggested, the educational processes are often where the reproduction and justification of the established social order take place. The social relationship between the teacher and the students is constructed based on the teacher’s instructions on what is considered appropriate language use when a student is asking the teacher for a meeting, and through the teacher’s explanation and demonstration on the proper language structure and use, particular social relationships between the teacher and the students is established. This social relationship reflects the larger social structure’s values, which are influenced by Confucianism that places teachers in high social status.

Be mindful of the difference in status when speaking

Excerpt 25

((teaching the new word 見面 ‘to meet or see someone’))

1 T: 然後最好不要說 “老師你什麼時候見我?”這樣聽起來有點不禮貌，因為被見的人
2 那個人，比方說 “我要見他”，“我要見他”，“我去見他”，這個人的地位比較高，
3 所以你不要說 “老師請你來見我” ，“請你來見我” 感覺不太禮貌，“我要跟你
4 見面”就好了，“見面”的時候兩個人的地位是平等的
5 ‘And it is best not to say “teacher, when are you going to come see me?” this sounds a
6 little impolite, because the person who are being seen, for example “I am seeing him”
7 “I am seeing him” “I am going to see him,” this person has higher status, so you do not
8 say “teacher, please come see me,” “please come see me” feels not as polite, just use
9 “I want to meet with you” is fine, when use “meet” it means two people have equal
10 status…’

This excerpt shows the teacher’s instruction on the usage of the new term 見面 ‘to meet/see’ in terms of the “correct” and “polite” way to schedule a meeting. In line 5, the teacher used an exemplification of the incorrect usage of the term, saying, “teacher, when are you going to come see me?” Interestingly, before providing the undesired example, the teacher introduced it by stating, “And it is best not to say,” where she establishes that
the undesirable implication of the example. After the exemplification, the teacher emphasized the undesirability of the language usage through the explicit negative evaluation, “this sounds a little impolite.” The use of hedging with “sounds” and “a little” functions to soften the teacher’s critique on the undesired example, which could make the statement sound less like a demand and make it more persuasive to the listeners. The teacher continued to elaborate on the reason behind the impoliteness of the negative example by stating that the person with a higher status should be the one who follows the word 見 ‘to see.’ In line 7-8, the teacher shifted to a stronger voice, saying, “so you do not say,” implying a sense of order, and follows that with a negative example “teacher, please come see me,” which suggests that it is undesirable for the student to place himself or herself after the “see”. In line 8, the teacher repeated the negative example, “please come see me,” and the explicit evaluation, ‘feels not as polite’ The use of repetition serves the purpose of stressing the teacher’s belief of the “incorrect” way to request a meeting with a teacher. The teacher ends the discussion by providing the language usage that she considers as the proper way to speak to a teacher, saying, ‘just use “I want to meet with you” is fine.’ The adverb “just” is used to reduce the force of the directive “use,” which makes the teacher’s instruction sound more like a suggestion instead of a command.

Brown (2011) defined ideologies of politeness as “beliefs pertaining to polite behavior that are shared to some extent within a given group, especially those beliefs perpetuated by those in positions of power” (p. 72). In the present case, the teacher is in the position of power in that she plays the role of an expert in the classroom, so, her beliefs on what is polite behavior or language use represents commonsense knowledge
that is held by all members of the Mandarin-speaking community. Furthermore, the teacher’s demonstration on the preferred way for a student to ask for a meeting with a teacher serves to develop a more equal social relationship between the teacher and the students.

Avoid speaking too casually to the teacher

Unlike the equal social relationship of teachers and students suggested by the teacher in the previous example, in excerpt 26, the teacher constructs the ideological perspective of the hierarchical teacher-student relationship through explicit instructions that the students are expected to speak to the teacher differently than how they speak to their peers. Also, the teacher associated adding the signifier 個 between a verb and an object with the people in Taiwan and suggested that this particular language use may risk being perceived as “too casual” or impolite.

Excerpt 26

Cindy: 老師，握個手，見個面，沒有 “個”也可以嗎？
Teacher, shake hands ((using shake + 個 classifier + hands)), meet up ((using see +個 classifier + face)), is it okay without “個 classifier”?

T: 那個握個手恩=恩=恩((laught))(這個大家看一下((writing 個 classifier on the board)), 這個有時候叫墊字，墊就是這個地方少一個東西你可以把它加進去，這個它的功能就是湊足音節，這個 “握”聽起來比較嚴肅 serious, “握個手”聽起來比較輕鬆，那個台灣人很喜歡說。我會說，如果是我的話，我會說 “來，大家握握手，還是好朋友”，可是台灣人很喜歡說 “我們吃個飯吧”， “喝個咖啡吧”，那個 “個”不是 “一個”，不是讓你只喝一杯，不是那個意思，它是一種說話輕鬆的方式。如果是我的話，我真的不太喜歡這樣子，對我來說聽起來就是，因為可能是不一樣的文化長大的，對我來說聽起來有點太隨便。上次有個學生，他就很久沒有跟我見面，他說 “老師，我們喝個咖啡吧”，我就感覺有一點太隨便，可能你們之間可以，可是他年紀比我年輕很多，然後是我的學生，可能說起來聽起來有點隨便, 所以他的意思是真的很輕鬆的感覺。當然沒有關係啦！

我會覺得他真的中文進步很多，越來越像台灣人，我們會說 “大家握握手，還是好朋友”
‘For 握個手((‘shake(V)+classifier+hands(O))) mm mm mm ((laughter)) now
everyone could take a look ((writing 個 general classifier on the board)) this
sometimes is called filler word, “fill” means that this place missed something and you
could add it in, its function is to complete the syllable, this “握手 shake(V)+hands(O)”
sounds more serious, “握個手, shake(V)+classifier+hands(O)” sounds more casual,
Taiwanese likes to say that. I would say, if it were me, I would say “here, everybody
shake hands, still good friends” ((the teacher repeats the verb 握 “shake” twice before
手 “hands”, instead of putting the classifier 個 in between the verb and the object)),
but Taiwanese likes to say “let’s have dinner, eat+ 個 classifier + dinner,” “let’s
drink coffee, drink+ 個 classifier + coffee”, that “個 classifier” does not mean “one”,
not that one only allows you to drink one coffee, it doesn’t mean that way, it is a way
to speak causally. If it were me, I really do not like it that way, to me it sounds like,
because perhaps it is from growing up in different cultures, to me it sounds a little too
informal. Last time there was a student, he hasn’t met with me for a long time, he says
“teacher, let’s drink coffee, drink+ 個 classifier + coffee,” I felt it was a little too
informal, perhaps it could be used among yourselves, but he was a lot younger than I,
and was my student, perhaps it sounds a little informal, so he meant to be very casual.
Of course it is okay! I would think he has progressed a lot in Mandarin, getting more
and more like Taiwanese, we would say “everybody shake hands, still good friends”…’
((the teacher repeats the verb 握 “shake” twice before 手 “hands”, instead of putting
the classifier 個 between the verb “shake” and the object “hands”))

The teacher’s classroom discourse serves as “the continuous social process of
classification (Fairclough, 2003, p. 88)” through which the teacher classifies certain ways
of speaking, in this case is the language structure “V + classifier + O,” as “Taiwanese”
and considers it as “causal” and “informal/impolite.” In this exchange, one of the students,
Cindy, raised a question regarding whether it is acceptable to omit the classifier 個 in
separable verbs, such as in 握個手‘shake(V)+classifier+hands(O),’ where the verb 握手
‘to shake hands’ has been divided into two parts: a verb 握 ‘shake’ and an object 手
‘hands’ with a general classifier 個 in between the verb and the object. The teacher
makes an implicit evaluation and direct impression through the verb “sounds” in line 21,
which also acts as a hedging, in that it distances her from her judgment and impression
that the separable verb “V-O” structure that is “serious” while the “V+ classifier + O” is
“casual.” In line 22, the teacher used the if-conditional clause, “if it were me, I would say…” as an indication that the following statement would be a personal opinion. However, the teacher’s institutional position as the holder of knowledge would likely give weight to her statement, turning the personal opinion into a statement of reality by way of legitimation through authorization (Fairclough, 2003). The conditional clause serves to introduce the desired language structure, which the teacher modeled in lines 22-23 by repeating the verb twice before the object: 握握手 ‘shake (V) +shake(V)+ hands(O), instead of placing a classifier between the verb and the object.’ Then, in line 25, the conjunction “but” creates the “logic of difference” (Laclau & Mouffee, 1985) and through this use of contrastive relation among sentences, it distinguishes the teacher’s desired way of talking from the “casual” Taiwanese way of language use. Additionally, the relationship of difference between the categorized Taiwanese usage and the teacher’s desired structure is established through the contrastive relations.

After the establishing the contrastive relation between the two usages, the teacher provided two examples of Taiwanese language usage in lines 25-26, which functions as an exemplification that elaborates on the teacher’s judgment of which usage is and is not preferred. In lines 27-28, the teacher repeated the comment that the Taiwanese usage is, “a way to speak casually,” serves to assert and reemphasize that this particular way of speaking is considered “casual.” The teacher’s explicit evaluation through a subjectively marked affective evaluation using the verb “like” (Fairclough, 2003) in line 28, “I really do not like it that way,” suggests the “V + classifier + O” structure is undesirable. Moreover, in line 29, the teacher employed the quantifier “a little” as hedging to soften the negative evaluation of “too informal/impolite” so that the listeners would be more
willing to accept the information. As Fairclough (2003) suggested, an evaluative statement does not necessarily include words that carry an explicit indication of (un)desirability, such as “good” or “bad,” and, in line 29, the undesirability of the language usage is assumed through the teacher’s word choice of 隨便 ‘informal/impolite.’ The teacher’s word choice to describe the undesired structure shifts from “causal” to “informal/impolite,” revealing her degree of disapproval towards this particular usage. Interestingly, before the teacher’s evaluation on the “Taiwanese” structure as “too informal,” the teacher repeated statements such as, “if it were me…” and, “to me…” in lines 27-29, which function both as hedging devices that soften the tone of the coming critique, and as an emphasis that the evaluation is a personal opinion. The teacher explained that, “because perhaps it is from growing up in different cultures,” suggesting a relationship of difference between the culture in Mainland China and in Taiwan.

In lines 30-33, the teacher recounted a previous interaction between herself and a former student, who used the undesired structure “drink(V)+ classifier + coffee (O)” to invite the teacher out for a coffee. The teacher explicit used a negative evaluation of the former student’s language as, “a little too informal,” and she continued, “perhaps it could be used among yourselves,” creating an I-you relationship that implies there is a difference between how one speaks to a teacher and how one should speak to peers. In line 32, the teacher provided reasons behind why she finds the former student’s way of speaking during their interaction as undesirable, saying, “he was a lot younger than I, and was my student.” This constructs the idea that one should consider the interlocutor’s age and social role when deciding which language structure is appropriate to use. Furthermore, in line 30, before narrating the conversation with the former student, the
teacher used the word “informal/impolite” to describe the undesired structure. However at the end of the narration, the teacher used the word “casual” to describe the former student’s intention behind the undesirable language use, saying “he meant to be very casual,” which softens the teacher’s comments on the former student who spoke in an “informal/impolite” way to the teacher.

Moreover, in lines 34-35, the teacher continued, “I would think he has progressed a lot in Mandarin.” The modal verb “would” indicates the teacher’s shift in judgment from negative to positive regarding the use of the structure “V+ classifier +O.” At first she stated that the student was being perceived as informal/impolite due to the use the structure, but she then said it served as an indication of his advancement in Mandarin. With the use of two comparative adjectives in “more and more like Taiwanese,” the teacher continued to alleviate her degree of criticism by connecting the former student’s use of the undesired structure as an indication of his progressed language proficiency and his ability to assimilate into a “Taiwanese” way of speaking. Different from her previous use of I-statements in delivering what she found as a more desirable language use, in her concluding remarks in line 34, the teacher’s use of exclusive-we in “we would say” and the repetition of the desired structure “shake (V) + shake (V) + hands (O)” creates a sense of a we-community in opposition to the Taiwanese-community which is associated with the undesired language structure.

At the end, the teacher repeated the correct usage, providing students a way of talking that is appropriate for conversing with a teacher, therefore, the effect of using the recommended form not only sways the students to use language in a certain way, but also molds them into a particular social role. The teacher’s instructions create the
representations of a specific group of social actors as “Taiwanese” and connect them to the use of the language structure. Also, according to Held (1999), politeness is considered ideological due to the dialectical relationship between the constructed beliefs of what is polite or impolite, and how these beliefs serve to maintain the power for certain groups. Thus, politeness not only reflects power but also stabilizes it (Held, 1999). In this event, the teacher’s beliefs on the desired language structure and pragmatic use seems to maintain the hierarchical social relation between the teacher and the students.

Certain essay formats serve as an indication of one’s respect for the teacher

The teacher often discussed the cultural idea of respect during demonstrations on preferred language use in both verbal and non-verbal communications. However, as excerpt 27 depicts, when the teacher lectured on the standard format of writing a Chinese essay, the instruction is not only about producing a correct layout for the essay, but also links it to the concept of showing respect for the teacher. In other words, expressing respect for the teacher is not limited to the areas of spoken language or bodily expressions, but is also present in the formatting of an essay, such as leaving two spaces at the beginning of each paragraph.

Excerpt 27

T: 格式的話，每一段要像 Karen 這樣((holding Karen’s essay))你們的格式是這樣的，這樣是比較標準的，標題寫在這，標題沒有標點符號，標題寫在正中間，然後每一段的前面兩個字不要寫，這是對別人的尊重，對老師的尊重。((bows))這樣的意思((Laughter))然後每一段前面兩個空，跟英文格式不太一樣
‘For the format, each paragraph should look like Karen’s ((holding Karen’s essay)). This is what your format should look like, this way is closer to the standard, title is located here ((pointing to the upper middle part of the paper)), there is no punctuation for titles, title is written in the middle, and do not write in the first two spaces for each paragraph, this represents respect for others, respect for the teacher. ((The teacher bows by bending her upper body)) same meaning as this ((Laughter)) leave two spaces before each paragraph, it is different from English format…’
This excerpt occurred when the teacher returned students’ hand-written essays, and she presented one of the student’s essays to the class as a model for the ideal essay format. She then instructed the students on what the “standard” format of a Chinese essay should look like and stated the reason behind writing in this particular way is to express one’s respect for the reader. In line 5, the teacher started the instruction by using the modal verb “should” in “each paragraph should look like Karen’s,” which functions as a demand that every student is required to follow. The teacher then states that Karen’s writing format is considered “closer to the standard.” The comparative adjective “closer” implies a difference between Karen’s essay and the other students’, and the word choice “standard” functions as a positive evaluation that suggests Karen’s way of writing is the ideal or desired format. In lines 6-8, after commenting on Karen’s essay as “standard,” the teacher went into a detailed explanation on what constitutes an ideal structure for a Chinese essay. The teacher then used the imperative clause, “do not write in the first two spaces in each paragraph,” which implies a sense of command that leaves no room for negotiation.

In line 9-10, the teacher elaborated on the desired format by providing a reason behind the requirement of leaving two spaces at the beginning of each paragraph, stating that it represents “respect for others, respect for the teacher.” To further emphasize that respect is associated with the leaving-two-spaces practice, the teacher bent her upper body to demonstrate the meaning of respect, connecting the writing convention to the image of a person bowing. The excerpt demonstrates the ways in which the ideal or standard way of writing is constructed through classroom discourse. Additionally, it not only establishes the correct way of writing Chinese essay, but also that writing the
incorrect way would make the writer appear disrespectful to the reader, in this case, the teacher. It is interesting how the two-space rule is not only about the standard format of essay writing, but is also attached to the representation of respect that is signified by the action of “bowing.” Furthermore, the cultural conception of showing respect through indention not only serves to rationalize the linguistic practice but also creates a particular social relationship between the teacher and the students, wherein the students are expected to display deference and respect to the teacher in different areas of interaction that are not limited to face-to-face interactions.

4.2.8 Language Ideology on Gender Differences

This section examines how cultural conceptions regarding how males and females should talk and be talked to are socially produced through the teacher’s instructions on discursive practices. Also, the teacher’s awareness and social interpretations of certain linguistic forms, in this case the use of particle “oh,” could be contrastive to the social world beyond the classroom suggested by the textbook. And the teacher’s metalinguistic awareness of the linguistic features represents a powerful influence on the language learners’ language beliefs and practices.

The implication of femininity in using particle 喔 ‘oh’

The use of the modal particle 喪 ‘oh’ is described in the students’ textbook with the example “你等一下，別掛喔！Please wait a moment. Don’t hang up, okay ?!” (English translation provided by the textbook), and it also presented the explanation in Chinese and English, “語調高長，表示提醒對方注意。女孩子跟小孩子或是大人用小孩子語氣說話時常用。喔 in this use should be spoken in a high and intended tone. It is used in imperative sentences to tell the other party to pay attention to a particular
matter. It is often used by girls, young children, and adults purposefully speaking in a child-like manner.” According to the textbook, the particle is used to describe the situation where one person is attempting to catch another person’s attention, and it is commonly used by girls and children. Unlike the information provided in the textbook, the following classroom instruction demonstrates that the teacher presented the use of modal particle ‘oh’ as only suitable for female speakers or for when adults are speaking to children. The teacher suggests male speakers avoid using the particle because it would make them sound too feminine. The teacher’s explicit instructions on the nature of the linguistic feature of the particle “oh” suggests that there are social expectations regarding how women or men should talk. These discussions play the role of constructing and maintaining particular gender roles in that when women make a request or remind someone about something, she is expected to use the particle “oh” to make the delivery softer and feminine, while a man is expected to avoid the particle in order to maintain his masculinity. The teacher’s discourse functions as a reproduction of gender stereotypes that serves to maintain the cultural conceptions of women and men’s language.

Excerpt 28

T: 它的語調高長，所以是“喲:::”這樣的。它的意思，是提醒對方注意，然後注意了，女孩子跟小孩子比較常用，或者大人跟小孩子或者跟狗說話((laughter)) “你
好乖喲”，跟那個狗狗說話((laughter))。好，所以這個時候用這樣的，所以男生最
好不要用，就是太女性化了，娘的們們兒的，就是那個很娘的感覺。好，所以
它在句子的尾巴它叫什麼？語氣助詞，就是專門女性用提醒的語氣…
‘It has high pitch and prolonged sound, so it is “oh:::” like this. what it means is to
remind the other person to pay attention, now bear in mind, girls and children use this
more often, or when an adult is speaking to children or dogs ((laughter)) “you are so
well-behaved oh:::” when talking to doggies ((laughter)). Ok, so use this when in this
situation, so boys had better not use this, it is too feminine, unmanly, too girly feeling.
Ok, so what does it call when it is at the end of a sentence? Modal particles, it is only
for women to use when calling attention to others…’
This excerpt occurred when the class encountered the new grammar usage of the particle ‘oh.’ It illustrates how the teacher’s expressed feelings on a discursive form serve to produce and reproduce gender stereotypes in that the use of the modal particles “oh” at the end of a sentence is considered feminine, and men are warned against in adopting this language. In line 6, the teacher began the explanation on the new linguistic feature by reading off the definitions in the textbook, “It has high pitch and prolonged sound,” and she provided an exemplification by demonstrating the sound “oh:::” in a prolonged and high-pitch manner as described in the textbook. The textbook’s explicit definition and the teacher’s demonstration serve as an ideal model on the desired and expected way for the learners to use the particle ‘oh.’

In line 7, the teacher used the imperative phrase “bear in mind” to suggest that the following information is important and is crucial for everyone to follow. Then, the teacher pointed out that, “girls and children use this more often,” which implies the appropriate gender and age regarding who can employ the modal particle “oh” in a socially acceptable manner. In line 8, the teacher continued to list the situations in which it is acceptable to use the particle “oh,” stating that it is also appropriate language use “when an adult is speaking to children or dogs,” which indicates another restriction on this particular language use is based on who the addressee is – in this case, a child or an animal. In lines 8-9, the teacher then provided an exemplification based on the rules she listed by saying, “you are so well-behaved oh:::” and after the demonstration, the teacher pointed out the context is “when talking to doggie.” The word choice of “doggie,” which in the original Chinese text is a reduplication of the Chinese word for dog “狗狗,” demonstrates a particular usage that is categorized as children’s talk. After the teacher
used the term “doggie,” she laughs, which indicates her purposeful shift away from her role as a teacher to a group of students to that of an adult speaking to an animal.

In line 10, following the teacher’s demonstration of how to use the particle “oh,” the teacher adds, “boys had better not use this.” The “had better not” implies a sense of warning that if one does the contrary, a negative consequence will follow. The warning also suggests that there is an expected way for men to speak, and they should avoid using the particle “oh.” The teacher also used a colloquial expression 娘兒的們的 meaning “unmanly,” which has a negative connotation in describing men who have feminine characteristic. This suggests men will be negatively labeled as “too girly” if they use the particle “oh.”

Interestingly, in lines 11-12, the teacher changed her previous instruction on the usage of “oh” from being used by children and women to it being “only for women to use.” This suggests the exclusivity of this particular usage, and that there is a woman’s language and a man’s language. The teacher’s instruction constructed the ideology of the preferred linguistic practices for men and women, in that it is considered acceptable when women to use “oh” at the end of a sentence, while men risk being “girly” in doing so. According to Fairclough (1989), the naturalization of an ideology is considered the most effective form of domination, because of its function of concealing the political interests of a particular group of people and presenting itself as universal and timeless truth (Nakamura, 2014). As shown in excerpt 28, the teacher’s discussion on the use of the particle “oh” seems not only to construct a certain reality but also to naturalize it as commonsensical truth. Furthermore, when the textbook definition and the teacher’s
instruction are taken together, they function as a means to naturalize norms and to ideologically control and restrict the ways in which women and men talk.

The implication of childishness in using the particle 喔 ‘oh’

In excerpt 29, the teacher continues to explain the nature of the particle “oh,” however, this time she focuses on how the use of this linguistic feature for adults may be taken as “pretending to be cute” or immature by people in Mainland China regardless of the gender of the speaker. Language instruction is often where ideologies are transferred in that the explanation of certain language patterns reveal the language beliefs the teacher has towards particular language varieties (Calton, 2013). The discussion of the particle “oh” in the excerpt below reveals the teacher’s ideology on this language use as it changes from regarding the use as an indication of femininity to a display of childishness.

Excerpt 29

T: …在大陸沒有，人家會覺得你裝可愛。因為我們長大比較不習慣太幼稚的感覺
((Laughter))所以我只有對狗才可以((Laughter))…
‘…Mainland China does not have this, people will think you are pretending to be cute.
Because when we grow up we are not used to being too childish ((laughter)), so I can only use it on dogs ((laughter))…’

After the teacher’s introduction of the particle “oh” illustrated in excerpt 28 that centered on women as the desired group of people to use this linguistic feature, excerpt 29 focuses on the teacher’s belief on the difference between the ways in which the use of particle “oh” is perceived in Mainland China and in Taiwan. In line 3, the teacher began by suggesting that this type of language use would not be found in Mainland China, saying, “Mainland China does not have this,” which could serve as an exaggeration on the degree of undesirability of this linguistic practice. Then, with the omission of connectors, the teacher continued, “people will think you are pretending to be cute,”
wherein “pretending” implies a negative value. Also, the Chinese collocation of 裝可愛 ‘pretending to be cute’ can be considered a derogatory label in a Mandarin-speaking country, used to describe women who intentionally speak in a childish manner to win affection. Furthermore, without the use of connectors or hedging, the semantic relations between the two clauses is more direct, limiting negotiation and thus adding a sense of commonsensical truth to the teacher’s statement.

In line 4, the teacher uses the Chinese grammar structure “Because….so” to indicate a cause-effect relationship when she elaborated on her previous comments for why the use of particle “oh” would result in being viewed as “pretending to be cute.” She then states the reason behind such a judgment is that “when we grow up we are not used to being too childish.” The teacher’s use of the exclusive-we, referring to herself and the people from Mainland China as a whole, separates her from people in Taiwan, which not only serves to suggest that there is a difference in language use between people in Mainland China and people in Taiwan, but also functions as an implicit evaluation on the language use through the adjective “childish.” The teacher said, “when we grow up,” which suggests that there are different ways of speaking among children and adults, and this particular language use is viewed as inappropriate for adults.

Moreover, the teacher used the words “too childish” to describe the language use of the particle “oh,” in which the adverb “too” functions as an intensifier of the degree for the term “childish” that attaches a negative value to the particular language use and suggests that it is undesirable. As the teacher developed the “cause,” which is the belief that using the particle “oh” is “childish,” she then provides the “effect” that “so I can only use it on dogs.” The word choice “only” implies a sense of exclusivity, suggesting the
high degree of undesirability associated with the particle “oh.” Unlike the previous instruction on the use of the particle “oh,” which describes it as a term used by “girls and children” or “adult speaking to children or dogs,” in the present excerpt, the teacher provided an I-statement, “I can only…” indicating a sense of personal opinion. However, as the teacher in the classroom, the students could easily perceive her personal opinion as the universal truth. In this excerpt, the teacher’s characterization of the linguistic feature “oh” as “pretending to be cute” and “childish” competes with the ideology presented in the textbook where the particle “oh” is seen as a feature that women or adults talking to children commonly use in Taiwan.

The restriction on using the particle ‘oh’ when the receiver is a male

In excerpts 28 and 29, the teacher explained that the particle “oh” is appropriate for women to use when reminding others about something when they want to sound soft, or for adults to use when talking to children, but that men should avoid the particle because it would make them sound unmanly. Unlike in Taiwan, the teacher added that this usage is uncommon among adults in Mainland China because it is childish and inappropriate and, therefore, may be perceived negatively. Up to this point, the discussion centered on the role of the speaker, however, in the excerpt below, when Karen provides an answer using the particle “oh,” the teacher turns the focus on the addressee, suggesting that it is not appropriate to use the particle when the receiver is male.

Excerpt 30

Karen: 你出門的時候一定要把門窗鎖好喔:::
1 ‘When you go out remember to lock the door and the windows oh:::’
2 Ss: ((Laughter))
3 T: ((Laughter))對弟弟也很奇怪((Laughter))因為弟弟是男生
4 ((Laughter)) ‘It is also odd to use it on a younger brother ((laughter)) because a
5 younger brother is a boy.’
6
In this expert, Karen provided her answer for a textbook exercise about using the particle “oh” at the end of a sentence as a reminder. The exercise question references a mock dialogue between a sister and her younger brother, where the sister is reminding her younger brother to lock the door and windows before leaving the house. In line 2, as Karen was providing her answer to the class, she not only prolonged the sound of “oh” as instructed earlier by the teacher, but she also intensified the particle “oh” by stressing it, which implies that this language use is unnatural to her. After presenting her answer, the class laughs, which is an indication that the class as a whole is uncomfortable using this linguistic feature. In line 5, the teacher provided an explicit evaluation on the situation, stating, “it is also odd to use it on a younger brother,” in which the word choice “odd” assumes a negative value that is attached to the linguistic feature. After the negative evaluation, the teacher gave the reason with the connector “because,” saying that the receiver of this usage is a “boy.” Combining the word “odd,” which has a negative connotation, with the explanation, the teacher constructs that it is undesirable for a person to use the particle “oh” when the addressee is male. This excerpt shows how classroom instructions contribute to the creation of language ideology on the appropriate ways to speak to males.

4.2.9 Standard Language Ideology

The production of standard language ideology is also central in the classroom discourse, and this section discusses how the teacher’s instructions contribute to the legitimization of certain language forms as standard, while delegitimizing other forms of language use. The standard language ideology creates a linguistic reality and ways of seeing language for the students, which could prevent the students from viewing certain
language forms as alternatives. Kroskri (2015) discussed one of the attributes of language ideologies as *positionality*, which focuses on how “language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest, or form the perspective, of an economically positioned social or cultural group. Members’ notion of what is ‘true,’ ‘morally good,’ or ‘aesthetically pleasing’ about language and discourse are grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to their political economic interest” (p. 98). In addition, Lippi-Green (1994) argued that standard language ideology “is part of a greater power construct, a set of social practices on which people depend on without close analysis of underlying assumptions” (p. 166). In this section, the teacher’s conceptions about what is “better” and “correct” shape the ways learners see different language forms, as she represents not only a member of the target language community but is also an expert on the target language.

**Discussion on standard language structure**

The teacher’s classroom discourse could be considered a semiotic process of linguistic ideologization that links linguistic features to a group of people. In the following excerpt, the teacher associates the linguistic feature “V看看 try V to see if…” to Taiwanese people, using the language structure that duplicates the word “看 see” instead of the verb to mean “try and see if…” In order to understand the semiotic process of linguistic ideologization in which languages index the essence of its speakers, Gal and Irvine (1995) offered the three semiotic processes of iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure. Iconization refers to the relationship between linguistic features and social groups, in which the linguistic features become the iconic representations as well as the depictions of the essential qualities of a social group. Fractal recursivity is the iconic
differences that create oppositional relationships among groups in a large scale, where the same differences could also be discovered within the groups, and thus, the same iconic differences could further divide each group. Erasure is the ideological process of neglecting certain people or sociolinguistic phenomenon that do not correlate with the iconic representations of language difference. Excerpt 31 illustrates the process of linguistic ideologization through the teacher’s discursive activity on the target grammar structure “VV 看 try V to see if…”

Excerpt 31

((on the grammar VV 看 ‘try V to see if…/trying something out’))

T: 這個文法是VV看，這你們一定常常聽到，“試試看”的意思就是試一試，比方說你要吃這個菜的話那個叫“吃吃看”，可是在台灣大家很可愛，說“吃看看”，“吃看看”不是正確的文法，但是台灣人很喜歡說“這是我做的菜，你吃看看”，我不知道為什麼會變成這樣，但是你們考試的時候一定要說“吃吃看”‘This grammar structure is V V 看((placing 看 at the end of two duplicated verbs means to give something a try in a manner suggested by the duplicated verbs)), you must have heard this very often, “試試看 ‘lit. try (V) try (V) 看’” means try it out, for example when you want to try out a dish it is “吃吃看 ‘lit. eat (V) eat (V)看看’, but in Taiwan everyone is very cute, and say “吃看看 ‘lit. eat (V)看看’, “吃看看” ‘lit. eat (V)看看, ‘吃看看’ ‘lit. eat (V)看看, ‘吃吃看’ ‘lit. eat (V)看看, ‘吃吃看’ ‘lit. eat (V)看看, give it a try.’ I do not know how it comes to this, but when you are taking examinations you must say “吃吃看 ‘VV 看’”…”

During this classroom instruction, the teacher introduced the grammar pattern VV 看, where 看 ‘see’ is placed at the end of duplicated mono-syllabic action verbs to create the meaning of ‘asking someone to give something a try,’ and the teacher points out that in Taiwan, this grammar structure is often used “incorrectly” in which Taiwanese duplicate 看 ‘see’ instead of the action verb. In line 7, the teacher demonstrated the correct usage of the target pattern, which serves as a modeling for the desired language form that she wanted the student to adopt. After the teacher explained the target
grammatical structure and its usage, the teacher continued with the conjunctive adverb “but,” indicating a contrastive semantic relation that the information that follows will likely be an opposite example to the previous description of the target pattern. In lines 8-9, the teacher described Taiwanese as “very cute,” employing the adverb “very” to intensify the degree of the adjective “cute.” Together, they function as a hedging device that serves to mitigate the teacher’s negative evaluation of the Taiwanese use of the pattern V 看看 as “not the correct grammar.” The teacher’s choice of the adjective “cute” could also be viewed as language subordination. According to Lippi-Green’s (1997) model of the language subordination process, the use of the adjective “cute” is a way to trivialize the language structure V 看看.

In line 10, the teacher’s comment of “not the correct grammar” suggests a negative value assumption towards the grammatical form of V 看看, rendering it an undesirable way of speaking. Furthermore, the students would consider the teacher, as both a native speaker of Mandarin and an authority figure in the classroom, as the more knowledgeable other whose evaluations and judgments are likely to carry great weight and to be regarded as commonsense and natural. Line 11, the teacher described that she does not know the cause or reason behind the change of grammatical structure from VV 看 to V 看 看 in Taiwan, stating, “do not know how it comes to this.” The collocation, “how it comes to this,” implies an undesired result, thus, it indicates that the shifted form is perceived as a negative change. At the end of the excerpt, the teacher reminded the students that when taking Chinese proficiency tests, they “must” use the target pattern VV 看. The modal verb “must” signals a strong sense of obligation, close to a command,
that the students should adhere to the standard structure during testing, which represents the gatekeeper for the standard form of language use.

The teacher’s instruction in excerpt 31 not only serves as a process of language ideologization but a process for language standardization. According to Lippi-Green (2004), *standard language ideology* is “a bias towards an abstracted, idealized, non-varying *spoken* language that is imposed and maintained by dominant institutions” (p. 293). This suggests that the notion of standard languages are ideologically constructed, and educational institutions play an influential role in the production and reproduction of the standard language ideology. The V 看看 structure, which varies from the form recognized by the teacher and the institution, is considered a grammatically incorrect way of speaking instead of as a sociolinguistic variant. As the excerpt illustrates, the teacher and the educational institution represent the power of authority to construct the standard language ideology where certain language patterns are considered the standard and desired form, while others are regarded as less desired. In sum, the teacher’s discussion on the linguistic features of “V 看看” and “VV 看” acts as an ideological process that constructs and rationalizes the discourse of correct and incorrect language use as opposed to developing a discourse of regional differences.

**Discussion on standard accent**

While in excerpt 31 the teacher discussed the Taiwanese linguistic feature of the grammatical structure V 看看, in the following excerpt, she discusses another linguistic feature that is linked to Taiwanese people, but which focuses on pronunciation. As illustrated in Excerpt 32, the teacher points out that Taiwanese often place an /u/ sound
before an /eng/ sound, and then she goes on to demonstrate the “normal” pronunciation, implying that the Taiwanese pronunciation is abnormal and undesirable.

Excerpt 32

In this excerpt, the teacher introduced the new term 夢想 ‘dream,’ and she demonstrated two types of pronunciations, ‘mengxiang,’ which she described as “normal,” and, ‘mongxiang,’ which places an /u/ sound in the word 夢 ‘meng,’ and is regarded as the common pronunciation in Taiwan. In line 5, the teacher modeled what she considers the standard pronunciation, then she stated, “Taiwan’s pronunciation has a /u/ sound,” suggesting there are two pronunciations. The use of pronoun the “they” creates a separation between the teacher and the people who use the sound /u/.

Then in line 6, the teacher modeled the Taiwanese accent by prolonging the pronunciation of the word 夢/meng/ as /mong/, which has the effect of stressing the identified characteristic of the Taiwanese accent. In line 6, the teacher used the connector “so” to indicate the effect of the identified Taiwanese pronunciation feature. The effect is then presented through the description of the possible scenario, “next time you got off a plane and took a taxi they would immediately know that you are from Taiwan.” The teacher is suggesting that people could immediately discern that one is from Taiwan by the linguistic feature of linking the /u/ sound with the /eng/ sound in words. The
association between the pronunciation trait and Taiwanese people could be seen as the process of linguistic ideologization. In line 7, the teacher provided another example when she said, “They would say taifong,” where the term “taifong” elaborates on the Taiwanese pronunciation of linking /u/ and /eng/ sounds, resulting in “feng” being pronounced as “fong.” Moreover, the teacher used the adjective “normal” to describe the pronunciation without the /u/ sound, producing the standard language ideology which reifies the belief that certain language varieties are normal while other varieties are abnormal.

**Discussion on standard pronunciation**

Spitulnik (1998) understood ideology as the notion of *language valuation* and *evaluation*, which “are processes through which different social values and referents come to be associated with languages, forms of speaking, and style of speaking” (p. 227). Excerpt 33 shows how the teacher’s classroom discussions serve as semiotic processes of language valuation and evaluation that naturalize particular language values. Unlike the ideology created by the textbook that there are two ways to pronounce certain terms, the teacher’s instruction in the excerpt below seems to create a language ideology that recognizes one standard way for the pronunciation of terms. The teacher’s perception regarding the pronunciation of the term 主角 ‘leading role’ acts as a hegemonic influence based on Mainland China’s beliefs that regard one pronunciation as legitimate and all others as non-standard. In short, the teacher’s discussion on what is “normal” can be seen as a process of language evaluation that delegitimizes the Taiwanese accent and creates a world view that perpetuates the interests of people with a certain accent.

Excerpt 33
‘Mm, this word has two pronunciations, but everyone is used to the incorrect one, so everyone read zhu3 jiao3, okay, this reads zhu3 jue2, this is the correct way. But if you used the Mainland China’s software program you need to type zhu3 jue2 in order to find the word, let me show you ((demonstrating on a word document that is projected onto the white screen)) look if I type zhu3 jiao3, right, only the word pork shank, the word for food, but if I type zhu3 jue2, it immediately appears, this Microsoft has Taiwan and Mainland China’s=’

Cindy:=老師所以說主角 juei2 比較好？

= ‘Teacher, so zhu3 juei2 is better?’

T: 可是在台灣沒有人說主角 juei2，會覺得你好奇怪，你就還是說主角 jiao3 吧！入鄉隨俗((Laughter))你看台灣的話，你看用台灣的軟體打的話就是主角 jiao3。好 (.3)為什麼覺得 juei2 比較好呢？給大家說一點那個在中國唱京劇最美的那個人，他叫梅蘭芳…他如果化妝成女生是這樣的 ((showing his pictures from Google images)), 然後這個樣的角色叫旦角，就是男生唱女生的叫旦角…所以非常非常有名的演員在北京我們叫他角 jue2 兒，所以你如果說他角 jiao3 兒((laughter))就不好聽了，所以我們都叫他角 juei2 兒，就是他的表演藝術才能很高，我們買彩票都是為了看他…我們都只能說我們是衝著這個角 juei2 兒來的，不能說我們是衝著這個角 jiao3 兒來的，所以其實我自己比較認同念成角 juei2 兒，但是在台灣的話京劇也沒有那麼流行，所以大家就念角 jiao3 就好了...

‘But in Taiwan no one would say zhu3jue2, will think that you are very odd, you should just say zhu3jiao3! When in Rome, do what the Romans do ((laughter)) look, for Taiwan, look, if you use the Taiwan’s software to type, it is zhu3 jiao3. Okay (.3) why is juei2 considered better? Let you know a little about the most beautiful person who sang Beijing opera, his name is Mei LanFang… when he was dressed as a girl he looked like this ((showing his pictures from Google images)), and this role is called dan4 juei2, it is when a male sings a female role is named dan4 jue2…so it is for actors that are very very famous we would called him jue2 er, so if you called him jiao3 er ((laughter)) will sound unpleasant, so we would called him juei2, it means he has high talents in performing arts, we purchase tickets only to see him…we can only say we are here for this jue2 er, cannot say we are here for this jiao3 er, so truthfully I myself agree to pronounce it as jue2 er more, but in Taiwan Beijing opera is not as popular, so it is fine for everybody to read it as jiao3…’

Excerpt 33 occurred when the class went over the key terms for chapter 4 and encountered the new term 主角 ‘leading role.’ In the textbook, the term 主角 ‘leading
role’ is introduced with two pronunciations zhu3 jiao3 and zhu3 jue2, placing zhu3 jue2 in a parenthesis, which suggests that both are correct and serve as alternative pronunciations for each other. Interestingly, the teacher introduced the new term by announcing that there were two pronunciations but that one was incorrect, which is different from the information provided by the textbook. She expresses this by using a clause linked by the conjunction “but” that expresses a sense of contrast in, “but everyone is used to the incorrect one,” and then combines it with the connector “so,” which indicates the result in, “so everyone read zhu3 jiao3.” In lines 7-12, the teacher elaborated on the legitimacy of the pronunciation zhu3 jue2 through the demonstration on how the term 主角 ‘leading role’ will not come up successfully on the Microsoft word system for Mainland China if the pronunciation zhu3 jiao3 is typed in.

As the teacher explained that there are different Microsoft word systems for Mainland China and Taiwan, one of the students, Cindy, interrupted and asked in line 14, utilizing the connector “so” that indicates results or conclusion, “so ju3 juei2 is better?” When describing the pronunciation ju3 juei2, Cindy used the comparative adjective “better,” instead of following the teacher’s example and using words such as “correct” or “incorrect” to describe pronunciations, which could demonstrate that Cindy sees the two pronunciations as interchangeable and not as a choice between correct and incorrect. The teacher provided an extensive response that begins (line 25-26) and ends (line 37) with a similar answer in which the teacher suggested the students use zhu3 jiao3, because it is a more common usage in Taiwan. However, in between advising students to use zhu3 jiao3, the teacher provides a detailed cultural background on the other pronunciation, zhu3 jue2, to support why she considers it a legitimate pronunciation.
In line 25, the teacher explained that in Taiwan “no one uses” the pronunciation zhu3 jue2, which could be viewed as an exaggeration that indicates the number of people in Taiwan who would pronounce the term for lead role as zhu3 jue2. The teacher then used the adjective “odd” to describe the effect if one chose to say zhu3 jue2 in Taiwan. The word choice “odd” assumes a negative value, implying that people in Taiwan may perceive the pronunciation zhu3 jue2 negatively. The teacher continued and added the idiom 入鄉隨俗 ‘when in Rome, do what Romans do’ as the reason for why the students should use the pronunciation that she considers incorrect. At the same time, the teacher demonstrated how Taiwan’s Microsoft Word recognizes the input for the pronunciation zhu3 jiao3 as the term 主角 ‘leading role,’ which serves to further emphasize that the pronunciation is considered correct and common in Taiwan.

It is not until lines 27-28, after the teacher suggested that zhu3 jiao3 is the more common pronunciation and that zhu3 jue2 is seen as “odd” in Taiwan, does she provide a more direct answer to Cindy through the use of the rhetorical question, “why is juei2 considered better?” This response may serve two possible functions. First, rhetorical questions persuade and influence the audience without being forceful. Second, with the omission of a subject, the teacher not only distances herself from the evaluative statement, but also presents the evaluation as an established fact with no room for negotiation. To further elaborate on why the pronunciation zhu3 jue2 is considered “better,” the teacher gave the example of the pronunciation for the term “dan4 jue2,” which is used to refer to the female leading role in Beijing opera. Furthermore, the teacher also introduced the actor Mei LangFang who was famous for playing the female leading role in Beijing opera and the teacher added that people would referred to famous actors as “角兒 jue2 er.”
To further emphasize the preferred pronunciation of the word 角 as jue2, in lines 34-35, the teacher said, “we can only say we are here for this jue2 er, cannot say we are here for this jiao3 er, so truthfully, I myself agree to pronounce it as jue2 er more.” The teacher uses the exclusive “we” to indicate herself and the people in Mainland China as separate from the people in Taiwan who use the pronunciation of jiao3. The modal verbs “can” and the negative form “cannot” imply permission and acceptability in that jue2 is desired while jiao3 is not. Furthermore, with the indication of a result and conclusion from the connector “so,” the teacher stated her position that of the two pronunciations, jue2 is more agreeable to her. Finally, as discussed at the beginning of the excerpt, the teacher completed her response by suggesting the students use the pronunciation jiao3.

As the excerpt shows, the teacher did not provide an explanation behind why people in Taiwan would pronounce the term as zhu3 jiao3 aside from that one would be considered “odd” otherwise. Instead, she gave a more detailed reasoning on why people in Mainland China pronounce the term zhu3 jue2 by providing a background on Beijing opera. Furthermore, even though the textbook used by the institution recognizes both pronunciations as correct, the teacher discussed the two pronunciations with the word “incorrect,” and used modal verb “cannot say” to describe the pronunciation zhu3 jiao3, and “better” and “can say” to refer to the pronunciation zhu3 jue2. Based on Briggs’ (1998) conceptualization on the construction of language ideology and its effect, this discursive interaction between the teacher and the students could be seen as “a construction of an ideological stance on language and an attempt to delegitimize competing ideologies” (p. 310). As shown in excerpt 33, the discussion on preferred pronunciation forms the language ideology of one standard convention for the word 角,
and it serves to delegitimize the competing ideology presented in the textbook that both pronunciations are regarded as correct and acceptable. The teacher’s employment and construction of certain standard linguistic ideologies while dismissing the others is closely linked to the position of authority and, at the same time, works to serve the interests and power of a particular group of people. Furthermore, standard language ideology remained is because:

- it is carefully tended and propagated, with use almost universal success, so that language, the most fundamental of human socialization tools, becomes a commodity. This is the effect of ideology of standardization which empowers certain individuals and institution to make these decisions and impose them on others (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 61).

Moreover, Piller also contended that the standard language ideology refers to:

- The belief that a particular variety—usually the variety that has it roots in the speech of the most powerful group in society, that is often based on the written language, that is highly homogeneous, and that is acquired through long years of formal education—is aesthetically, morally, intellectually superior to others ways of speaking the language” (Piller, 2015, p. 4).

Piller (2015) also argues that because there is only a small group of people who are able to speak in a way that is regarded as standard and superior, the ideology of standard language plays an important role in creating and sustaining social inequality. In the present case, the teacher creates the standard language ideology that views the language variety close to the Beijing dialect as the standard, which competes with the ideology
formed in the textbook where both varieties, Mainland China and Taiwan, are regarded as acceptable and standard pronunciations.

4.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter focused on uncovering the language ideologies constructed through the linguistic practice in the classroom and revealing how these ideologies are rooted in social interest that help produce and reproduce certain social structures. The teacher represents a powerful source of influence, whose conceptions and interpretations of particular language forms serve to conceptualize a linguistic reality, and this linguistic reality is not formed objectively but ideologically. In other words, this chapter examined how the teacher’s conscious explanations of appropriate language use or behavior construct and maintain language ideologies that are often presented as commonsense knowledge, even while they are serving the interests of a particular group of people, obscuring competing ideologies, and preventing the students from discerning alternatives.

The following identified ideologies relate to different facets of language learners in a social world: the desired characteristics that language learners should acquire in order to be successful; the valued ways for learners to speak in terms of word choice, structure, rhythm, and content to sound polite and pleasant; the promoted cultural values of displaying selflessness and humbleness; the constructed relationship between the target language and the students in which the target language is difficult for the language learners to fully master; the production of gender differences; and the promotion of a homogenous standard language.

In short, the teacher’s ideological interpretations of the nature of language contribute to creating and reifying ideologies about language, and, as Brigg (1998)
suggests, these ideologies are likely to influence the language learners’ linguistic worldview and function as a guide in deciding the appropriate ways to talk and act. Also, the teacher’s notion of what is considered good in terms of language forms and discourse could result in language legitimation of particular language varieties being valued while other varieties are devalued. And through the ideological processes of promoting certain ways of speaking, thinking, and acting, they produce and reproduce particular social relations and structures.
Chapter 5:

Identities of CSL Learners

This chapter focuses on examining the narratives of three participants (Karen, Cindy, and Keiko) with the goal of understanding the ways in which second language learning histories, life experiences, social interactions, ideologies, and social contexts serve as symbolic artifacts that mediated their construction of identity. The three participants have different goals in learning Mandarin: Karen, a mother of three children whose learning motivation resided in being able to “live” in Taiwan; Cindy, an employee of a seafood company owned by her family who wants to become an interpreter for the company. Keiko, who works for a Japanese entertainment company, hopes to become a bilingual speaker so that she can become an interpreter for the entertainment company for which she works, and she can also meet new people and make more friends. For each participant, I first present a background regarding their learning motivation and goals, then I discuss in detail the main themes and sub-themes that emerged from the participants’ narrative.

5.1 Karen

Karen was a South Korean female in her mid-thirties, and a mother of three young children. Her family moved to Taiwan from South Korea due to her husband’s job relocation, and she had lived in Taiwan for two years before attending the IMLP. Karen started learning Mandarin when she was in Korea, where she took some lessons in a cram school because her occupation at that time required her to be able to engage in simple conversations in Mandarin. During her first two years in Taiwan, she did not enroll in any Mandarin learning programs at language institutions. At that time, she had to take care of
her youngest child, which left her limited time to learn Mandarin in language institutions because they require regular attendance. However, her Mandarin learning was not impeded, because she hired tutors to engage in one-hour tutoring session with her from her home after dinner. Also, she would have coffees with her husband’s Taiwanese co-worker’s wife to practice Mandarin. Even though she created many opportunities to expose herself to the target language, her learning result was limited because the Mandarin tutors she encountered were mostly her husband’s friends who were native speakers of Mandarin but not professionally trained in Mandarin language teaching, which resulted in the tutoring session not as effective as she anticipated.

Karen disclosed her goal of learning Mandarin during our first interview, where she said, “因為現在來要台灣生活” [“Because now we are here in Taiwan, we need to live”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Her language learning motivation came from her eagerness and determination to stay in Taiwan. She reported that, regardless of opportunities her husband’s company may offered that would require them to relocate, she and her husband would choose to continue to live in Taiwan. The reasons behind her desire to reside in Taiwan were manifold, one of the primary reasons being that she her husband had better working hours in Taiwan than he did in Korea. When in Korea, she and her husband both worked for most of the day, and she had to resort to having her mother take care of the children during the week, leaving only weekends for her and her husband to spend quality time with the children.

Also, she mentioned that she preferred the learning environment in Taiwan for her children for three reasons. First, she stated that “台灣的小孩很乖比韓國” [“The children in Taiwan are more well-behaved comparing to Korea”] (Karen, interview, April 24,
and when I asked her to elaborate, she replied, “韓國的小朋友很兇，會打” [“The children in Korea are very mean, will hit”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). She continued to elaborate on the hostility of the children in Korea by sharing the perspective of a teacher from Korea stating,

我們以前剛來的時候，我們小朋友都讀在韓國學校，台北韓國學校，可是那個老師都是韓國派來的，可是他們，啊有一位老師跟我說的時候，一直哭，在韓國的時候很辛苦，因為小朋友很兇，沒有禮貌，還有恩一直哭哈哈…所以他決定來哈哈… [“When we first arrived, our children were studying in the Korean school, Taipei Korean school, but the teachers were all from Korea, but they, ah when one of the teachers was telling me, was crying non-stop, was very hard in Korea, because the children were very mean, impolite, and mm crying non-stop haha…so the teacher chose to come haha…”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017).

Feeling confused about the difference regarding teaching Korean children in Korea and teaching Korean children in Taiwan, I asked “可是他也是交韓國小朋友啊?” [“But he is still teaching Korean children?”] Karen responded “因為一直住在韓國的小朋友，一起生活所以不一樣，變的會一直罵別人” [“Because the children who lived in Korea, living together so it is different, will become someone who are mean to others”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Karen’s response shows that she believed the environment in Korea would influence her children to become more hostile compared to Taiwan.

Secondly, she stated Taiwanese teachers are more tolerant toward the condition of the uniforms students wear: “還有老師比較不嚴格，可是在韓國如果衣服變小的話(}
一定要買新的，可是在台灣沒關係，變這樣((手比手踝))也沒關係，髒髒的也沒關係” [“And the teachers were less strict, but in Korea when the children were growing out of their uniforms had to purchase new ones, but in Taiwan it is all right, when it becomes this ((pointing to the wrist)) is also acceptable, stained is acceptable”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). In the narrative, she described that in Korea, when a student grows out of a uniform or it does not fit well, the parents are expected to purchase new ones immediately, but in Taiwan it is still acceptable to wear and no one minds when the uniform becomes shorter at the wrists or is stained.

Finally, in connection to the first reason, Karen stated that students in Korea would mock others if their uniform did not fit well or if it was dirty. She provided an imitation of the things Korean children are likely to say: “你的衣服怎麼那麼小?你的家裡沒有錢喔?你的父母做甚麼?” [“How come your clothes are so small? Your family doesn’t have money? What do your parents do?”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Due to these reasons, Karen preferred raising her family in Taiwan instead of Korea, and with the goal of living in Taiwan, Karen was highly motivated to acquire the target language.

5.1.1 Learning Mandarin “To live”

One of the themes that emerged from Karen’s narratives is the importance for her “to live” in the L2 community. As mentioned previously, she responded to the question of what her purpose was for learning Mandarin in a succinct and determined manner: “因為現在來台灣，要生活” [“Because now are here in Taiwan, need to live”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Karen’s response revealed her perspective on the
representation of speaking Mandarin, which is closely related to one’s ability to actually “live” in the place where the target language is spoken. There are three subthemes that I placed under the theme of To live, which are the lost identity as a workingwoman, the identity as an involved parent, and the identity as a non-participant in social interactions. I see these subthemes as representations of the aspects that comprised the meaning of “living” to her. For each representation there is an underlying motive or goal, and each goal is associated with the identity that Karen aimed to acquire or maintain. Karen’s narrative represents her definition of “to live,” which is more than simply to survive physically in a foreign country, but means to achieve and maintain her desired identities as an involved parent, as a workingwoman, and as an active participant in social conversations. Her narrative shows that these identities are closely linked with her Mandarin ability.

The lost identity as a workingwoman

The connection between the goal of “living” in Taiwan and the ability to speak Mandarin in Karen’s mind is apparent and present in different aspects of her life in the new country. One of the important parts that constitute the definition of living to Karen appears to be the regaining of her lost identity as a “workingwoman.” She lost this identity by both the transition to a new place and with the level of her Mandarin proficiency. When asked about why she wanted to attend the IMLP, Karen shared her plan for obtaining a job after she becomes more fluent in Mandarin: “我需要能力講中文，講中文的能力，講中文更流利，還有如果有機會的話找工作” [“I need the ability of speaking Mandarin, Mandarin speaking ability, become more fluent in Mandarin, and if there are opportunities I want to find a job”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017).
Karen’s comments reflect how the lack of language skills constrains her from forming the identity she once had as a workingwoman.

Moreover, Karen expressed the overwhelming sense of boredom she experienced after moving to Taiwan: “我來台灣之前在韓國一直做工作，所以來台灣之後我很無聊” [“Before I come to Taiwan, I was always working in Korea, so I feel very bored after I come to Taiwan”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). In this statement, Karen’s emotional state and her lost identity as a workingwoman is revealed in that the transition from being a person who was always working to being a person who spent most of her time at home caused her to feel negatively. The reason behind her idea to acquire a job is that she wants to go back to the previous representation of herself and the lifestyle she was accustomed to before coming to Taiwan. As Karen continued her narrative, her descriptions of the negative emotion caused by the transition intensified, changing from boredom to sadness: “一直在家，我第一年一直哭” [“Always at home, in the first year I was always crying”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). By looking at the progression of Karen’s emotions in the narratives, it is clear that her lack of Mandarin skill restrained her from maintaining her previous identity as a workingwoman and that she believed learning Mandarin would offer her opportunities for future employment in Taiwan, which would provide her the ability to regain her past role.

The identity as an involved parent

Another subtheme under “to live” is Karen’s desired in maintaining the identity as a responsible parent, which is expressed through her view on the responsibility of a parent to maintain certain relationship with the teacher for her children. When asked if she is concerned about making mistakes when speaking Mandarin in her everyday life,
she disclosed that she was afraid of making mistakes when communicating in Mandarin with other parents. Nonetheless, she still pushed herself to participate in situations where she felt reluctant to take part in due to her Mandarin skill. Karen’s response disclosed her struggles, emotions, and reasons behind her decision of attending the meeting: “家長會那種的時候，我不敢說，不要去，可是我沒去的話，不好，老師會，我覺得老師會不愛我的小孩，所以如果爸媽有關心的話，家長有關心的話，老師也會有關心”

[“When it comes to Parent-teacher conference, I am afraid to speak, don’t want to go, but if I didn’t go, it’s not good, the teacher will, I think the teacher will not love my children, so if the mother and father shows that they care, parents show that they care, the teacher will also care”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). This narrative on the Parent-teacher conference as a potential stressful situation reveals Karen’s sense of vulnerability caused by her own assessment of her Mandarin language ability. Her concern for speaking Mandarin could sometimes be so overwhelming to her that she would have the immediate reaction of refusing to attend her children’s Parent-Teacher conference. However, her belief on the importance of parents attending these meetings to show dedication and involvement and that parent attendance would influence the ways in which the teacher would treat her children, overcame her fear. This narrative illustrates that the act of learning Mandarin is not merely an instrument that Karen uses to get by in a foreign country but is also a skill that she needs to adopt in order to participate in certain events that will potentially influence her children’s relationship with their teacher. This belief regarding the responsibility of a parent is what motivated Karen to overcome her fear and to participate in school events that required the use of Mandarin, and, in turn, constructed and maintained her identity as an involved parent.
Additionally, Karen mentioned that while she was sitting in her seat during the Parent-Teacher meeting, other parents would come to her and invite her to play dates for the children: “他們都會問我，問我甚麼時候，我們的小孩一起玩” [“They would ask me, ask me when, our children can play together”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017).

This interaction between Karen and the other parents who invited her to participate in a common activity among parents not only represents the positive outcome for Karen of facing her fear of attending the parent-teacher conference for the good of her child, but it also shows how being recognized as part of the parents’ group further reified her identity as an involved parent.

The identity as a non-active participant in social interactions

Even though Karen had spent two years living in Taiwan, based on her narratives, her interactions with native speakers of Mandarin were very limited. In the past, the situations where she was able to practice Mandarin one-on-one with a native speaker were either with a tutor or with her husband’s friends. And most of the time she found the results were not ideal in that the tutoring sessions were only one-hour sessions and most of the tutors were friends of her husband instead of professional, experienced, Mandarin teachers.

Karen was also able to practice Mandarin at events when she went out with her husband’s Taiwanese friend. Karen had high hopes of developing her Mandarin skill through these social events with native speakers, however, to Karen’s disappointment, the Taiwanese friend did not give her many opportunities to speak: “有的時候我老公的台灣朋友一起，可是我認識的台灣人有一個女生她喜歡說自己的，一個人講那我一直聽哈哈” [“Sometimes I would go out with my husband’s Taiwanese friends, but one of the
Taiwanese friends who is a girl she likes to talk about herself, she keeps talking and I keep listening, haha”] (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017). The social interaction between Karen and the Taiwanese friend presented in the narrative constructed Karen’s identity as a less successful participant in the target language community who was either constrained by her Mandarin ability or was denied access by the native speaker who took a more active position in the conversation. Thus, these experiences shaped Karen’s goals to expand her Mandarin vocabulary and to meet new, non-Korean friends, and motivated her to enroll in the IMLP. Karen expressed that there was a of vocabulary that she did not know and that opportunities for her to meet native speakers were limited, therefore, to her the Mandarin program was where she was able to practice Mandarin while socializing with new people.

5.1.2 The Desire to Assimilate

The identity as the other

In Karen’s narratives, another prevalent theme is related to her observations on the differences between Taiwanese-Mandarin and Chinese-Mandarin, and social interactions where she was being perceived as different because of her accent in Mandarin and her choice of words, and these experiences of difference served to mediate her identity as the other. Karen shared several incidences that she encountered in various contexts where she realized the Mandarin that she learned in South Korea could not always be successfully applied in Taiwan, and that people in Taiwan might be perceive the way she spoke as distinctively different. The realization was formed by comments Karen received from native speakers in Taiwan, which implied a sense of otherness that led to Karen’s awareness of the distinction between the two types of Mandarin.
As mentioned previously in the description of her background, Karen learned Mandarin in a cram school in South Korea for her job, and when she came to Taiwan, Karen noticed some of the tones for certain words were pronounced differently that, “一般韓國的補習班中文老師都是中國大陸的，所以辭典也是大陸的，聲調也有一點不一樣。恩我剛來的時候，台灣人跟我跟我：‘阿你是大陸人嗎?阿你的老師是大陸人…”” [“Usually the teachers for the Mandarin cram school in Korea are from Mainland China, so the dictionaries are also Mainland China’s, the tones are a bit different. Mm when I first came here, Taiwanese would ask me ask me: ‘Ahh are you from Mainland China? Ahh your teacher is from Mainland China…””](Karen, interview, April 24, 2017).

Karen’s statement points out that before coming to Taiwan, she was mainly exposed to native speakers of Mandarin who were from Mainland China and the dictionaries she used were also only referenced Mainland China’s language use. Therefore, she recognized the gap between the resources and tools that she was familiar with and the surrounding context through the incidents where Taiwanese people asked her if she was from Mainland China.

Moreover, in one of the interview questions, I asked her which activity she enjoyed the most, and she selected the listen-and-write test, which was a test where the teacher would read five to eight sentences and the students had to write down both the Chinese characters and the tones. When I asked about her reason behind this choice, she said, “之前司機先生都問我你是大陸人嗎?哈哈哈…所以我喜歡聽寫” [“Taxi drivers would always ask me, ‘Are you from Mainland China?’ Hahaha…so I like the listen-and-write test””](Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). These two events shared by Karen suggest that she was often identified as a person from Mainland China based on the ways she
spoke, which made her aware of the dissimilarity between the spoken Mandarin in Taiwan and in Mainland China.

Furthermore, Karen not only noticed the differences in accents but also the habit of communication between what she learned in the Mandarin cram school in Korea and in the daily interactions in Taiwan. Karen shared that there was one occurrence that happened in Taiwan where she was in the hospital and one of the staff was communicating with her on the subject of receiving vaccinations. Karen said that at first she could not understand what the hospital staff was referring to when they said “打預防‘lit. Take preventative’,,” because the noun for “shot” is often omitted in hospital discourse. Karen expressed that what she learned before, which she referred to as “大陸的 ‘Mainland China’s ,’” is that one must speak the whole term “打預防針 ‘take vaccinations.’” However, in Taiwan, people prefer to use shortened words instead of the complete terms and it often caused her confusion. These two interactions that Karen encountered with Mandarin speakers in Taiwan mediated Karen’s identity as “the other” who did not speak or use language in the same ways as people in Taiwan.

Karen’s identity as the other seemed to mediate her future trajectory regarding her goal of learning to speak Mandarin in ways that are similar to how Mandarin is spoken by the people in Taiwan. And this goal made Karen the only participant who commented on the fact that the teacher’s accent was different from people in Taiwan. Karen’s sensitivity to the teacher’s accent is revealed by her question, “你覺得她知道她的發音是有一點大陸的嗎？” [“Do you think she knows her accent is a bit Mainland China’s?”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Karen’s question was an indication of her categorizations on the two ways of speaking in that she perceived the way the teacher spoke as “Mainland.”
I replied to her that I thought the teacher was aware of her accent as different from Taiwanese people, and that her Beijing accent was considered the standard accent while the accent representing the southern region of China that I have is not.

The response that I gave regarding linguistic variations corresponds to Lippi-Green’s (1994) discussion on how standard language ideology is used “to rationalize and justify discrimination of all kinds—and to tolerate such discrimination, even when it is directed toward ourselves” (p. 166). Karen’s question caught me by surprise, but it also reminded me to reflect on my own standard language ideology that views the Beijing accent as legitimate and how this language ideology is linked to the standard language ideology constructed in the classroom. It also reminded me to investigate the relationship between this particular standard language ideology and Karen’s language ideology developed in her social world beyond the Mandarin classroom. After the interview I wrote down my reflection as follows:

…She also asked me if the teacher knows that the way she speaks is different from how people in Taiwan speak, Karen said it in a way, which implies it is not what she is looking for. At the moment, based on my bias and the ideology that I have, I replied that I believe the teacher knows that her pronunciation is different, and I added my personal judgment saying that the teacher’s way of speaking is “standard.” … Karen’s way of describing the teacher’s pronunciation, using the word “different” instead of word like “standard,” perhaps to her it does not matter what is “standard” and what is not, to her she sees the teacher’s pronunciation as different from how Taiwanese speaks, and connecting with the communication difficulties she has shared that caused by different word choices between
Taiwanese Mandarin and Chinese Mandarin, from her experience there are two ways of speaking, and Chinese-Mandarin to her is not working in her daily life. In retrospect, her description leads me to think the reason behind how I view the teacher’s accent as “standard,” and the hidden meaning behind my lens of interpreting the world. And my immediate response to her statement also shows the researcher bias I have regarding what count as “standard” accent is close to the Beijing dialect. (The researcher, summary/reflection journal, April 24, 2017).

My reflection on the first interview with Karen shows that Karen’s keenness toward linguistic variations is caused by her social interactions with Taiwanese people, and those social interactions also mediated Karen’s perceptions about the differences between the way the teacher speaks and the way the Taiwanese people she knows speaks. In other words, Karen understood the two ways of speaking as two types of Mandarin—Taiwanese-Mandarin and Chinese-Mandarin. Furthermore, Karen did not use the word “standard” in her description of the Beijing accent, which may imply that she resisted adopting the standard language ideology constructed in the teacher’s instruction, and instead sees the two ways of speaking as simply different rather than standard or non-standard.

Interestingly, after my reply, Karen did not respond to my comment but mentioned another Korean student in the classroom, saying that, “所以老師說一個人，她是上海留學，坐在前面，中國留學生，所以老師覺得她的發音比較舒服” [“So the teacher comments on a person, who studied in Shanghai, sits in the front, studied in China as a foreign student, so the teacher thinks her pronunciation sounds more comfortable”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). This narrative shows that Karen made
sense of the teacher’s compliment by reasoning that the teacher, who is from Mainland China, would instinctively prefer the Korean student’s way of speaking, which was similar to the teacher’s own accent. Karen’s narratives suggest not only that the teacher’s accent is different from Taiwanese-Mandarin, but also that she believed the teacher to favor the Chinese-Mandarin accent.

After sharing the event where the teacher complimented another student’s pronunciation, Karen added, “因為我來台灣說的，我認識的台灣人的發音跟老師的發音有一點不一樣” [“Because the way I talk in Taiwan, the pronunciation of the Taiwanese I know are a little bit different from the teacher’s”] (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Again, different from the teacher’s constructed standard language ideology that described Taiwanese-Mandarin as “incorrect” or “abnormal,” Karen’s narrative indicates that her view does not categorize the differences between the accent of the teacher and the Taiwanese people as correct/incorrect, normal/abnormal, or standard/non-standard. Instead, she describes the relation between the two as “different.” Most importantly, she not only identified the teacher’s accent as different from other Mandarin speakers she encountered in Taiwan, but she also delivered it in a way that suggests the teacher’s accent is of concern to her regarding her goal of learning to speak the same as the people in Taiwan.

“I want to say it in the way Taiwanese would say it”

Since in the early stages of the course, Karen discussed that one of her goals was to learn to talk in the ways Taiwanese people talk, and this primary purpose is shown in various situations such as conversations in the classroom or in the interviews. The field
note below was recorded on the second week of the course and illustrates how Karen asked me how to give taxi drivers directions in a “Taiwanese” way:

At 12:00, during break time, Karen approaches me with the handout that the class was working on in the first period of the class, she speaks in a very soft and low voice, perhaps she does not want to disturb other students. At first, I thought she has questions about the content of the handout that the class has been working on, so when she starts by saying “搭計程車的時候” [“when taking a taxi”] I look at the content of the handout and cannot find the question relate to anything about taxi, feeling very confused and not knowing that she is trying to provide me with the context of her question that has nothing to do with the handout. I ask her to say her question again, and until the second time I realize that she is trying to start a question about riding a taxi. Then she describes the situation by drawing on the empty space from the margin of the handout. She scribbles a symbol similar to this “柊” indicating a corner and draws a line along the corner to show me the route, she wants to know what I would say in telling the driver to stop after taking the right turn. Then, I tell her the way I would say it as “前面右轉停” [“stop after the right turn”] and as I am telling her, she tries to write down my sentence word by word on the margin of the handout at the same time, so I repeat it for several times. After she writes down the entire sentence she read it in a very low voice. I ask her if the taxi did not stop at the location where she wanted, trying to know more why she would ask me this question. She replies “他聽得懂，但我想跟台灣人說的一樣” [“He understands, but I want to say it in the way Taiwanese would say it”] (Field notes April 4, 2017).
Karen appeared to be very determined to speak like a Taiwanese, in that even though her way of communicating with the taxi driver was successful, she was able to arrive at the correct location where she wanted the taxi to stop, she still decided to come to me for guidance on how to talk to the taxi driver. Additionally, she seemed to treat my response as a guideline or model by writing it down verbatim in the margin of the worksheet. Karen’s decision to approach me for the modeling on how Taiwanese speak, along with saying, “I want to say it in the way Taiwanese would say it,” could be an indication of her determination to assimilate to a particular way of speaking. In addition, the mediated identity as “the other” developed through the social interactions with the taxi drivers who commented on her accent also reinforced her goal of learning to speak Mandarin in a way that is similar to people in Taiwan.

Furthermore, the teacher, who is from Mainland China and who has lived and taught Mandarin in Taiwan for thirteen years, often provided the class with two sets of Mandarin terms with the same meaning but that she categorized as “common usage in Taiwan” or “common usage in Mainland China.” This offered the students a rich set of words that aimed to equip them with the ability to communicate with people from different Mandarin-speaking areas. However, from Karen’s perspective, this particular teaching style caused her difficulty in memorizing which terms were considered common in Taiwan or Mainland China. She expressed, “可是我有的時候會搞混，我只是想知道台灣的，可是老師有的時候教我們大陸的是這樣，台灣是這樣，我一直哈哈哈哈…哈哈哈我只是想知道台灣的哈哈哈已經夠了哈哈哈” [“But sometimes I get confused, I only want to know Taiwan’s, but the teacher would sometimes teach us Mainland is this, and Taiwan is that, I always hahaha…hahaha I only want to know Taiwan’s hahaha it is
enough, haha”) (Karen, interview, April 24, 2017). Karen’s narrative demonstrates her struggles to remember two sets of words with similar meanings, and, different from some of the students in the class who saw learning both Taiwan and Mainland China usages as beneficial, Karen considered it to be a source of confusion. To her, it was “enough” only to learn the terms commonly used in Taiwan. This sense of resistance is evident in Karen’s narrative in that she did not recognize the teacher sharing the common usages in Mainland China as beneficial, and this view of may have been formed by her goal of “speaking in the way Taiwanese people would speak.” Karen’s goal of mastering the language usage and accent commonly used in Taiwan seems to lead her to consider some of the knowledge presented by the teacher in the classroom as a constraint rather than an affordance in her language learning.

5.1.3 The Gap Between the Knowledge Constructed in the Mandarin Classroom and Experiences in Daily Life

One of the themes in Karen’s narrative is the gap between what is discussed in the classroom and what she has experienced in her daily life. In the classroom, the teacher would often remind the students to be extra cautious in using certain words or sentence structures when communicating with others in that some language use may be perceived as too informal or impolite. During the interview, Karen discussed that there is a sentence that the teacher considered it impolite but that other parents had used on a mobile phone application where parents from her children’s school use to communicate: “她說有一句話是沒有禮貌，可是我女兒的家長那個line，都寫老師說沒有禮貌的字，可是他們都用” (“There is a sentence she says it is impolite, but on the parents’ Line ((smart phone application)) for my daughter’s class, they were always using the word that the teacher says it is impolite, but they all use it”) (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017). However, when
I asked her which word was used in the texting group, she could not remember it. She continued to say that she wondered if the parents were impolite people: “這個沒有禮貌的人嗎? 哈哈” [“Is this an impolite person? Haha”] (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017).

Karen’s narrative shows a sense of conflict in making sense of the situation, because on the one hand there are certain words that the teacher presented as impolite, and on the other hand the parents she knew often used the impolite words and sentences in their text group. From the narrative, Karen seemed to be negotiating between whether she should not accept the teacher’s constructed belief that the particular words are impolite or decide that the parents are impolite people for using the words. Either way, it is evident that the teacher’s instructions on impolite words and sentences have influenced Karen’s way of seeing the other parents. To put it another way, the teacher’s instructions have ideological implications towards what type of language use is polite and impolite, and it shaped how Karen interpreted and made sense of the social world in which she takes part. From the sociocultural integrative approach, this language ideology constructed in the classroom serve as a symbolic artifact that mediated Karen’s sense-making process on the behavior of the parents who used the impolite language form.

Furthermore, the narrative not only represents Karen’s sense-making process, but the use of the question statement and her laughter express a sense of uncertainty in judging her fellow parents as impolite. Karen’s astonishment is likely created by the contrast between the language ideology established in the classroom and how fellow parents, who Karen expected to behave in a certain way, employ the impolite language usage regularly. Moreover, Karen’s hesitancy in concluding that the other parents are
behaving impolitely could be caused by her prior experiences with the parents in that Karen believed the friendly parents would not be impolite towards others.

Another linguistic feature that the teacher, using the textbook descriptions, introduced in the classroom that does not coincide with Karen’s experiences outside of the classroom is the use of the particle “oh.” As discussed in the previous chapter, the particle “oh” is introduced as a distinctive linguistic feature of Taiwanese people that is common among women and children. While in the classroom this language feature is presented as a common linguistic trait of Taiwanese people, Karen shared that in other social contexts she noticed that the Taiwanese people she knows do not use the particle “oh”: “我有注意過，很多對小朋友很常用，可愛喔，好喔，恩…我認識的台灣人都不會講，女生也是…” [“I have noticed it before, many use it on small children, so cute-oh, alright-oh, mm…the Taiwanese I know do not use it, girls as well…”] (Karen, interview, June 8, 2017). Karen observed that there are people who utilize the particle when interacting with children, but at the same time, the Taiwanese people that she knows, including women, do not apply the particle in their speech. The narrative reveals how Karen compared the linguistic knowledge acquired in the classroom to the linguistic experiences she gathered beyond the classroom. Also, similar to the teacher’s belief that the use of the particle “oh” may risk the speaker being perceived as “pretending to be cute,” Karen said that the female Mandarin tutor she once had did not often incorporate the linguistic feature in her speech: “我剛來的時候，跟老公的家教，請家教，她也是女生，可是她不常用那個字，那個是，太自己覺得自己很那個可愛的感覺哈哈哈” [“When I first came to Taiwan, was with my husband’s tutor, hired a tutor, she is also a
girl, but she does not use that word often, that is, one thinking oneself as cute, hahaha”] (Karen, interview, June 8, 2017).

In the interview, when I asked if she would use the particle in her speech, she responded no by shaking her head, and when I asked if she thought it to be coming across as nauseatingly cute, she nodded. The belief that the teacher and tutor introduced Karen to regarding the socialization of certain ways of speaking seemed to mediate her choice of speech style in that Karen resisted utilizing this linguistic feature in order to construct an identity as someone who does not “pretend to be cute.” Karen’s resistance to using the particle “oh” has led to her appropriation of Mandarin, in that in the interview when I asked her how she signals politeness in Mandarin, she replied, “恩我說聲音的不一樣哈哈” [“The volume for how I speak would be different, haha”] (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017) I continued to ask, “怎麼樣不一樣?你是會說的比較小聲嗎?還是聲音比較高來表現你的禮貌?” [“In what way are they different? Do you mean you would speak in lower volume? Or you would speak in a higher pitch to show your politeness?”] Karen responded, “恩溫柔的” [“Mm, soft”] (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017) and when I asked if that was the Korean way of showing politeness, she confirmed. I then asked Karen if she had learned ways to signal politeness in Mandarin, and she said “嗯我們在學校學的那種 ‘喔’、 ‘阿’或是 ‘請’ 這種” [“Mm, we learned to say those ‘oh,’ ‘ah,’ or ‘please’”] (Karen, interview, May 25, 2017). However, Karen did not choose to use those particular particles to sound polite in Mandarin, she instead incorporated the Korean ways of indicating politeness by using a softer volume. Even though Karen had learned how to signal politeness by using the particle “oh,” she still regarded this linguistic
feature as nauseatingly cute and resisted utilizing it in her speech. This internalization process whereby one “make[s] something one’s own” (Wertsch, 1998, p. 53) demonstrates that Karen is an active agent who engages in the appropriation of symbolic artifacts.

Karen’s story revealed how her identities as the other, non-active participant in social communications, and the involved parent were shaped through social interactions and dialogues with others. It also demonstrates her resistance toward the standard language ideology and her ability to actively transform a language ideology of her own with the goal of assimilation by adopting Taiwanese-Mandarin accent, and how past experience mediated her desire to regain her lost identity as a workingwoman.

5.2 Cindy

Cindy, a Vietnamese woman in her mid-twenties, had lived and learned Mandarin in Taiwan for about a year at the time of the data collection. Unlike other participants, who usually lived in a rented apartment with another roommate or with family, Cindy stayed with a Taiwanese family in a three-generation household during her study in Taiwan. This offered her exposure not only to Mandarin but also to the Taiwanese dialect because the grandparents in the family used the Taiwanese dialect as their primary language for communication.

Cindy’s family owned a seafood trading company in Vietnam, but its business with Mainland China had grown rapidly. Cindy explained the company used to rely on English as its primary language for business, but now the company considered it is necessary to be able to conduct business in Mandarin for the Chinese customers who were older and did not speak English. Cindy explained, “因為我的工作常常跟中國人，
老人，差不多都是五十歲六十，因為做生意的人如果是一個成功的人…他們也不會說英文的，他們應該請一個秘書的，所以我覺得我學中文的時候也算是一種工具的，跟他們溝通比較容易，因為如果他們用中文說話的時候我聽到我就懂他們的意思…翻譯有的時候翻不出來，還是翻不對的，所以你常常說 misunderstand” [“Because my job would often interact with Chinese, older people, all around ages of fifty or sixty, because if it is a person who does successful business…they do not speak English, they would hire a secretary, so I think of learning Mandarin as a tool, easier when communicating with them, because if they speak in Mandarin I would understand what they mean…interpreter sometimes could not interpret, or interpret it wrong, so as you often say misunderstand…”](Cindy, interview, June 7, 2017). Cindy’s narrative shows that the company believed it was best to send Cindy to learn Mandarin in Taiwan with the hope that she would become the interpreter for the company. Cindy explained that she was chosen out of a 500 person staff to learn Mandarins because the family did not trust anyone outside of the family to take on the task. Cindy’s motivation to acquire the target language seemed to reside in the responsibility her family placed on her. From the beginning of the study, Cindy’s learning goal was clear, and her investment in the Mandarin class was high in that she always used the target language to communicate with her classmates.

Cindy’s motivation to learn Mandarin is also shown in how she behaved in the Mandarin classroom in that every day before she walked into the classroom, you could hear her excited voice accompanied with the laughter of the classmates walking down the hall. Furthermore, she did not hesitate to engage with the teacher in Mandarin and she would always enter the room by greeting the teacher loudly, and after the greeting she
would often make small talk with the teacher. Based on her interactions with the teacher and her fellow classmates, one would assume that she had accomplished her goal of language acquisition before she had moved to Taiwan. However, regardless of her significant progress in Mandarin, throughout the course she revealed her concern for her ability to conduct business in Mandarin.

5.2.1 Accomplishing the Assigned Task of Learning Mandarin

Learning Mandarin is an assigned task

As previously discussed, Cindy was sent to Taiwan on behalf of her family’s company with the important task of learning Mandarin in order to assist the company in arranging trade with Chinese businessmen. Being the only person who was assigned to complete a task that would serve as a crucial element of the company’s future business transactions imbued Cindy’s language learning with a sense of great responsibility. Near the middle of the intermediate-2 course, Cindy had studied Mandarin for almost a year, and she reported that her family had come to visit her for a few days. When we talked more about her family’s recent visit, Cindy revealed that she believed the main purpose behind their decision to travel to Taiwan was to examine her Mandarin ability: “所以剛剛他們來台灣我覺得他們要看我的中文怎麼樣，我覺得…” [“So for their recent visit in Taiwan, I think they wanted to see how my Mandarin is going, I think…”] (Cindy, interview, May 2, 2017). Her narrative shows that in her mind, she believed that her friends and family member did not come to Taiwan simply for the enjoyment of a vacation, but that their primary goal and intention was to evaluate her Mandarin skills. This also suggests the power relations among them in that her sister and friends are the evaluators while Cindy is the evaluated. I continued to ask Cindy about the family
members that visited, and she replied: “有一個是我的姐姐，另一個，怎麼說()公司裡面的有最高的是女生，第二個是他，然後我姊姊第三個” ['One of them is my older sister, the other one, how do I describe() in the company the highest positions is a woman, and the second position is him, and my older sister is the third’] (Cindy, interview, May 2, 2017). Providing information about their positions in the company shows that in this particular narrative on their visit, Cindy’s perspective centered on their professional roles in the company. This places Cindy in the role of staff member who the company has invested in to acquire the target language for future business, and that she is reasonably under evaluation by those who hold higher positions in the company.

There exists in Cindy’s narrative a sense of certainty that the purpose of her family and friends’ short trip to Taiwan was to observe her level of proficiency in Mandarin, even though they never explicitly stated that this was their intention. Therefore, I asked her what made her conclude that the real reason behind the visit was to check on her Mandarin learning progress, and she responded: “因為很多國家他們可以去旅行，對不對？因為他們有 VIP APEC 的，他們可以去很多國家不用申請簽證，他們可以去加拿大的，什麼 Australia 的，因為他們是什麼，他們的公司他們是最高的，他們的地位很高，他們有 APEC VIP 的，有很多國家，他們為什麼沒去呢？為什麼來台灣？” ['Because there are many countries that they could travel to, right? Because they have APEC VIP, they could go to many countries without applying VISA, they could go to Canada, or Australia, because they are what, they are the highest in the company, their statuses are high, they have APEC VIP, there are many countries, why didn’t they go? Why come to Taiwan?’] (Cindy, interview, July 5, 2017). Cindy’s
narrative shows her sense-making process regarding the main purpose behind the visit as an “inspection” in that with all the possible places that her sister could easily visit with her APEC business travel card, she selected Taiwan, which seemed illogical to Cindy. Thus, the only explanation was that they were there to examine what Cindy had managed to achieve.

Furthermore, her sister’s insistence on visiting Taiwan, regardless of Cindy’s “warning,” also reinforced her suspicion and led to her belief that her sister’s central motive was to evaluate her Mandarin skills: “對我一直跟他說台灣沒有什麼特別的…他們不管我的話…所以我覺得他們來台灣一半是來玩的，一半是來看我的中文…” [“Yes, I kept telling her that there is nothing special about Taiwan…they ignore what I said…so I think the reason why they came to Taiwan part of it is to have fun, and part of it is to come and check on my Mandarin ability…”] (Cindy, interview, July 5, 2017). Cindy’s narrative reveals the dual purposes of her family and friend’s visit to “have fun” and to “check on” Cindy’s Mandarin proficiency. The two speculated purposes on Cindy’s sister’s visit is revealed through Cindy’s narrative, in that on the one hand, based on Cindy believes that one of her sister’s intents is to travel around Taiwan. On the other hand, from the company’s perspective, the older sister who has a higher position in the company has the responsibility to check an employee’s progress regarding the assigned task.

The identities of an interpreter and a tour guide

As I asked Cindy to elaborate on her experiences during her sister and family friend’s visit, who both hold high positions in the family company, Cindy shared their positive evaluative statements, and she told me about successful events where she used
Mandarin and how these experiences seem to form her desired identity. The family’s positive evaluation regarding Cindy’s Mandarin ability seemed to help mediate her identity as an interpreter. She recounted the dialogue between her and her family from when she and a Taiwanese friend went to pick them up at the airport: “...他們，我在外面等他們，他們剛看我的時候，因為那個時候我有跟一個我姐姐的台灣朋友一起去機場接他們，所以他們一聽我說中文的時候，他們‘哇嗚~你會說中文啦哈哈哈’，我很容易被他們捉弄我，欺負我” [“They, I was waiting outside for them, when they saw me, because at that time I was with my sister’s Taiwanese friend who also went to the airport with me to pick them up, so when they first heard me speaking in Mandarin, they said ‘wow-you can speak Mandarin now, hahaha.’ I am easily teased by them”] (Cindy, interview, June 7, 2017). Cindy’s description of her family’s first reaction demonstrates their amazement at seeing her use Mandarin to communicate with a native speaker, and their evaluation “wow-you can speak Mandarin now, hahaha” functions as an affirmation on what she has achieved in that they considered her someone who had successfully acquired the target language. This dialogue between Cindy and her family members depicted in the narrative mediated the construction of Cindy’s identity as someone who could communicate in Mandarin.

Furthermore, the family visit seems to also influenced how Cindy saw herself in that in the interview she first defined herself as someone who only knew two words of Mandarin before coming to Taiwan, which were 你好 ‘hello’ and 謝謝 ‘thanks,’ and after I complimented her progress for only a year of learning, she said, “哪有啦，還好，可以帶他們出去玩，當翻譯的人” [“No, it’s only alright, can take them to places, be
Cindy described herself as an “interpreter” capable of taking her family to visit places in Taiwan. Her sense of self is suggested through her narrative on the transformation from being a beginner of Mandarin to being capable of filling the role as interpreter for her family. As we continued to discuss the one-week trip that her family took, she shared the experience of being in charge as she took her family to visit various famous places in Taiwan, and her sense of accomplishment is evident:

R: 所以是只有你帶著他們玩之後?台灣朋友沒有一起?
　‘So it was just you who took them to places after? The Taiwanese friend didn’t go together?’
Cindy: 對對對沒有,因為他們來一個禮拜,兩天在台北的,我有姐姐的朋友帶我們一起,可是去高雄沒有,我當導遊的哈哈哈
　‘Yeah, yeah, yeah, no, because they were here for a week, two days in Taipei, my sister’s friend took us around, but she didn’t travel with us to Kaohsiung, I was the tour guide, hahaha’
R: 你當導遊,所以你負責跟台灣人溝通
　‘You were the tour guide, so you are in charge with communicating with Taiwanese?’
Cindy: 對
　‘Yes.’
R: 那你有很高興嗎?他們有稱讚你嗎?
　‘Then were you happy? Did they compliment you?’
Cindy: 真的很高興，因為我用中文減價的?什麼?坐計程車的時候,恩司機說=
　‘Was truly very happy, because I used Mandarin to discount? What? When we were taking Taxi ride, um the driver said=
R: = 阿講價=
　= ‘Ahh bargain’=
Cindy: =對講價對,都成功了哈哈哈,然後還有一個很好笑是我們去高雄的時候,然後坐捷運到那一站,然後從那一站坐公車到什麼佛光山的那邊,然後到公車站他們說什麼公車一定要等半個鐘頭,公車才開的,然後那個時候我們站在那邊有一個老的司機,他來問我們要不要坐計程車,然後我問他多少錢,他說他不是一台,他是一個人一個人多少錢,他說一個人比如說一百塊,然後我就跟他說 “一人七十塊可以嗎?” 然後他說 “不行” 然後我說 “好了,八十塊”, 然後不知道他去哪裡然後他回來說 “好了好了,你們跟我一起去到那邊”, 他把他的車子開下來,然後所以一個人是八十塊,然後五個人是四百塊,可是他很老了,然後我們在車上聊天的,然後聽起來他也很可憐的,然後去那邊我們還是付本來的價錢哈哈哈,也是一個人一百
塊的，因為他也是老人，也是賺錢很辛苦的，所以我們付本來的價錢
= ‘Yes, bargain yes, was successful every time, hahaha, and there was one time
that was very funny, it was when we went to Kaohsiung, and we took the metro
to a stop, then we have to take a bus from that metro stop to get to Fo Guang
mountain, then we arrived at the bus stop, but they said we had to wait at least
for half an hour for the bus, for the bus to leave the bus stop, and there were an
old driver near where we were standing, he came to us and asked if we wanted to
take the taxi ride, then I asked him how much would it cost, he said it is not
charge per car, he charges per person, he said for example a person costs a
hundred, and I asked him “would it be alright to charge seventy for a person?”
He then said “no” and I said “alright, eighty,” and then I didn’t know where he
went and then he came back and said “Fine fine, you come along with me to go
over there,” he drove his car down, so at the end it was eighty per person, and we
had five people so it was four hundred, but he was very old, and we were
chatting in the car, he sounds very pitiful, and when we got there we still paid
him the original price, hahaha, still a hundred for a person, because he was an old
man, and was working very hard to earn money, so we paid in the original price.’
(Cindy, interview, June 7, 2017)

Cindy displayed a sense of achievement when she identified herself as the “tour
guide” for her sister and friends, and this particular positioning occurred only when she
referenced the part of the trip where the group left Taipei for Kaohsiung. Since they were
traveling without the assistance of the Taiwanese friend, Cindy was the only person who
could communicate with the native speakers during their travel and thus her
independence and Mandarin ability was stressed. In addition, the role of “tour guide”
implies Cindy’s relationship to others in that even though they are not in a business
situation, Cindy still was able to display her role as an interpreter who assisted her sister
and friend (both has high positions in the company) while taking them to places in
Taiwan. Also, “tour guide” signifies a strong sense of professionalism that requires not
only a certain level of language ability but also a familiarity with cultural knowledge in
order to travel in a foreign country. When asked how she felt about being the “tour guide”
and “interpreter” for the trip, Cindy shared her experience on using Mandarin to
successfully bargain taxi fee with a driver. This event represents a significant
achievement with Cindy’s Mandarin skills in that she was able to successfully negotiate prices with a native speaker.

Cindy decided to share the event taken place in Kaohsiung as a prelude to discussing the bargaining narrative. This particular event centered on Cindy’s happiness at being a “tour guide” for her family and demonstrates her independence because she accomplished it without the help of her Taiwanese friend. Cindy also demonstrated her ability to travel in Taiwan using Mandarin when she related how they had to transfer from one type of transportation method to another in order to arrive at the location where the bargain event occurred. Cindy continued to say that after they arrived at the bus station, an elderly taxi driver offered to drive them to Fo Guang Mountain, and she focused on the interaction of bargaining. Cindy provided vivid descriptions of her interaction with the taxi driver and provided great detail on what both parties said during the negotiation. Through the reenactment, one can easily identify pattern of negotiation, wherein the interlocutors each named a price for the car fare in a back and forth manner. At the end of the exchange, Cindy expressed that, even though she had succeeded in lowering the price of the taxi fare, she still decided to pay the full price because she was empathetic toward the elderly taxi driver. This shows that, to Cindy, the bargaining was not about the money, but was about a way to demonstrate her ability to use Mandarin in negotiations, which requires a certain level of proficiency.

In narrating the scene this way, focusing on the process of negotiation through the reenactment of what was said, Cindy presented herself as someone who is capable of using the target language to the desired result. The social interaction (the dialogue between Cindy and the Taxi driver) presented in the narrative mediated Cindy’s
construction of her identities as both a successful language learner who is capable of negotiating with a native speaker of Mandarin and a competent interpreter for her family.

Fear of not fulfilling her responsibility

Cindy exhibits a considerably high level of language proficiency based on her stories about the social interactions she had with the native speakers as well as her self-identification as an “interpreter” and “tour guide” for her family and friends in the context of traveling in Taiwan. However, there exists an uncertainty in Cindy’s narrative regarding whether she is equipped with the language she needs to fill the role of the interpreter in the business context for her family’s company. During the interview, Cindy expressed her concern that the teaching material utilized in the class could not be applied to her future work in her company. When I asked if she thought the course would help her prepare for the task of assisting the family business by using Mandarin to communicate with Chinese businessmen, she said, “我覺得不太幫助我，因為在課本裡面的內容對我的後來的()工作()沒有關係…我覺得後來要用的生詞跟現在學的不會用，不會常常用…” [“I feel it does not help me too much, because the content of the textbook is not related to my future job…I feel the vocabulary that I need in the future and what is learned now will not be used, will not be used too often…”] (Cindy, interview, May 2, 2017). This narrative occurred in the early stage of the intermediate-course. Cindy identified a disconnection between the vocabulary taught in the classroom and the possible vocabulary required for business discourse.

During an interview that occurred a month into the course, I decided to follow up on the same question, wondering how her judgment may have changed based on another month of learning Mandarin and encountering different chapters available in the
textbook. She replied with a high degree of certainty that she did not believe the Mandarin covered in the course would be useful for her future job:

R: 那你覺得這門中文課有幫助到你學習到你要的嗎? 我記得你說過你想要學了以後幫助家裡做生意，對不對? 你覺得有幫助到你嗎?
   ‘Do you think this Mandarin course help you learn what you wanted to learn? I remember you said you want to assist your family business, is that correct? Do you think it helps you?’
Cindy: 從開始到現在我覺得沒有幫助到我之後的工作
   ‘Since the beginning till now I feel it will not help me with my job in the future.’
R: 你覺得沒有幫助到你的工作
   You don’t think it helps you with your job?
Cindy: 可是在生活中有，可是在以後的工作我覺得一點都沒有
   ‘But it does in daily life, but for the job in the future I don’t think it will help even slightly.’
R: 你覺得一點都沒有，為什麼? 你可以解釋一下嗎?
   ‘You don’t think it will help even slightly, why? Could you explain?’
Cindy: 因為在課本裡面的內容對我以後的工作沒有關係
   ‘Because the content of the textbook is not related to my future job’
R: 恩恩就那些單字和用語你覺得不會在工作上面可以用到
   ‘Mm, mm, so those terms and phrases you think they will not be applied in your job’
Cindy: 恩恩對應該完全沒有
   ‘Mm, mm, yeah, perhaps completely not.’
R: 那你怎麼會想要繼續學習? 因為你還是繼續好好上課，好好考試，昨天放假你也沒缺課，你怎麼還是好好學習當你發現這跟你要的不一樣?
   ‘Then what makes you want to continue leaning? Because you are still continuing to go to classes, taking exams, yesterday was a holiday but you still didn’t miss the class, why would you still choose to continue to learn if you realized this is different from what you want?’
Cindy: 應該還是有一點，因為如果在公司裡面跟客戶溝通應該不會只是公事，聊天的部分、還是請客
   ‘Should still help a little, because if in the company when communicating with the client the conversation will not only be of business, there are still parts where we chat, or take them out for meals.’
R: 喔你可能要出去social
   ‘Oh so you might have to go out and socialize.’
Cindy: 因為客戶常常來看我們的公司怎麼樣，然後下午晚上請他們吃飯
   ‘Because clients would often come to visit our company, then in the afternoon or evening we would take them out for dinner.’
R: 喔對對可能那時候會要用到，所以你覺得到時候會用到這也是讓你有動力
   ‘Oh, yes, yes, it may be of use when that happens, so you think you may need it for those time and this is what motivates you?’
Cindy: 对对对
    ‘Yes, yes, yes.’

(Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017)

Cindy’s response, “Since the beginning till now I feel it will not help me with my job in the future,” shows that her particular awareness of the gap between the materials taught in the classroom and the language used in a business context had not developed recently, but was the result of her reflections over time. Cindy saw the vocabulary and phrases introduced in the textbooks as language used mainly in daily interactions and would not apply to her future job as an interpreter for the family business. Thus, after a year of studying in the IMLP, she believed she was only equipped with the language for daily Mandarin conversations. However, when asked what motivated her to keep studying in a program that did not cater to her language needs, she replied, “Should still help a little, because if in the company when communicating with the client the conversation will not only be of business, there are still parts where we chat or take them out for meals.”

In this narrative, Cindy spoke about the different kinds of interactions that could lead to different types of conversations in a business context. One type of interaction is the “business” part that would require formal language and the other is the “small talk/chat” part that would entail more casual language. Cindy believed she could apply the Mandarin covered in the class to the socializing part of future business interactions with Chinese businessmen, which could include informal conversation or lunch/dinner entertainment. This is the reason Cindy was still motivated to continue to the same program even though it did not fulfill her need to learn business Mandarin.
One important focus of Cindy’s narrative was on her observation that there are two types of language use: everyday Mandarin and business Mandarin. Her main concern was that what she had learned in the past year would not help fulfill her intended role as an interpreter for the family company due to the lack of exposure to business discourse in Mandarin. In addition, due to this realization, Cindy’s learning goals in the Mandarin Learning Program changed from learning the language she would need for business transactions to acquiring the discourse for social interactions.

Cindy also discusses her unease about the difference between the Mandarin used in Mainland China and in Taiwan, and how those differences could hinder her interpretation performance. Her concerns related to the differences in accent, vocabulary, and Chinese characters. Cindy raised her concern about the differences in accents between the people in Taiwan and Mainland China in the early stages of the intermediate-course. One time, before the class had started, she and the teacher had a short conversation on the issue:

Cindy: 老師，台灣的口音跟中國的口音差很多嗎？
Teacher, do Taiwanese accent and Chinese accent differ a lot?”
T: 嗯，怎麼辦？
‘Mm, yes, what are you going to do?’
Cindy: 怎麼辦?
‘What am I going to do?’
T: 並用一下嗎？哈哈哈對我都沒有影響，對你有影響哈哈哈
‘Combined them? Hahaha, it does not affect me at all, it affects you, hahah.’
Cindy: 沒有啦我在中國跟香港工作
‘No, because I will be working in China and Hong Kong.’
T: 國語都一樣的，如果說標準的國語，台灣跟大陸應該是一樣的
‘Mandarin is all the same, if it is standard Mandarin, it should be the same in Taiwan and in China.’

(Classroom audio-recordings April 4, 2017)
In the excerpt, the degree of difference between the Taiwanese accent and Mainland accents is discussed. Cindy expressed that she is concerned because she will be working mainly in China and Hong Kong where the accent may be of very different compared to Taiwan. The reason behind Cindy’s frustration may be her fear that she will not be able to achieve her goal to be an interpreter for her family’s business.

When asked about her feelings toward the fact that the teacher would often provide two words of the same meaning, one that is commonly used in Taiwan and one that is frequently used in Mainland China, Cindy said “我覺得很好啦，因為我未來的工作也是跟大陸人” [“I think it is very nice, because my future job is to work with people from Mainland China”] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). Unlike Karen who only wanted to learn the usage in Taiwan and considered confusing to learn both, Cindy saw it as beneficial to learn both usages because she would need to have frequent contact with people from Mainland China.

Even though the teacher would often provide the common usages in Mainland China together with the usages in Taiwan, the content of the textbook still centered on Taiwan’s common language use and it used traditional Chinese characters, as did the teacher in the classroom. This led to Cindy’s other two concerns – that she would have issues communicating with people from Mainland China because of different vocabulary and phrases, and that she would be unable to read simplified Chinese because the students were only taught with traditional Chinese characters. Cindy described the possible communication failure she might encounter when interacting with people in Mainland China: “有的時候我搞不清楚，真的，因為在台灣他們說這樣，在大陸他們說哪一個?我怕未來我去大陸我說他們懂，可是他們說我不懂，是這樣
‘Sometimes I’m confused, truly, because in Taiwan they speak this way, and in Mainland which one do they say? I fear that in the future when I go to Mainland they understand what I said, but I don’t understand I said,’” (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). In her response, Cindy expressed the fear that she would be unable to comprehend the Mandarin used in Mainland China since she mainly learned Taiwanese-Mandarin. Cindy also expressed that learning only traditional Chinese while her future job would involve working with people from Mainland China where simplified Chinese is used was a potential issue for her: “對阿這是我的問題，現在的問題，因為我姊姊有一天他給我們一張然後裡面是中國字的，簡體，然後我看不懂，看不出來然後他就也沒有辦法了” [“Yeah, that would be a problem for me, the current problem, because one day my sister sent a piece of paper and it is in Chinese, simplified, and I couldn’t read it, couldn’t discern and she has no other solutions’] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). In this narrative, Cindy provided an example of how only knowing traditional Chinese caused her to be unable to help her sister in translating a document in simplified Chinese. This incident symbolized to Cindy how she had not realized her role as an interpreter in the way that she or her family expected. I then asked her what her solutions were for this issue, and she said “我跟老師說‘怎麼辦’，老師也說‘怎麼辦’哈哈哈，早上發音課的老師也說‘怎麼辦’，然後我說我可以如果是用 email 聯絡的可以翻，然後他說‘這個也不對’，所以我不知道怎麼辦” [“I asked the teacher, ‘what should I do now,’ and the teacher also says, ‘what should we do now,’ then I asked the teacher from the pronunciation class in the morning who also says ‘what should we do now,’ and I said if its communicate through email I could convert , then he said ‘that wouldn’t be right,’ so I do not know what to do…”](Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). From Cindy’s response, it
is clear that she tried to find possible solutions by asking her teachers’ opinions what she
could do, or what they thought about using an online converting program to convert
Traditional to simplified Chinese. But the teachers could not provide her suggestions and
her idea of using the online converting program was dismissed by one of the teachers,
leaving her feeling powerless toward the situation.

5.2.2 Successful Language Learner

The good student

When we were discussing what constituted as a good student in the language
classroom, the characteristics she described coincided with her description of her own
Mandarin learning experiences and strategies. Thus, even though she did not explicitly
say that she considered herself as a good student, her identity as a good language student
was implied in her narratives. Cindy’s narratives show that she was able to utilize the
many resources available in the surrounding environment including the teacher, her
classmates, the Taiwanese’s family she lived with, and the people she encountered on the
street.

Behind her strategy of maximizing opportunities to practice the target language
was her strong belief on the importance of not being afraid of using the second language.
Cindy believed that when one is learning a new language, it is best to practice speaking
the language with people from other countries or with native speakers of the target
language: “恩如果學語言的時候應該跟別得國家的同學還是跟台灣人說話練習比較
好” [“Mm, when learning a language, it is best for one to practice speaking with
classmates from other countries or with Taiwanese people”] (Cindy, interview, May 31,
2017). And when asked what type of student she would consider a good student, she said,
“恩好學生嗎? 我覺得要多用中文話的...不要用自己的語言，因為有些同學他們沒有機會跟台灣人說的，所以在教室裡面跟同學說話比較好...不用不好意思、害羞...”

[“Mm, good student? I think is one who uses Mandarin...not uses one’s own language, because for some students they don’t have the opportunity to talk with Taiwanese, so in the classroom it is better to speak with classmates...no need to feel embarrassed, shy”]

(Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). In her narratives, Cindy considered a good student as someone who would avoid using their own language, and would use Mandarin to communicate with classmates more. This suggests that, in Cindy’s eyes, classmates are important resources for practicing the target language, especially for those who do not have much access to native speakers. This belief also coincides with the teacher’s ideology regarding the role of one’s first language in that she discourages its use during the process of learning a second language.

Interestingly, when Cindy pointed out the reason behind the importance of using Mandarin to communicate with other classmates in the classroom, she said, “Because for some students they don’t have the opportunity to talk with Taiwanese.” She seems to separate herself from the other classmates who she believed had limited opportunities to interact with the native speakers, and separated herself from those who used their native language to communicate in the classroom. As mentioned previously, Cindy was the learner who often engaged in small talk in Mandarin with both her classmates and the teacher. This behavior not only fulfilled one of her suggested requirements for a good student, which as to use only Mandarin in the classroom for communication, but also mediated her identity as a good student. In short, Cindy’s belief in the importance of using Mandarin as much as possible in the classroom mediated her behavior in that she
would optimize opportunities practice the target language, either through conversing with the teacher or with her peers, which in turn led to the formation of her good language learner identity.

In connection with the practice of using only Mandarin in the classroom, Cindy also discussed another characteristic of good students, which was the ability to avoid feeling embarrassed or shy when using Mandarin. This is also closely related to how Cindy described herself when she said she was someone who was not afraid of making mistakes, and that she saw mistakes as opportunities to learn. When asked if she would avoid making mistakes while speaking Mandarin, she said: “有的時候恩，比如說剛開始的時候，我常常在我的頭裡想英文，還是越南話，然後用中文說出來，可是說錯了，真的，恩因為越南話跟英文也不一樣，然後英文跟中文也不一樣，對反過來…所以現在想說什麼就說什麼” [“Sometimes, mm, for example at first, I would often think in English in my head, or Vietnamese, then would use Mandarin to speak, but it turned out wrong, really, mm, because Vietnamese is different from English, and English is different from Mandarin, yeah, its opposite…so now I would say whatever comes into mind”] (Cindy, interview, May 2, 2017). When I asked, “錯了也沒關係？It’s fine to make mistake？” she then responded, “恩錯了也是一種機會，你之後就不會錯了” [“Mm making mistake is also an opportunity, you would not make the same mistake afterwards”] (Cindy, interview, May 2, 2017). In Cindy’s narrative, she disclosed that at the beginning of the course, she would attempt to avoid making mistakes when speaking Mandarin by translating it from English or Vietnamese in her head, but that still resulted in making mistakes. This led her to being to “say whatever comes into mind” and consider mistakes as “opportunities to learn.” Cindy’s emphasis on the importance of
speaking freely in Mandarin without the aid of one’s native language or another language mediated her actions in that she would speak freely in Mandarin without going through the process of translation in her mind, and this behavior helped form her identity as a good language learner.

Other than the importance of using Mandarin to communicate with classmates and the characteristic of confidence, Cindy also considered preparing many questions to ask the teacher as quality of a good student. She argued that the only way for the teacher to know if a student truly understands the content of the class, saying: “應該有很多問題然後問老師，應該是這樣也算是好學生。因為如果你當老師的時候你說什麼學生都說‘好好好’，可是你不知道那位學生懂還是不懂” [“One should have many questions for the teacher, perhaps this would count as being a good student. Because if you were a teacher, the student always responds, “ok, ok, ok,” to whatever you say, but you don’t know if the student understands or not”] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017).

This response reveals Cindy’s belief about a characteristic of good student behavior in the classroom and the excerpt below demonstrates how Cindy raised questions without the teacher’s initiation. It also demonstrates how her identity as a good student was co-constructed with her classmate, Keiko. The following excerpt occurred when the teacher introduced the new vocabulary嘗試 ‘attempt’ to the class, and Cindy immediately asked a question about the similarity between the new vocabulary and one already learned:

Cindy: 上個學期我們學什麼？
‘What we learned from last semester?’
T: 嚐嚐，品嚐
‘Taste, savor’
Cindy: 不是
‘No.’
T: 我怎麼知道，你們上個學期學了很多吧哈哈
‘How would I know, you have learned a lot last semester, haha.’

Cindy: 第三本書後面
‘It’s at the end of the third book.’

T: Taste 吃吃看？那個是第二課
‘Taste to taste and see? That is in lesson two.’

Cindy: 我說的是第三本書最後面
‘What I wanted to say is at the end of the third book.’

T: 哪一課？
‘Which lesson?’

Cindy: 在教室裡面什麼嘗試的
‘In the classroom something about attempt.’

T: 試驗吧？
‘Experiment?’

Cindy: 阿對對試驗,不一樣？
‘Is experiment and attempt the same?’

T: 試驗就是把，試驗就是這樣的東西，怎麼樣()，那個叫試驗
‘Experiment is taking, experiment is this type of thing () that is called experiment’

Keiko: 聰明哈哈哈
‘Smart.’

T: 我覺得她很糊塗哈哈哈
‘I think she is very scatterbrained, hahaha.’

(Cindy, interview, May 17, 2017)

In this excerpt, Cindy interrupted the teacher’s instruction on the vocabulary 嘗試

‘attempt’ by raising a question about something they had learned previously. The

teacher’s response of guessing the vocabulary Cindy was asking about many times before coming up with the correct word demonstrates that Cindy’s behavior was allowed. Also, Cindy’s attempt to compare two words with the same Chinese character 試 ‘try’ indicates her intent to relate what learned before to the newly introduced material. A Japanese student, Keiko, then complimented Cindy’s question, saying it was “smart,” which suggests that other student view Cindy’s behavior positively. Even though in the end, the teacher described Cindy as someone who is “very scatterbrained” because of Cindy’s difficulty in recalling the word she had learned before, her behavior as someone willing to ask questions in the classroom was not diminished, which fits Cindy’s belief on the
characteristic of a good student. Moreover, Keiko’s positive evaluation towards Cindy’s question also serves to shape Cindy’s identity as a good language learner. In sum, the dialogue among Cindy, the teacher, and Keiko represents how Cindy’s identity as a successful language learner was co-constructed in social interactions.

Other than the act of raising questions in the classroom, Cindy mentioned the ability to incorporate newly learned words into one’s speech as another characteristic of a good student. Cindy’s perspective on the characteristics of good students appears to be mediated by an interaction with the teacher that occurred during a three-minute presentation activity, where each student was required to prepare a three-minute speech in the classroom and present it in groups. Cindy incorporated the newly learned vocabulary into her speech and the teacher commented, “他用我們剛剛學的字很好” [“It is very nice she used the vocabulary that we just learned”] (Classroom interaction, May 7, 2017). The teacher’s compliment reveals that she places value on students utilizing recently introduced words into their speeches, and at the same time, this particular social interaction also mediated the construction of Cindy’s identity as a good student in the classroom.

In one of the classes, the teacher said to Cindy that, “你是我的得意門生” [“You are my prized student”] (classroom recordings, April 20, 2017) and in an interview I asked Cindy about her reaction towards the teacher’s compliment. Cindy replied, “很好，很開心可是我覺得如果你是老師，然後你教學生的時候，然後他都聽的懂然後他用對的你的話，你也很開心對不對?” [‘Very nice, very happy, but I think if you are a teacher, when you are teaching the students, and one is able to understand everything you said and use your words correctly, you will be very happy too, right?’] (Cindy, interview,
May 31, 2017). Cindy’s response reveals that she believed the teacher would respond positively when a student could understand and correctly use what the teacher had taught. I asked her to elaborate on this particular belief, and she explained that utilizing new vocabulary immediately after it is introduced is considered the behavior of a good student: “比如你教中文的時候，然後你說的話學生都聽得懂，然後他用對的，比如他說話的時候他說對的，你覺得你教學生很值得…恩恩對這是也讓我在家不用讀書，上課應該是記得出來…阿也是這個我回答了，好學生哈哈哈，好學生如果是剛學的時候，用這個生詞說話的還是念一個句子，我覺得比較好，你也了解這個生詞是甚麼意思，然後你也馬上記住” [“For example, when you are teaching Mandarin, and the student understand all of what you said, then he/she uses it right, for example he/she uses it right, you will think it is worth it to teach the student….mm. yes. this is why I don’t have to study at home, I would be able to memorize it in the class…ah, I also answered the question, good student, hahahaha, a good student would use the new vocabulary to speak or read a sentence when it is just taught, I think this is better, you would understand what it means, and you can memorize it immediately”] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). In this narrative, Cindy made a connection between the teacher’s positive evaluation of her as a “prize student” to the act of incorporating newly learned words into sentences in the classroom. This implies that from Cindy’s perspective, this behavior is what teachers are pleased with.

In the beginning of the narrative, Cindy focused on the positive reaction a student would receive from a teacher when the student can fully comprehend the content of the class as well as successfully implement the new words. Then, she moved on to discussing how the act of incorporating the new words served as an efficient learning strategy for
her, saying, “this is why I don’t have to study at home, I would be able to memorize it in the class.” Finally, she ended by expressing that the behavior of implementing newly taught vocabulary is one of the criteria of a good student. Cindy’s narratives represents her belief, which could have been mediated by her past experience when the teacher complimented her for immediately incorporating new vocabulary into her speech, and by the interaction with the teacher when she complimented Cindy.

The class clown

Often, when the classroom was quiet, such as before the class began when students were settling into their seats, or during the ten-minute break when some students would leave to stretch or sit quietly to read or play on their mobile phones, Cindy would say loudly enough for everyone to hear, “好安静” [“so quiet’]. The other students would laugh in response to her comment, breaking the quietness for a short moment. Cindy enjoyed this type of moment where the atmosphere in the classroom would be lifted by her humorous remarks.

Her intent to make the class laugh could be found in many other situations as well. Her efforts to make jokes to please others would sometime occur during the teacher’s lectures. For instance, there was one time when the class was learning about one of the thirty-six stratagems, “苦肉计 inflict injury on oneself to win the enemy’s trust.” This phrase is used to describe a strategic move when a man pursues a woman, and, at first the class did not understand the teacher’s explanation. However, after the teacher used Cindy as one of the roles in the explanation, the class finally perceived the meaning of the new phrase. Cindy then said, “為什麼用我大家就懂了哈哈哈” [“Why does everyone understand when I was used in the example, hahaha”] (classroom recordings, May 8,
2017) and the entire class laughed with her. Cindy’s laughter after her statement indicates that she was intentionally making a joke about herself with the goal of entertaining others. While Cindy was the one who actively constructed her role of classroom entertainer in the two events discussed, the teacher also reified her role as the class clown:

T: 他在班裡的角色很重要
   ‘His/her role in the class is very important.’
Ss: 他在班裡的角色很重要
   ‘His/her role in the class is very important.’
T: 嗯Cindy哈哈哈，你是我們班上的開心果
   ‘Mm, Cindy hahaha, you are the class clown of our class.’
Cindy: 哈哈哈哈
   ‘Hahahaha.’

(Classroom recordings, May 5, 2017)

The excerpt occurred when the teacher read through a list of new vocabulary and constructed example sentences for each word and the student would then repeat the created sentences after the teacher. When the class encountered the vocabulary 角色 ‘character/role,’ the teacher formed the sentence, “His/her role in the class is very important.” After the students repeated the sentence, the teacher commented, “mm Cindy,” implying the sentence was describing Cindy, and then added, “you are the class clown of our class,” to elaborate that the reason why Cindy had a significant role in the class was because she made everyone laugh. The teacher’s explicit compliment not only serves as an indication of the teacher’s perceptions of Cindy, but it could also have a considerable influence on how the other students viewed Cindy.

This particular dialogue between the teacher and Cindy mediated and co-constructed Cindy’s “class clown” identity. When I asked Cindy about her feelings towards being regarded as, “the class clown,” she replied “很開心阿因為怎麼說，因為我從小的時候就是這樣，我都讓別人，還是別人跟我一起出門一起去玩的時候他們
都開心，我不知道為什麼，是這樣...哈哈哈他們很喜歡欺負我，然後你記得有一天Kendall打我，然後我說‘老師Kendall打我’，然後他說‘為什麼每一個人都欺負你’哈哈哈，因為我不會生氣，真的不會生氣” [“Very happy because how can I say this, because I am like this since little, I always let others, or when I was out with others they would always be very happy, I don’t know why, this is how it is...hahaha they all like to tease me, and you remember one day Kendall hit me, and I said ‘Teacher, Kendall hit me,’ and then she said, ‘Why does everyone always tease you?’ hahaha because I won’t be upset, truly won’t be upset”] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). When I asked if her intention was to lighten the classroom atmosphere, she replied, “對對對我不喜歡無聊得地方，還是安靜得地方，我真的不喜歡，太安靜也容易睡著 [“Yes, yes, yes, I don’t like boring places, or quite places, I truly don’t, too quiet is also easy to fall asleep”] (Cindy, interview, May 31, 2017). Cindy, as an active agent who was able to co-construct a representation of herself as “the class clown,” shows through her narrative with a peer of a similar age, and the dialogue she included in the narrative where she invited the teacher into the situation seemed to create a scene that one would commonly find in a pre-school instead of an adult language classroom. This interaction is mediated by Cindy’s goal to make everyone happy and lift the classroom atmosphere. Also, the dialogue presented in the narrative reveals how Cindy’s goal mediates her behavior and how her dialogue with the teacher co-constructed Cindy’s identity as “the class clown.”

5.3 Keiko

Keiko is a Japanese female in her mid-thirties who had lived in Taiwan for nine months. She was always fascinated by people who could speak more than one language. While still in high school, she chose to attend cram school to expand her English skills
because, as she described, during that time her friend had the opportunity to study abroad in the United States and Keiko started to feel a little envious, “…還有我的同學是美國念書，所以有一點羨慕他… ‘And my friend was studying in the United States, so was a little envious of her/him…’” (Keiko, interview, July 12, 2017). When I asked her to elaborate on the reason behind her feeling of envy, she replied, “會說英文的話，有一點後來感覺哈哈” [“If one is able to speak English, it seems to be quite cool, hahaha…”] (Keiko, interview, July 12, 2017). Keiko’s narrative reveals that she found it admirable to study abroad and her evaluation of English speaking abilities demonstrates that she considered it “cool.” This indicates that Keiko has a positive association attached to the ability to speak a foreign language. It also demonstrates her goal in learning English was to achieve this sense of “coolness.” However, even though Keiko’s admiration of her friend’s ability to speak English motivated her to learn English as well, that motivation did not last because she lacked determination for learning: “…以前的我沒有興趣…想學的心理不夠” [“In the past I had no interest…not enough determination for learning”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017).

Similar to her previous English language experience, Keiko’s motivation to learn Mandarin developed when she was on a business trip to Taiwan two years before when she saw people who were able to code switch between Japanese and Mandarin: “因為兩年以前我在日本工作的時候來台灣拍電視劇，那時候跟台灣人一起合作很好玩，所以那時候我對中文跟台灣很有興趣，所以我，然後我在日本開始學中文，可是學費很貴，還有沒有時間，所以我想住台灣…” [“Because, two years ago, I was working in Japan, I came to Taiwan to shoot television show, during that time working with
Taiwanese was very fun, so it is since then I started to become interested in Mandarin and Taiwan, so I, and I started learning Mandarin in Japan, but the tuition fee is very expensive, and did not have much time, so I wanted to live in Taiwan”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Keiko also discussed her desire to use Mandarin in her job and gain the role of an interpreter for the Japanese entertainment company for which she worked. This goal arose during her experiences collaborating with Taiwanese people: “因為我想用中文做工作，我想用中文工作…我第一次來台灣的時候，跟台灣人一起工作，那時候我覺得我也想要像他們，他們，那個台灣人會說中文跟日文，所以我也想…”  
[“Because I want to work in Mandarin, I want to work in Mandarin…the first time I came to Taiwan, working with Taiwanese people, at that time I felt I wanted to be like them, they, the Taiwanese could speak Mandarin and Japanese, so I wanted that too…”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). Keiko continued to say that before the company’s collaboration with Taiwan three years ago, she had no interest in learning Mandarin, but she admired her Taiwanese colleagues who could communicate with many people because of they could speak both languages: “他們可以溝通，跟很多人，可以聊天…所以我很羨慕他們” [“They are able to communicate with many people, able to chat…so I admire them…”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). From Keiko’s narrative, it is clear that her motivation to learn Mandarin was deeply influenced by her observation of people who could switch between two languages while interacting with others, which, in Keiko’s eyes, broadened their opportunities to have social contact with more people. Keiko’s declaration, “I wanted to be like them,” shows her eagerness not only to obtain the language ability but also to become the people who are able to speak more than one language, in this case the role of interpreter, who she very much admired. In addition,
what seems to set apart Keiko’s English learning experience during her years in University and her current Mandarin learning situation was that she had the clear goal of acquiring the language to become an interpreter, instead of merely wanting to be bilingual.

Before deciding to study abroad in Taiwan, Keiko had studied Mandarin in Japan for a year, but the learning outcome was not as ideal as she expected due to two main reasons. The first was that her learning time in the classroom was limited in that she was only able to attend the class once a week and for one hour each session: “在日本一年，可是在日本的時候一個星期一次，再說一個小時，很少…” [“A year in Japan, but when in Japan once a week, and speaks for an hour, very little…”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). The other reason was the teaching style of the instructor “還有老師是很年輕的人，很年輕的台灣人，好人，可是教法的話不太好” [‘The teacher was very young, a very young Taiwanese, good person, but the teaching was not too good’] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). When asked to elaborate on the “not too good” teaching style of the instructor, she described, “看起來朋友，朋友的感覺，年輕的所以…還有別的說，別的事情說的時候，看起來好像朋友的感覺所以學，教課文的內容慢慢” [“Like a friend, the feeling of a friend, a young teacher so…and talking about other things, when taking about other things, seems to be like a friend so learn, teaches the content of the textbook slowly”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Keiko’s response shows that she considered her past Mandarin learning experience in Japan to be ineffective. This past language learning experience formed her beliefs on the ideal language learning environment as including frequent exposure to the target language and requiring an instructor who would be more aware and focused on the teaching schedule. Keiko’s
determination to immerse herself in a Mandarin-speaking environment is revealed when she shared that she purposefully selected the Mandarin Learning Program because she believed it had fewer Japanese students as compared to other Mandarin institutions. Thus, she was able to create an optimal learning environment for herself where she would be forced to use Mandarin to communicate not only outside of the IMLP, but also among her peers.

5.3.1 The Challenging Journey of Learning Mandarin

The “subpar Mandarin speaker” identity

Different from Keiko’s previous Mandarin learning experience in Japan, where the teacher would use Japanese as the language for instructions, the Mandarin Learning Program adopts a Mandarin-only policy. Thus, during her first interview, Keiko expressed that at the beginning of the program she had great difficulty in understanding the teacher and it was challenging for her to follow the content of the class, especially when grammar rules were discussed: “開始的時候我完全聽不懂老師說的內容哈哈哈。一點點，大部分聽不懂所以哈哈哈。一個月半，兩個月吧，兩個月左右我完全聽不懂，所以老師說的內容聽不懂。可是老師教文法，所以很難哈哈哈，可是越來越聽的懂” [“At first I completely did not understand the content of what the teacher had discussed, hahaha. A little, did not understand the majority hahaha. A month and a half, perhaps two months, for two months I completely did not understand, so did not understand the content of what the teacher had said. But the teacher was teaching grammar, so very difficult, but become more and more able to understand…”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). With the repetitive statement that she was unable to understand the teacher’s instructions, Keiko’s narrative depicts the challenging situation she faced
when she first started at the Mandarin Learning Program. During her first two months of learning, Keiko could not understand the majority of the class content, however, as time passed, she found herself gradually starting to comprehend the information discussed in the class.

Other than the need to become accustomed to the all-Mandarin classroom environment, pronunciation was another area where Keiko believed she required improvement. When I asked how she saw herself, she responded “發音不好的學生，還有說話也不好的學生” [“A student who does not have good pronunciation skills, and a student who does not have good speaking skills as well”] (Keiko, interview, May 24, 2017). This way of viewing herself could have been constructed by her experience both in and outside of the classroom. In the classroom, Keiko would often receive special “one-on-one training” where the teacher would stop the lecture and focus on correcting Keiko’s pronunciation. During this time, the rest of the class would focus their attention and gaze on Keiko, waiting for her to successfully produce the correct pronunciation. In one class activity, the teacher used PowerPoint slides projected onto the white board that consisted of one to two vocabulary words that had been introduced during the previous classes, and the students had to read the vocabulary out loud as the teacher clicked through the slides. The teacher would go through the slides quickly, with the purpose being to test the students’ familiarity with the vocabulary. When the teacher would notice a mispronunciation that stood out from the rest of the group, she would model it to the class without necessarily singling out the student who had mispronounced the word, and then the entire class would repeat after the word after her. However, the teacher would often explicitly call out Keiko for making an error, who sat closest to the teacher’s
podium, and then the teacher would look at her when providing instructions on correct pronunciation. This indicated that Keiko was the only student who needed special assistance with certain vocabulary:

("我跟他提過 I mentioned it to him" on the slide)
Ss: 我跟他提過
‘I mentioned it to him’
T: 提過 ((emphasizing the first word 提 ti2 ))
‘Mentioned’
Ss: 提過 ((emphasizing the first word 提 ti2 ))
‘Mentioned’

("一分錢一分貨 You get what you pay for" on the slide)
Ss: 一分錢一分貨
‘You get what you pay for’
T: 那個Keiko, 一分錢 ((stresses the pronunciation “qian2”))一分貨。二聲是先平然 後在揚，嗯那個二聲是一定要揚，這樣的qian2 qian2
‘Um, Keiko, a penny ((stresses the pronunciation “qian2” for the word “penny”)), a penny’s worth of merchandise. The second tone is flat at first and then rises, mm, must rise for the second tone, like this qian2 qian2.’
Keiko: qian2 qian2
T: 嗯對對對，一聲就是一直要高高的就好了
‘Mm yes, yes, yes, first tone is to just always keep high would be fine.’
(Classroom recordings, April 21, 2017)

The excerpt shows the teacher did not generally provide corrections to a specific student, but instead she would model the vocabulary to the class as a whole, and all of the students would receive the correction and repeat the vocabulary regardless of whether they had pronounced the vocabulary correctly the first time. Interestingly, the second part of the interaction serves as an example that the teacher would choose to correct Keiko directly, which separated her from her classmates, with instructions meant only for her. The difference between the instructions meant for the class as a whole, and the instruction meant for Keiko could be seen when the teacher said Keiko’s name specifically. The teacher’s act of singling out Keiko could serve to construct how Keiko
regards herself.

There were many activities in the classroom that aimed to create opportunities for the students to practice their speaking skills, and the three-minute presentations were one that many students find challenging. For this activity, students typically had five minutes to prepare their before presenting it with a partner as a practice run, and then deliver their short speech to a group of three to four people. When asked whether the presentation activity made her nervous, Keiko said, “一點緊張…恩很長很長，所以還有我的說話跟別人的,說話的能力很低，所以他們很棒，我覺得所以沒有自信，自信沒有了。…” [“A little nervous….mm, very long, very long, so and my speaking compares to others, speaking ability is low, so they are great, I feel so no confidence, the confidence is gone…”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Keiko’s lacked of confidence is revealed in her narrative and it is clear that she considered the three-minute presentation time as exceptionally long, leading to her sense of nervousness. And the activity was one where Keiko could not help but compare herself to others who she thought of as more advanced regarding their speaking skill, which made her feel less confident in herself.

The challenges in pronunciation that Keiko faced also occurred beyond the classroom context. When she interacted with native speakers in various situations, there were many occasions where she encountered communication difficulties due to her Mandarin pronunciations. When the importance of tones in Mandarin was discussed in the interview, Keiko shared an event about how she felt defeated because of her pronunciation performance:

Keiko: 我跟台灣人一起吃飯的時候，那個人完全聽不懂日本人的，完全聽不懂日文，還有他不習慣日本人的中文，我說 “這個很辣”，可是我說 “很la2”，所以他完全聽不懂哈哈
When I was having a meal with a Taiwanese, that person completely does not understand Japanese, completely does not understand Japanese, and he is not used to Japanese Mandarin, I wanted to say “this is very spicy” ((spicy in Mandarin is pronounced “la4” with 4th tone)), but I said “very la2*”((mispronouncing “la4” as “la2”)), so he completely did not understand, hahaha.

R: 哈哈他不知道你在講什麼
   ‘Haha, he did not understand what you were saying.’
Keiko: 哈哈哈 這個東西很辣 為什麼他聽不懂?
   ‘Hahahaha, “this thing is very spicy.” Why couldn’t he understand?’
R: 四聲沒用力
   ‘4th tone was not stressed’
Keiko: 對對這個這麼簡單的字，也聽不懂
   ‘Yes, yes, such a simple word, couldn’t understand.’
   (Keiko, interview, May 24, 2017)

In this narrative, Keiko described the interlocutor as someone who did not know any Japanese and who was not familiar with people who have Japanese accents when speaking Mandarin. This suggests that Keiko was in a situation where Mandarin was the sole language she could use to communicate with this person and that she must use Mandarin so that each tone was correctly spoken in order to maintain a successful communication. Keiko said that when she wanted to express that the food was “spicy” she failed to properly pronounce the 4th tone of “la” and she pronounced the 2nd tone instead. According to Keiko, because of the mispronunciation of one word, the friend could not understand what Keiko was attempting to express. She then described her confusion at that time, saying, “this thing is very spicy.” Why couldn’t he understand?

This sense of confusion seemed to turn to frustration when she said, “such a simple word, couldn’t understand,” conveying that on the one hand she considered the word “spicy” as “simple,” but on the other, she was unable to successfully communicate it in speech.

Other than the miscommunication with her friend due to her struggle over pronouncing the 4th tone adequately, Keiko had also experienced failure of communication for restaurant orders: “我想避免說錯，所以說話以前我看，查我想說
的句子的聲調，像這個拿鐵，看了以後說，可是常常說出來，我想，我想唸紅茶的時候，來的時候別的茶…可是別的茶來，忘記了，發音不一樣的茶來哈哈哈，還有我點五號的套餐的時候，常常來二號的…我的五，這個也不會說，所以五號二號…” [“I wanted to avoid making mistakes, so before I speak I would look at, check the tones for the sentence I wanted to say, for example this latte, look at it first and then speak, but often times when speak, I wanted to, when I wanted to say black tea, a different tea would come…but other tea came, I forgot, a tea with different pronunciation, hahaha, and when I ordered number five meal, often the number two meal came…my five, couldn’t even say this right, so number five and number two…”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Keiko’s narrative reveals that she perceived mistakes as something that should be avoided, and her description of how she would confirm the tones of each word before speaking shows her dedication to avoiding errors. However, Keiko’s frustration toward her pronunciation ability is shown that regardless of her effort to check the tones beforehand, she would still mispronounce the word or the tone, which often resulted in her not receiving what she had attempted to order.

Keiko’s struggles with pronunciation not only occurred while ordering food, but also when interacting with native speakers on the street. Keiko shared that sometimes when she was asking for directions, native speakers on the street would refuse to interact with her when they saw her as a foreigner: “路上的人，很難，恩走路上的話，問路，我說的時候，他他好像有知道我是外國人的話，阿 “不用不用”((搖手)), 這樣的事情也有…” [“People on the street, it is hard, mm, when walking on the street, asking for directions, he, he seems to know that I am a foreigner, ah “no, no” ((waving hands)), things like this happened too…”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Attempting to clarify
what Keiko thought regarding the native speaker’s reasoning behind the refusal to communicate, I asked, “你覺得是你講話聲調的關係? ‘You think it is because of the way you speak, the tones?’” She replied, “聲調的關係” [“Because of the tones”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). It is interesting that Keiko understood the cause for the native speaker’s declination of further communication as a reflection on speaking ability, assuming that it was the source of the problem when there could have been other explanations. This serves as an indication of how Keiko considered her pronunciation a significant area of challenge that has influenced her in different contexts.

Besides the native speaker’s rejection on the street, Keiko also noted that sometimes the clerks in restaurants would speak to her in Japanese when they saw her: “…還有看我的時候，大部分的店員說日文 …” [“And when they saw me, most clerks would use Japanese”] Keiko’s statement shows that clerks in stores would immediately identify her as Japanese. Feeling a bit surprised, I asked, “喔他們會說日文喔? ‘Oh, so they are able speak Japanese?’” Keiko seemed to perceive the clerks’ switching from Mandarin to another language as a sign of her poor Mandarin speaking skills: “一點點，習慣日本人的店的店員說日文或是英文，可是我想說中文，可是中文不好的話，他馬上變日文或英文哈哈哈” [“A little, for the restaurants that are used to Japanese customers would speak in Japanese or English, but I wanted to speak in Mandarin, but if Mandarin is not good, he would switch to Japanese or English immediately, hahaha”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Her response indicates her frustration and disappointment that, even though she wanted to use Mandarin to interact with the store clerks, they would often use Japanese or English to communicate with her. In order to
confirm Keiko’s desire behind her eagerness for others to use Mandarin when interacting with her, I said, “所以你是想要練習的哈哈哈，恩在台北很多店都會說日文吧，尤其永康街那邊” [“So you wanted to practice hahaha, mm, there are lots of stores that are able to speak Japanese, especially near Young-Kang street”]. Then Keiko responded, “對對所以他們看起來我，我，他們以為我是旅行的人哈哈哈” [“Yes, yes, they saw me as, me as, they thought I was a traveler, hahaha”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017).

Keiko’s response separates her from the role of “traveler” and this suggests that as a language learner who had been studying Mandarin for eight months at the time of the interview, she did not wish to be considered as a common “traveler” who could not speak Mandarin. The way the store clerks communicated with her in languages other than Mandarin seemed to indicate that her Mandarin speaking ability still required improvement. The store clerks’ goal to assist the customer in a way that is the most efficient constrained Keiko’s opportunity to practice the target language. Also, the social interactions between Keiko and the store clerks mediated and constructed her identity as a traveler instead of a proficient Mandarin speaker.

The “less than” identity

Unlike the other students who reflected on or discussed their learning experiences in a way that focused mainly on themselves, Keiko seemed to evaluate her language performance in relation to the other students in the classroom. She seemed to self-identify as being a less successful learner as compared to her peers. When I asked, “那你有想改變的地方嗎? Is there anything you would want to change?” Keiko replied, “聲調跟說話的能力哈哈，對對對阿聽力也不夠，因為我常常說，有時候聽不懂老師說的，有時
The skills for tones and speaking, hahaha, yes, yes, yes, and listening skill is lacking as well, because I often say, sometimes could not understand what the teacher said, sometimes could not understand what the teacher said, but Claire and Cindy understand all of it…the sentences that I didn’t know, they often would use, and Satomi’s proficiency level is high too, because she has a Taiwanese boyfriend, hahaha, started learning Mandarin half a year ago, and her job requires using Mandarin as well, very experienced, so yes, yes, yes, their skills are very high…and the sentences that the classmates use, there are ones that I didn’t know….recently Claire said ‘discount’ which I didn’t understand, then Claire said ‘bargain’ I know when it is in English, so there are many incidences like this…so why do I only understand when English is used, but my English proficiency level is low too, hahaha” [“The skills for tones and speaking, hahaha, yes, yes, yes, and listening skill is lacking as well, because I often say, sometimes could not understand what the teacher said, sometimes could not understand what the teacher said, but Claire and Cindy understand all of it…the sentences that I didn’t know, they often would use, and Satomi’s proficiency level is high too, because she has a Taiwanese boyfriend, hahaha, started learning Mandarin half a year ago, and her job requires using Mandarin as well, very experienced, so yes, yes, yes, their skills are very high…and the sentences that the classmates use, there are ones that I didn’t know….recently Claire said ‘discount’ which I didn’t understand, then Claire said ‘bargain’ I know when it is in English, so there are many incidences like this…so why do I only understand when English is used, but my English proficiency level is low too, hahaha”] (Keiko, interview, May 24, 2017).

The dialogue between Keiko and Claire presented in narrative was one where Claire utilized the Mandarin vocabulary 打折 ‘discount’ during a casual conversation, and Keiko was not familiar with the word. The fact that Claire had to translate the Mandarin vocabulary into English for Keiko to understand it seems to mediate Keiko’s identity as a less successful learner compared to her peers. Furthermore, Keiko’s response shows that she was inclined to refer to herself as being less than her classmates based on their
language performances in the classroom. And, even though the interview question was about which part of her classroom experience she would like to change, she quickly digressed from listing the skills she would like to improve to describing those different skills with examples that demonstrated her classmates as being more advanced than she was. In other words, Keiko understood her language ability as being less than her peers because she had trouble understanding the teacher’s instructions when the others could, and because the other students could produce sentences she had not heard of and use vocabulary that she did not know. Keiko’s narrative that compares herself to the other students seems to reveal how these social interactions and dialogues mediated Keiko’s perception of herself in relation to the other students and shaped her “less than others” identity.

5.3.2 The Road to Success

Learning strategies: The “diligent language learner” identity

As the previous narratives show, Keiko was always very vocal about her Mandarin ability in that she believed it required much work, especially her speaking skills, which she described as, “我說的時候想日文，然後說中文，所以我的說的能力很差，還有需要很多時間，我的人應該常用中文想，或是不用想馬上說，可是我的話需要想，然後說，所以，恩” [“When I speak I think in Japanese, then I say in Mandarin, so my speaking ability is very bad, and it takes a lot of time, I should be able to think in Mandarin more often, or didn’t have to think at all and speak right away, but for me I need to think, then speak, so, mm”] (Keiko, interview, May 24, 2017). In order to overcome the pronunciation challenges she faced while learning Mandarin, Keiko found the teacher’s emphasis on pronunciation to be significantly beneficial. Keiko
mentioned that the teacher’s instructional emphasis as well as frequent correction of her pronunciation helped improve her memorization of Mandarin tones in that: “…還有老師常常改變我的腔調，發音，很喜歡這樣子的，我的發，我需要發音的，練習，還有聽寫很多，需要腔調，以前的老師沒有…所以我以前的腔調完全不記得…”

[“And the teacher often corrects my tones, pronunciation, really, really, like this kind of, my pro-, I need pronunciation practice and lots of listen-and-write tests, requires writing down tones, the teacher before does not require this, so I do not remember the tones learned before”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). The teacher’s instructional beliefs on the importance of correct pronunciation provide affordances in guiding Keiko to both identify and overcome her pronunciation challenges. Furthermore, in order to satisfy her need to receive pronunciation correction, Keiko expressed that she would strategically choose to sit in the seat right in front of the podium so that she would be closest to the teacher. Due to this proximity, the teacher more easily noticed Keiko’s pronunciation and she was able to have more opportunity to receive direct correction. From the sociocultural theoretical standpoint, Keiko’s intentional placement of herself changes the relationship between her and the physical environment, and this change may provide new affordances such as receiving more direct correction and more one-on-one instruction from the teacher.

Second, Keiko also regarded her peers in the classroom as important learning resources in that she saw the act of chatting with friends as crucial in her language learning development. She stated that not only did it require one to use Mandarin, but that it could also help one become accustomed to diverse accents: “別的國家的人的中文，特色，有，日本人的中文跟越南人的中文不一樣，這樣的，用中文工作的時候，應
該說很多國家的人” [“The Mandarin spoken by people from other countries, uniqueness, there are, Japanese’s Mandarin is different from Vietnamese’s Mandarin, like this, when using Mandarin in work, should be able to speak people from many countries”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). When asked to elaborate on the description of “different Mandarin,” Keiko said, “發音，發音不一樣，每個國家的特色有，所以恩，別的國家的，聽別的國家的人說中文，很多有用” [“Pronunciations, different pronunciation, each country has its uniqueness, so mm, other countries, listening to people from other countries speak Mandarin, it is very useful…”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). Keiko’s response indicates that she identifies the importance of becoming familiar with the accents of people from other countries because she believes that she is likely to encounter various accents when she works as an interpreter, and she considers interacting with her peers in the classroom as way to gain exposure to other accents that may help her with her job.

Keiko also saw her peers as resources who she could learn new sentence structures from: “還有朋友逼我知道很多中文的句子，所以聊天的時候可以知道新的句子” [“And friends pushes me to know many sentences in Mandarin, so I can know new sentences when chatting with them”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). It is clear from her response that her friends in the classroom played a significant role in her language learning progress. Through interacting with them, she was exposed to different language uses and, if she wanted to continue the conversation, she needed to ask for clarification when she encountered new phrases or words. In one of the interviews she referred to one of her classmates, Cindy, as her “second teacher” and when asked to elaborate on the reason behind this particular title she replied, “因為我發音的課的時候
常常一起練習，那個時候他說一個句子，然後我說一個句子哈哈，還有如果我句子說錯的時候，我說錯的話，他馬上改變我的發音” [“Because in my pronunciation class we would often practice together, she would say a sentence, then I would say a sentence, haha, and if I have said the sentence wrongly, she would correct my pronunciation immediately”] (Keiko, interview, July 5, 2017). This relates to her main reason for selecting the IMLP, which was that she believed there would be fewer learners from Japan so that she could push herself to use Mandarin as the sole language for communication. Keiko’s goal of practicing Mandarin as much as possible led her to adhere to her Mandarin-only policy and to see peers not only as emotional support but also as a significant resource. The social interactions Keiko described mediate her identity as a language learner in relation to her peers.

In addition, Keiko shared that she had been attending language exchange group meetings once a week for a three-hour session. She described the Taiwanese people in the meeting as, “他們日文很好，所以他們好像老師的，不懂的地方問他們” [“Their Japanese is good, so they are like teachers, can ask them anything that I don’t understand”] (Keiko, interview, May 9, 2017). Other than attending the group language exchange meetings, Keiko also met with a Taiwanese woman once a week for a one-on-one language exchange session, and they usually spent three to four hours chatting. To Keiko, it seemed that the language exchange meetings functioned as an opportunity for her to practice speaking outside of the classroom, and the original objective for these types of meetings was to let people have the opportunity to practice the second/foreign language with native speakers. In this case the languages were Japanese and Mandarin, and Keiko suggested that her Taiwanese language partners were all very proficient in
Japanese, thus, she considered them her “teachers” and could ask them questions. These meetings served as an environment, other than the classroom, where she could both practice the target language and ask for clarification on her Mandarin questions.

Keiko’s narrative shows that even though she faced many challenges in the L2 community related to her difficulties with correct pronunciation, she was able to utilize the available resources in the environment and create opportunities to optimize her learning. Recall that Keiko strategically placed herself closer to the podium so that the teacher could easily identify her pronunciation errors. Also, the teacher’s frequent corrections of Keiko’s pronunciation served to form Keiko’s identity as a “subpar speaker of Mandarin,” however, this particular identity did not impede Keiko from learning but instead helped her realize that she needed extra practice and reinforced her goal to perfect her pronunciations. Similarly, although the interactions between Keiko and her peers developed her “less than others” identity, Keiko saw her classmates as a resource who could expose her to sentences and words that she had never heard of and allowed her to become accustomed to diverse accents. Keiko’s narrative also reveals that she considered Cindy as her “second teacher.” This positioning also suggests Keiko’s language learner identity not only existed between her and the teacher, but was also present with classmates who were more proficient in Mandarin and were open to correcting her.

The “interpreter” identity

For Keiko, knowing Mandarin allowed her to increase the scope of her job as well as to meet more people: “工作方面,中文是一個工具,可以說中文的話,我可以的,我可以工作的事,越來越多，還有我對對對,還有生活的話,在生活方面,我可以越來越多的人認識”了 [“In respect of work, Mandarin is a tool, being able to speak
Mandarin, I could, the work I could do, becomes more and more, and I yes, yes, yes, and as for life, in terms of life, I could meet more and more people”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). This narrative reveals that learning Mandarin to Keiko was not simply for the instrumental purpose of broadening her career horizon, but also provided her the skill to fulfill her goal of making new acquaintances. Keiko also shared the ways her Mandarin ability was implemented in her work in that when a Japanese director came to Taiwan, she was able to communicate with two Taiwanese child actors in Mandarin: “…還有現在也，日本導演來，跟他跟台灣人一起拍照，還有那個演員說中文，兩個小孩，他們說中文，所以拍的影片也說中文，所以我現在寫日文…說小孩的內容，所以大部分知道哈哈哈…所以我的中文進步了哈哈哈…” [“And the same as now, Japanese director came, with him taking pictures with Taiwanese people, and the actors speak Mandarin, two children, they speak Mandarin, so Mandarin was said in the film, so I am writing Japanese…writing about the content of the children, so most of the part I know, hahaha…so my Mandarin has progressed, hahaha”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). This particular work experience appeared to function as an affirmation of Keiko’s Mandarin ability in that she was expected to be both an onset interpreter who assisted the communication between the Japanese director and the Taiwanese actors, and a translator who provided the Japanese translations for the recorded footage. Furthermore, Keiko’s identity as an interpreter is evident in the excerpt through her description of her role in the narrative event. Keiko is beginning to reach the outcome that she once admired other people, which was that because of their ability to speak two languages, they could meet new people, and translate Mandarin into Japanese.

When asked if she thought that what was taught in IMLP was useful to her
learning, she said, “有用，因為如果我不會中文我明天不能去上海，這樣的事情第三次，這一年第三次了” [“It is useful, because if I do not know Mandarin I cannot go to Shanghai tomorrow, it is the third time for this type of opportunity, the third time within this year”] (Keiko, interview, July 15, 2017). Keiko’s comments reflect her belief on the value of IMLP in that she connects the positive outcome of more job opportunities directly to her Mandarin skills. And as she utilizes her language skills in her work environment, her identity as an interpreter or translator is formed. When I asked Keiko to reflect on her experience using Mandarin at work, she expressed: “很開心,用中文做工作的時候，一邊工作一邊學中文哈哈哈對對對，所以很開心‘Very enjoyable, when using Mandarin in work, learning Mandarin while working, hahaha, yes, yes, yes, so very happy,’” (Keiko, interview June 14, 2017). Keiko’s working experiences and opportunities due to her Mandarin skill mediated her identity as an interpreter and the narratives seem to reveal the multifaceted nature of identity in that her identity as an interpreter and a language learner appear to exist side by side as she is working.

The desired identity as a “mature woman”

With the goal of understanding how the teacher’s ideology may have influence the language learners’ language use and how they perceive others, I asked Keiko her thoughts about the teacher’s instructions on the use of the particle “oh,” which as the teacher states is a tone that is overly affectionate to the point where people may perceive the speaker as pretending to be cute. Keiko said that she did not feel the speakers were acting cute when she heard her Taiwanese friends use the particle “oh.” Instead, she understood it as “台灣人說話 ‘The ways people in Taiwan speak.’” However, she said she would be cautious with the use of the particle in order to avoid risking others taking
her as someone who does not speak in a way that is suitable for her age: “有的人觉得这很装可爱的人，所以我需要注意，因为我不是年轻人，所以我需要注意，对对对”

[“Some people think this person as pretending to be cute, so I need to be mindful, because I am not a young person, so I need to be aware of it, yes, yes, yes”] (Keiko, interview, June 14, 2017). Keiko’s narrative shows her process of making sense of the usage of the particle “oh,” by combining the teacher’s beliefs with her experiences from the social interactions with her Taiwanese friends. As a symbolic artifact, the teacher’s language ideology on the specific linguistic usage of the particle “oh” mediated Keiko’s ways of using Mandarin. Keiko’s narrative represents the outcome in which Keiko internalized the teacher’s belief that she should be mindful of using the particle “oh” so that she can avoid the possibility of being perceived as someone who pretends to be cute and does not behave in a way that is suitable for her age. Keiko’s conceptualization of Mandarin pragmatics, which the teacher’s ideological belief mediates, led her to understand the meaning behind the use of the particle “oh” in social interactions. However, it is important to note that Keiko did not take the teacher’s beliefs as is, but internalized the knowledge in a way so that when she heard her Taiwanese friends using the particle “oh,” she did not perceive them as acting cute. But, at the same time, she knew that some people would perceive the use of the particle “oh” negatively, thus she knew that she needed to be cautious with this usage because she was no longer a young person. In other words, Keiko internalized the symbolic artifact (the teacher’s linguistic beliefs) to control her mental activity (the way she interpreted her Taiwanese friends who used the particle “oh” or the consequences of using the particle herself) and thus mediated her actions by restraining herself from using this linguistic feature in order to
maintain her identity as someone who acts her age. Taking the aspect of reciprocity between individuals and artifacts, which is one of the important aspects in SCT (Swain et al., 2015), the relationship between Keiko and the cultural knowledge the teacher provided appears to be reciprocal in that when Keiko internalized the cultural knowledge she changed it, and the transformed cultural knowledge then changed her.

5.4 Chapter Discussion

The narratives of the three participants show the dynamic and contingent nature of identities, which are mediated by symbolic artifacts in different contexts, and that these identities also mediate their goals and actions. Karen’s identity as “the other” was constructed through her interactions with taxi drivers whose comments indicated that they thought the way she spoke showed she had not assimilated with the people in Taiwan, or comments from others that positioned her as a person from China or a student of a Chinese teacher based on her Mandarin accent. The frequent positioning from the native speakers in Taiwan as an “outsider” made Karen aware of the different Mandarin accents, and this positioning mediated her goal of learning the accent and common language uses of Taiwanese-Mandarin.

However, it is important to note that Karen was not simply a passive receiver of other’s positioning, but she was also an active agent who constructed her own identity. Even though she was nervous about attending her children’s parent-teacher meeting because she would need to interact with other parents who were native speakers, and she only attended because of the responsibility she felt to ensure that the teacher would take care of her children, she eventually overcame her fear and her involved parent identity is formed. Furthermore, from the SCT perspective, Karen’s resistance to using the particle
“oh” was mediated by the teacher’s belief that the particle “oh” could make the speaker seem like she or he is “acting cute,” as well as Karen’s own observation that her female friend who was a native speaker of Mandarin did not use the particle. Due to this resistance, Karen internalized the use of Mandarin regarding demonstrating politeness in that although she had previously learned that the particle could indicate one’s politeness, she chose not to use it and to instead show politeness by incorporating the Korean way of speaking in a lower volume when using Mandarin.

Cindy’s narrative reveals her multifaceted identities in that in the classroom her identities include “the good student” and “the class clown,” which were co-constructed with her peers and the teacher. Other than the dialogues with the teacher and peers in classroom interactions, Cindy’s clear beliefs on the proper behaviors of a good language learner mediated her behavior in the classroom and that in turn helped shape her identity as a good language learner. In the context beyond the classroom, Cindy demonstrated her Mandarin ability by successfully bargaining with the taxi driver over the fee, which fulfilled her roles as an interpreter and a tour guide for her sister and friends who were also her supervisors in the family company. This particular interaction helped construct Cindy’s desired professional identity as the family company’s interpreter.

Keiko’s conflicted identities are also shown through her narrative that in the classroom she considered herself a less than a successful language learner. However, in the professional context where her Mandarin ability was required, she demonstrated her language skills and created multiple work opportunities as an interpreter that mediated the development of her professional identity. Keiko also showed the fluid nature of one’s identity in that she revealed that while working as a Japanese-Mandarin interpreter she
was also learning Mandarin. Thus, Keiko experienced a constant shifting between her professional identity and her language learner identity.

Common themes emerge among the participants’ narratives. In Karen and Keiko’s narratives, they both discussed the gap between the knowledge presented in the classroom and their life experiences beyond the classroom regarding the use of the particle “oh.” The difference Karen mentioned was that the textbook and the teacher discussed the commonality of the implementation of the particle in daily conversation for Taiwanese people (especially female), however, based on her life experiences, the people that she knew, including a female friend, did not use this linguistic feature in their speech. Thus, she was skeptical of the textbook’s explanation. Regardless of the knowledge presented in the textbook, Karen’s resistance toward the use of the particle was based on her experiences with native speakers outside of the classroom as well as the teacher’s belief that a listener might perceive a speaker as “acting cute” if the speaker were to use the particle.

Keiko also discussed the disconnection between the concept delivered in the classroom and the way she perceived the linguistic feature used outside the classroom. While the teacher characterized the linguistic feature as “nauseating,” Keiko related that when her Taiwanese friends use it in their interactions, it seemed like the natural way of speaking for Taiwanese people. However, it is important to note that even though Keiko did not think her Taiwanese friends were “acting cute” when they used the particle “oh,” Keiko was hesitant to incorporate it into her speech because she did not want to be viewed as someone who failed to behave in an age-appropriate way, which was a reflection of the teacher’s belief.
Based on Karen and Keiko’s narratives, it is evident that the teacher’s beliefs had a significant influence on how they interpreted certain linguistic features in that they were socialized into a certain way of talking. At the same time, the teacher’s concepts also mediated their actions and in turn formed their identities as people who do not “act cute.”

Another major theme in both Cindy and Keiko’s narrative was how the acquisition of Mandarin helped them to achieve their professional identities as “interpreters.” Even though Cindy had yet to use her Mandarin skills in the formal business setting, she was able to take her family and friends on a long trip in Taiwan and successfully bargain with a taxi driver in Mandarin. These events helped to shape her identity as an interpreter for her family. And for Keiko, her Mandarin ability provided her with many opportunities to go on business trips as an interpreter, even though she saw herself as less than a successful language learner in the classroom when compared to her peers. Additionally, her experiences using Mandarin outside of the classroom context provided her with a sense of advancement in the target language that led to the formation of her professional identity.
Chapter 6:

Discussion, Limitations, Implications, and Conclusion

In this chapter, I first revisit the research questions presented in Chapter 2 by summarizing the cultural and historical resources available in the participants’ social environment and providing further discussion on how they function as mediational means that form the identities of the CSL learners through co-constructions with others or active internalization. Then I discuss the limitations of the present study and provide suggestions for future language learner identity research in SLA and implications for language teaching and learners’ desired identity development. Finally, I present the conclusion for the study.

6.1 Research Questions Revisited

The purpose of this study centered on discovering the culturally constructed symbolic artifacts available in the language learners’ social world, and understanding how these artifacts served as mediational means that formed language learners’ identities such as through co-constructions with others in social interactions and active internalization of the cultural resources. The data presented and analyzed in Chapters 4 and 5 answer the following research questions:

1. What are the culturally produced artifacts (dialogue, concepts, belief systems, ideologies, etc.) available in the environment (classroom, workplace, on the street, etc.) and how these can serve as constraints and affordances to learner’s identities construction?

2. How can we understand learner identities as simultaneously formed through the learner’s active internalization of the cultural resources available in the
environment and co-constructed with others through social interactions in the L2 community?

With the analysis of the teacher’s classroom discourse and the language learners’ narratives from the interviews, Chapters 4 and 5 identified several cultural artifacts that potentially serve as symbolic means that construct learners identities, however, not every artifact is used as a mediated tool. Thus, this section aims to discuss the available cultural resources that act as symbolic means and mediated language learners’ identities. The identified symbolic means are the language ideologies developed in the teacher’s classroom instructions and interactions, the social interaction and dialogue with native speakers in various contexts, and learners’ personal history and life experience.

### 6.1.1 Social-Interaction and Dialogue

In the interviews, language learners’ narratives disclose their emotions and reflections on the spontaneous second language interactions they had with native speakers, and the ways in which these social interactions and dialogues function as mediational means that mediate their construction of identity. Karen’s identity as a non-active participant was formed through her interaction with a Taiwanese friend. Karen revealed that during their meeting, the Taiwanese friend often dominated the conversation, which left limited opportunities for Karen to use the target language. This particular interaction served as the mediational means that formed Karen’s identity as a non-participant in the conversation and denied her the identity of an active participant in the conversation. Furthermore, during the two years she lived in Taiwan, Karen adopted an identity as “the other” that she did not desire, which was mediated by her interactions with native speakers in Taiwan who would either ask her if she was from Mainland China
or conclude that her Mandarin teacher came from Mainland China. In addition to the statements that differentiated her from the Mandarin speakers in Taiwan, the different language usages between Taiwan and Mainland China that caused her communication difficulties also reinforced her identity as “the other.” However, Karen also shared how she established a valued identity as a caring parent by overcoming her insecurity about her Mandarin ability and participating in the parent-teacher conference. As Holland et al. (2003) suggested, an individual can acquire “affiliations, disaffiliations, and relations of self-production” (p. 210) through participating in specific activities. Karen’s participation in the parent-teacher conference can be regarded as the symbolic means she utilized to establish her desired identity as an involved parent who cares about her child’s learning at the school. Also, the interaction between Karen and the other parents who invited her to schedule a play date for their children not only reified Karen’s desired identity as an involved parent, but also showed that the parents recognized and accepted Karen.

During the process of learning Mandarin, Cindy co-constructed many identities with the teacher, her classmates, and family members, all of which fed into an identity as a successful language learner. Cindy constructed the identities of tour guide and interpreter through the dialogue between her and the taxi driver. The dialogue in Cindy’s narrative captured how Cindy used Mandarin to negotiate the taxi fee with the taxi driver, and, at the end, she successfully bargained for the taxi fee. This event also represents the ways in which Cindy’s dialogue with the taxi driver mediated and formed her tour guide and interpreter identities. Furthermore, the success story not only demonstrated Cindy’s Mandarin ability, but also represented her ability to fulfill the role of interpreter for her company’s family. Even though Cindy successfully displayed her Mandarin competency
when traveling with her family and friends around Taiwan, there were many occasions where she revealed her concerns over the differences between Chinese-Mandarin and Taiwanese-Mandarin and her ability to communicate with people in Mainland China without issue. Cindy relayed one event where she was unable to interpret a business document that was written in simplified Chinese because she could only read traditional Chinese. Cindy was made even more aware of potential communication issues when she failed the task assigned by her family’s company. Cindy’s concerns and the fact that she could not fulfill the responsibility given by her family appear to have threatened her interpreter identity.

Other than the identities of tour guide and interpreter, Cindy also formed the identity as a successful language learner through her dialogues with the teacher and Keiko in the language classroom. In one incident, after the teacher introduced the new word “嘗試 attempt,” Cindy brought up the word “試驗 experiment” with the purpose of confirming whether it had a similar meaning to the word “attempt,” and Keiko then commented that Cindy was “smart.” This narrative showed that Cindy was an active learner in a classroom where most students chose to listen unless they were called on because she would often initiate conversations with the teacher by inquiring about the class content. It also showed that Cindy was the kind of language learner who was able to associate what she had learned with newly introduced content. Cindy’s successful language learner identity was mediated when the teacher praised her for incorporating the newly learned vocabulary into the three-minute presentation with the compliment, “他用我們剛剛學的字很好” [‘It is very nice she used the vocabulary we just learned.’] The teacher’s compliment also implied her belief that it is desirable for students to implement
f新鲜地学会的单词融入到他们的语言中去。Cindy在教室里担任班宠的角色也是通过与教师的对话性互动形成的。After the students had repeated back to the teacher the example vocabulary “his/her role in the class is very important,” the teacher added “Cindy you are the class clown of our class.” In this way the teacher recognized her as having a significant role in the classroom. The compliments that occurred in these social interactions were the mediational means that formed Cindy’s representation of self and her behavior in the classroom.

Keiko’s identity as a “subpar speaker in Mandarin” was established through her interactions with the teacher, communications with Taiwanese friends, and through dialogue with other native speakers. In the classroom, the teacher would read sentences to the entire class that the students were then expected to repeat. While the teacher did not correct specific students every time she heard a pronunciation mistake, Keiko often received one-on-one corrections in that the teacher would single out Keiko by calling her name, point out her pronunciation mistakes, and then provide instructions while the rest of the class waited quietly. Calling out Keiko’s name before providing the correction suggested that the teacher’s instruction was meant specifically for Keiko only, and that she was the only student in the class who needed extra assistance to achieve the correct pronunciation.

Keiko’s struggles with Mandarin pronunciation could also be identified in her interaction with one of her friends who was a native speaker of Mandarin in that when Keiko tried to communicate that a dish tasted spicy, she had trouble producing the word in its correct tone, and her friend could not understand what she said. This resulted in Keiko feeling a sense of defeat because she failed to express the intended meaning with a
word that she regarded as uncomplicated. Moreover, Keiko’s pronunciation skills affected her interaction with native speakers on the street. She described that due to the way she spoke, native speakers could easily identify her as a foreigner and sometimes refused to assist her when she tried to ask for directions. Also, as Keiko visited stores hoping that the staff would be willing to communicate with her in Mandarin, she found that most store employees would switch to Japanese or English after they heard her speak Mandarin.

The social interactions in the classroom and in other contexts served to influence how Keiko saw herself and mediated her identity as a “subpar speaker of Mandarin.” In addition to the lacking Mandarin speaking abilities, Keiko also expressed a need to increase her Mandarin vocabulary when she realized that she often could not understand the teacher even though the other students seemed to follow the class content without problem. Additionally, her peers were able to produce sentences that she did not know, and they could incorporated vocabulary into their speech that she was not familiar with. Keiko’s narrated an event where she compared herself to a classmates who used the word “bargain” in Mandarin. Keiko did not know the word until her classmate provided an English translation, and this dialogue seemed to contribute to Keiko’s development of her “less than others” identity.

Interestingly, Keiko’s identity as a “subpar Mandarin speaker” that was formed in the classroom and through social interactions with her classmates did not hinder the construction of her identity as an “interpreter” in the work context. The “interpreter” identity was developed through work experiences where she successfully translated recorded videos from Mandarin into Japanese and served as an interpreter for a Japanese
director who collaborated with Taiwanese staff. Furthermore, Keiko’s interpreter identity was also reified through business trips to Shanghai that her company offered her. These opportunities indicate that her company evaluated Keiko’s Mandarin skills positively, and served to mediate Keiko’s desired identity as a bilingual speaker and an interpreter. However, it is important to note that Keiko’s language learner identity was not separate from her professional identity as an interpreter. Keiko’s narrative demonstrated that the two identities existed simultaneously in that she expressed that even as she was using Mandarin at work, she felt she was learning Mandarin at the same time.

6.1.2 Personal History and Life Experiences

Learners’ cultural and historical background also played a significant role during their identity development process. Aside from the goal of adopting the identities of an active participant in conversations and a caring parent, Karen’s motivation for acquiring Mandarin skills was fostered by her prior self-understanding as a working mother. Karen revealed that she cried frequently during the first year she lived in Taiwan because she was no longer a working woman as she had always been back in Korea. Thus, she expressed that the possibility of acquiring a job in Taiwan drove her need to obtain a higher fluency in Mandarin. Karen’s narrated event demonstrated how she experienced a sense of identity-lost, and how the previous self-concept as a working woman mediated her goal to regain the past identity through the acquisition of Mandarin. Karen’s experience of loss of identity during the initial stage of living in the second language community was discussed in many first-person narratives as presented in Pavlenko and Lantolf’s (2000) book.
Keiko’s narratives showed the ontogenesis of her experiences with second language learning that mediated her self-understanding. In the beginning, she wanted to adopt English as her second language because one of her friends was studying in the U.S. and was able to speak English, however, her motivation for learning English did not persist because, as disclosed, her purpose in learning English during that time was unclear to her. While her passion for learning English faded, her keenness to be able to speak another language remained, and, together with her work experiences collaborating with people in Taiwan, ignited her interest in learning Mandarin in order to connect with more people and to become a Japanese-Mandarin interpreter. Before attending the IMLP in Taiwan, Keiko had studied Mandarin using one-on-one tutoring lessons in Japan, and she expressed that the learning outcome was not as good as she had anticipated. She reported that the dynamic between her and the teacher was similar to a friend relationship so they spent most of the class time chatting. Additionally, the teacher was inexperienced and could not provide clear instructions on grammar, and Keiko’s time for language learning was limited in that she could only attend class once a week and then only for an hour. Examining Keiko’s history regarding her language learning experience in Japan and the reasons behind her desire to become a bilingual speaker allowed me to understand her behavior in the IMLP classroom. Furthermore, Keiko’s learning history also shows her primary goal for learning Mandarin was to mediate her desired identity as a “bilingual speaker” who would be able to socialize with people other than Japanese speakers, as well as to become an interpreter for the company she worked for.
6.1.3 Language Ideologies

As presented in Chapter 4, there exist several language ideologies in the language classroom that were constructed through the teacher’s explicit metapragmatic commentaries and metalinguistic discourse or constituted by the discursive interactions between the teacher and the language learners. Even though the teacher constructed many language ideologies that functioned as cultural artifacts, not every cultural artifact was used as a mediational means in the learners’ identity formation process. One of the language ideologies that served as a mediational means in the constructions of learners’ identity was the linguistic feature of the particle “oh.” As previously discussed, the teacher regarded the particle as a distinctive feature of Taiwanese people, and while it was described in the textbook as a common usage in Taiwan, the teacher constructed the ideology that one may risk being viewed negatively as pretending to be cute when incorporating this feature into one’s speech. Another language ideology that influenced learners’ identity development was the standard Mandarin ideology, wherein the teacher established the belief that the Mandarin used in the Beijing region was considered “standard” and “normal,” while Taiwanese-Mandarin was described as “non-standard” and “abnormal.”

Based on the cultural artifacts of the teacher’s belief that the use of the particle “oh” risks the speaker being viewed as pretending to be cute and Karen’s observation that her female Taiwanese tutor seldom used the particle that the textbook ascribed to Taiwanese people, Karen resisted using the particle in order to construct a certain identity, in this case, that of one who does not act cute and behaves in age appropriate ways. One of the functions of this particle is to soften one’s tone when speaking and to signal
politeness. But because Karen was reluctant to incorporate the linguistic feature into her speech so that she could maintain her identity as a particular type of person, she chose to transform the ways in which she showed politeness in Mandarin by integrating it with a Korean way of showing politeness, which is to lower one’s volume and strength when speaking. According to Wertsch’s (1998) discussion on the second meaning of internalization, discussed briefly in Chapter 5, which understands internalization as appropriation, the relationship between an individual and the symbolic tool can “bring something into oneself or to make something one’s own” (p. 53). Through this process of internalization Karen was able to signal politeness and at the same time avoid the possibility of being taken as the person who tries to be cute.

Keiko’s internalization of the symbolic means could be seen in her response to the linguistic ideology regarding the use of the particle “oh.” The language ideology on the linguistic feature presented in the classroom was that one must use it cautiously because of the risk of being negatively perceived as someone who acts childishly. Keiko’s narrative shows that she was being socialized into avoiding this particular way of speaking, however, it is important to point out that she did not copy this particular language ideology directly. Instead, she transformed it into a version of her own in making sense of the social world. While the language ideology mediated Keiko’s formation of her desired identity as someone who does not “pretend to be cute” and influenced her way of speaking in that she avoided using the particle “oh,” she did not believe that her Taiwanese friends who used the particle were acting cute, but instead say their use of the particle as natural. The fact that Keiko viewed herself differently from her friends regarding the ways she perceived the usage of particle “oh,” in that she could not
use the particle but her Taiwanese friends could, represents the active internalization process that “the individual becomes a law unto himself, exercises his private judgment, fights his own battles for truths, shows the virtue of independence…” (Baldwin, 1898, p. 19-20).

Because of events of positioning, Karen’s goal was to adopt an accent similar to the Taiwanese-Mandarin accent in order to avoid being seen as “the other,” regardless of the standard language ideologies developed in the classroom. Thus, even though the dominant language ideology constructed in the IMLP classroom positioned Taiwanese-Mandarin as non-standard and Chinese-Mandarin as standard, Karen resisted the standard and non-standard ideology, and instead chose to see the two accents as “different.” Thus, when faced with the standard language ideology developed in the classroom and the language ideology beyond the classroom context where the Beijing accent was perceived as undesirable, Karen was able appropriate these contrasting language ideologies and formed an ideological thinking of her own to use in interpreting the social world. Karen’s ideology that described the various Mandarin accents as “different” could also be found in her interpretation of the incident where the teacher complimented one of her classmates, who had studied in Mainland China prior to moving to Taiwan, on her pronunciation. Karen did not interpret the situation from the standard/non-standard ideological stance, but instead commented that the teacher perceived the classmate’s way of speaking as more desirable because it was closer to how the teacher spoke because of her experience studying in China. Furthermore, language ideologies formed in the classroom have the potential to influence how one should interpret others based on the kinds of language that are employed in a conversation. Karen shared that there was a
language use that the teacher believed to be impolite and should be used with caution. However, to Karen’s surprised, she found that many parents used the impolite word when text messaging in a group chat, and she revealed that she started to wonder if the parents who used the word were impolite people.

One of the teacher’s language ideologies developed in the classroom was that she viewed the role of one’s L1 as an impediment and suggested that a more effective way of learning a second language was to forget about one’s L1 completely. Similarly, Cindy described her L1 as a source of interference in the Mandarin learning process. Cindy shared that, at first, she would think in her L1 and in English before speaking in Mandarin, but that this strategy resulted in incorrect Mandarin usage, thus she revealed that she decided to “say whatever comes into mind” in Mandarin. The language ideology that considers the L1 as an impediment appears to have mediated the language learner identity of someone who was willing and able to speak freely in the target language without the involvement of another language.

In this section I have presented the mediational means separately and provided examples that describe how the cultural artifacts serve as mediational means that mediated the construction of learners’ identities. However, it is important to point out that the mediational means did not work in isolation during the process of learners’ identity formation. For example, Karen’s identity as a person who did not pretend to be cute was established through both her experiences with native speakers of Mandarin and the language ideology constructed in the classroom.
6.2 Advantages of the Sociocultural Integrative Approach

The sociocultural integrative approach implemented in this study offers the advantage of highlighting the connection between cultural artifacts and individuals (Swain et al., 2015) in understanding language learners’ identity formation process, wherein an individual is considered “a person-acting-with-mediational-means” (Wertsch, 1998). For instance, the reciprocal relationship between the culturally and historically produced artifacts and the individual can be seen in the case of Keiko, whose identity was mediated by the language ideology on the particle “oh,” which the teacher presented as a linguistic feature that may imply that the speaker is someone who pretends to be cute and does not act in an age appropriate way. However, even as Keiko was mediated by the language ideology in that she chose to refrain from using the particle “oh” to avoid being viewed as someone who tried to act cute, she transformed it in that she did not interpret her mature female Taiwanese friends who used this feature as trying to act young and cute. As Swain et al., (2015) suggests, one should not consider how one’s identity is influenced by language ideologies without also considering the bi-directionality between the culture and the individual. Therefore, the sociocultural integrative approach allowed me to see not only the reciprocal relationship between the two but to also examine the developmental process of the two.

Moreover, associated with the previous notion on the connection between the individual and the cultural tool and how the two develop together, the sociocultural integrative approach recognizes the individual not as a passive recipient of the cultural knowledge, but as an active agent who is involved in the identity formation process through the internalization and transformation of the cultural tools. Karen transformed the
standard language ideology developed in the classroom and conceptualized Chinese-Mandarin and Taiwanese-Mandarin not as standard and non-standard, but instead considered them as different. And based on this internalized language ideology, she aimed to adopt Taiwanese-Mandarin in order to avoid being perceived as “the other,” instead of desiring the Chinese-Mandarin that the teacher regarded as standard. Finally, the sociocultural integrative approach focuses on the ontogenesis of an individual in that in order to understand the present behavior of an individual, one must also consider the individual’s history or past experiences (Swain et al., 2015). Keiko’s goal in gaining the desired identity as a bilingual speaker was revealed through her narratives on how she admired her friend in Japan who had studied in the United States and who could speak English.

One of the key findings in this study is that language learners can form their desired identities in one context, while in another context their identities may be contradictory to the desired identities. For example, Keiko’s constructed “subpar language speaker” and “less than others” identities in the language classroom and through interactions with native speakers in stores. However, she also constructed an “interpreter” identity in the context of her job that required her to exhibit expertise in the Mandarin language. While these identities contrast, Keiko’s “subpar language speaker” identity did not hinder her from developing the “interpreter” identity. This finding regarding the situational nature of identity where language learners can negotiate different identities in different contexts based on how they and others see themselves is similar to the case of Rie in Morita’s (2004) study. Rie was able to construct an identity as a competent member in one classroom while having a marginalized identity in another classroom.
Another important finding is that native speakers beyond the classroom context often given the participants’ identities as language learners, and the second language learner identity could be simultaneously present with a contrasting identity. Karen’s identity as a language learner was formed simultaneously with her identity as “the other” through the social interaction with a taxi driver. The driver’s comment that her Mandarin accent was different from people in Taiwan established her identity as “the other,” while in the same interaction, his question regarding whether Karen’s teacher was from Mainland China also assumed Karen’s identity as a language learner. This dialogue between Karen and the taxi driver co-constructed dual identities of “language learner” and “the other” for Karen. Unlike Karen’s dual identities that both suggest a role that has lesser power in relation to the native speakers, Keiko described that when she was working as an interpreter, she was also “learning Mandarin while working.” This shows Keiko’s “language learner” identity existed simultaneously with the contrasting identity of an “interpreter,” which suggests a sense of mastery in the target language. These two examples demonstrate that as a second language learner in the L2 community, the language learner identity seems to be connected to learners’ other identities whether formed by others or by the language learner.

The other key finding is that although Cindy did not think the content of the class catered to her goal of learning business discourse, her learning motivation was not decreased. In the interview, she shared her concern over the gap between the teaching material and her learning needs, which shows that the cultural resources in this case served as a constraint in developing Cindy’s desired identity as an interpreter. Nonetheless, when asked what motivated her to continue the class if the class content did
not suit her needs, Cindy responded that she believed she could also apply the everyday language use that the class centered to a business settings where more casual conversations was required. This response shows that Cindy’s involvement in the classroom was not influenced by the class material that failed to directly meet her purpose, because she negotiated the ways in which it could help her to achieve her goal of becoming an interpreter in business contexts. According to Norton Pierce’s (1995) conceptualization, the distinction between investment and motivation is that the notion of investment understands language learners as fluid and have multiple goals, while the notion of motivation assumes language learners as fixed with unitary goal. Thus, a language learner could have high motivation on adopting the target language, but low investment in the language classroom if the content of the classroom does not cater to one’s needs. Unlike Mai, one of the participants in Norton’s (1997, 2000, 2013) study on immigrant women in Canada, who had a strong motivation to learn the target language, but minimal investment in the ESL classroom because the class activities only focused on the learners’ past experiences and neglected the present circumstances that impeded them from linking their imagined identities, Cindy’s investment in the classroom activity was maintained by her active renegotiation of the connection between the classroom activity and her desired identity.

6.3 Limitations and Implications for Pedagogy and Future Research

6.3.1 Theoretical Limitations

The use of the ethnographic-informed approach has the inherent limitations of the researcher’s bias and may have influenced the conclusions derived from the data. However, as Maxwell (2013) suggested, long-term and complete observation of the
language classroom and multiple interviews with the participants were the methods that I employed to increase the credibility of the study. Furthermore, the researcher reflections written with field notes and interviews represent the act of reflexivity, which shows how my personal beliefs and values came into play during the study. Moreover, the qualitative approach considers researchers as “human instruments” and views it as the primary instrument in research inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lave and Kvale (1995) contended that a researcher’s values and life experiences are significant instruments for understanding the participant’s social world. Lastly, Duff (2014) argued that recent sociocultural traditions consider researcher subjectivity as a valuable aspect of interpretive inquiry that can lead to an invaluable understanding of the participants. Thus, being a person who has her own values, beliefs, history, and life experiences, what I presented is one of the realities seen through my perspective as a native speaker of Mandarin born and raised in Taiwan.

Another limitation is the issue of reactivity, wherein the participants may have changed their behavior because they knew that they were being observed. In response to this problem, I followed Maxwell’s (2013) and Hammersley and Atkinson’s (1995) approach which suggests that my goal for qualitative research should not be to attempt to minimize my influence on the research site, but rather to be aware of how I might influence the participants, and how I could productively use that influence to create a more in-depth understanding of the participants. My identity as a second language speaker of English and a student who had studied abroad in the United States appeared to be the base of the connection between the participants and me in that they often raised questions regarding my learning experience in the States.
The other limitation is that CDA does not emphasize on close analysis as in the approach of conversation analysis (CA) that focuses on the organization of conversations through detailed analysis of language such as turn-taking units, and considers all utterances as action. Through centering on moment-by-moment minute details of a conversation, CA is able to offer an understanding on how individuals utilize linguistic resources to shape the conversational patterns and sequences (Fox, Thompson, Ford & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014) that CDA was unable to show.

6.3.2 Practical Limitations

The participants were from East and Southeast Asian countries (Japan, Korea, and Vietnam) that are influenced by Confucian philosophical views. Thus, how the identified cultural resources may have impacted the identity development of language learners from western cultures is not explored in this paper. Furthermore, only one interview was conducted with the teacher, which prevented me from gaining a more in-depth understanding of the teacher’s perspective. Moreover, the teacher participant was assigned by the IMLP and the study only observed the class of one teacher participant, thus the ideologies uncovered in the study could not represent the common values and beliefs promoted by the teachers of the IMLP as a whole. Finally, the research site did not permit video recordings, thus, the semiotic resources such as gesture that is considered as significant regarding its relation with speech during one’s thinking for speaking process (Lantolf, 2010) within the SCT domain could not be included in the analysis.

6.3.3 Implications on Pedagogy and Future Research

Previous identity-focused SLA studies discussed the relationship between the language learner and the larger social world by analyzing the roles that social interactions
and language play during the process of one’s identity formation. While the current study acknowledges the importance of those elements, it highlights the cultural and historical aspects of an individual’s identity and focuses on examining the cultural artifacts in the social environment and how they function as mediational means that mediate language learner identity. Based on the findings of the study, I provide two suggestions for L2 pedagogy.

The first suggestion is for teachers to recognize L2 learners’ language needs and their desired identities, and to develop classroom activities that address L2 learners’ communicative needs and which serve to develop their communicative competence in specific areas, such as business. As the findings show, culturally constructed artifacts have the potential to become the mediational tool that shape learners’ identities. Thus, if the classroom activities are designed to serve the L2 learners’ linguistic goals, they may act as the mediational means that help learners establish their desired identities. The second suggestion is for language teachers to be aware of the language ideologies constructed in the classroom and to allow room for negotiation of other possible linguistic ideologies that are present in the larger social world. Discussions of language ideologies associated with culture, accent, and grammatical structures in the language classroom could offer learners with other ways to interpret the social environment. The last suggestion would be for teachers to develop language learners’ critical language awareness (Fairclough, 2013b), which is to recognize the importance of the relationship between language and power, through language instructions in the classroom. By fostering language learners’ critical language awareness they are able to recognize how certain language practices serve to maintain particular power relations, and through the
process of discussing the social aspect of language, alternative culturally constructed conceptions may be revealed and language learners could use those conceptions to organize how they navigate the larger sociocultural world.

Language learners’ social interactions with native speakers other than the teacher were described in the interviews for this study, and the narratives revealed that their L2 identities were not only formed in the language classroom but the L2 learner identities were also developed in various contexts outside of the language classroom. Thus, one avenue for future research could look into how language learners’ “L2 learner identity” is formed in various contexts, and how those contexts serve to afford or constrain learners’ development of their desired identities. Another avenue for future research would be to investigate the Mandarin language learning experiences of participants from eastern and western cultures in order to compare how the identities and learning experiences of participants from non-Confucius cultural backgrounds are mediated by the cultural resources provided in a Mandarin speaking community. Finally, in the present study, the teacher’s ideology viewed traditional Chinese characters as more desirable than simplified characters. Further research could investigate the language ideologies constructed in Mandarin classrooms in Mainland China and other places where traditional Chinese characters are used and taught, and would examine how these language ideologies differ and mediate language learners’ behaviors and beliefs.

6.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to fill in the gap in the CSL field that lacked research from the social perspective, to investigate the bi-directionality between the language learners and the cultural world, and to identify the language learners’ critical
reflexivity toward the constructed language ideologies during their identities development process. This study, therefore, identifies the available cultural artifacts in the CSL language learners’ social world which consists of the Mandarin language classroom and other contexts described in the narratives, and examines the ways in which these cultural tools function as meditational means that form the participants’ identities. The cultural artifacts discovered in the study were the language ideologies developed in the teacher’s discursive practices in the classroom, the dialogue and social interactions with native speakers in contexts beyond the classroom, and the participants’ past history and life experiences. In addition, the study finds that, as Swain et al. (2015) suggests, although there are many historically and culturally constructed symbolic artifacts present in the language learners’ social environment, not every artifact acts as a meditational tool in the formation process of language learners’ identities. Furthermore, when symbolic tools are used as mediating means during identity construction, the language learners are not passive users that simply copy the mediating tools directly but are active agents who transform and change the mediational means through active internalization and create a rule of their own. Moreover, the study discovers that the language learners’ “L2 learner identity” is not limited to the language classroom but can be positioned by native speakers in various contexts or formed by the learners themselves, and can be present with a contrasting identity.
# Appendix: Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>Overlapped talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Latched talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Prolonged sound or syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Short, untimed pauses of one tenth of a second or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Undecipherable or doubtful hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(())</td>
<td>Additional observation: gestures, eye gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
<td>At the beginning of a stretch of talk, identifies the speaker; T is for teacher, Ss for students, R is for researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Incorrect pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ ”</td>
<td>Demonstrations on (in)correct language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Marks stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ ’</td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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