



VIETNAMESE FEMALE SPOUSES' LANGUAGE USE PATTERNS IN SELF INITIATED ADMONISHMENT SEQUENCES IN BILINGUAL TAIWANESE FAMILIES*

Li-Fen WANG¹

Abstract: This paper aims to identify how Taiwanese and Mandarin (the two dominant languages in Taiwan) are used as interactional resources by Vietnamese female spouses in bilingual Taiwanese families. Three Vietnamese-Taiwanese transnational families (a total of seventeen people) participated in the research, and mealtime talks among the Vietnamese wives and their Taiwanese family members were audio-/video-recorded. Conversation analysis (CA) was adopted to analyse the seven hours of data collected. It was found that the Vietnamese participants orient to Taiwanese and Mandarin as salient resources in admonishment sequences. Specifically, it was identified that the two languages serve as contextualisation cues and framing devices in the Vietnamese participants' self-initiated admonishment sequences.

Keywords: Conversation analysis, cross-border marriage, intercultural communication

Özet: Bu çalışma, Tayvanca ve Çince'nin (Tayvan'daki yaygın iki dil) iki dil konuşan Tayvanlı ailelerdeki Vietnamlı kadın eşler tarafından etkileşimsel kaynak olarak nasıl kullanıldığını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Üç Vietnamlı-Tayvanlı aile araştırmaya katılmıştır (toplamda on yedi kişi), ve Vietnamlı kadınlar ve onların Tayvanlı aile üyeleri arasındaki yemek zamanı konuşmaları sesli ve görüntülü olarak kaydedilmiştir. Toplanan yedi saatlik veriyi analiz etmek için konuşma çözümlemesi kullanılmıştır. Vietnamlı katılımcıların uyarı dizilerinde Tayvanca ve Çince'yi göze çarpan kaynaklar olarak kullandıkları görülmektedir. Vietnamlı katılımcıların kendilerinin başlattıkları uyarı dizilerinde bu iki dilin bağlamsal işaretler ve çerçeve araçları işlevlerini gördükleri gösterilmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Konuşma çözümlemesi, sınır ötesi evlilik, kültürlerarası iletişim

1. Introduction

The so-called 'foreign-brides' phenomenon in Taiwan refers to a gradual increase of foreign female spouses from Southeast Asian countries. According to a number of researchers (e.g. Tien & Wang, 2006; Wang, 2001; Wang & Chang, 2003), a marriage between a Taiwanese man and a Vietnamese girl usually involves professional marriage brokers. The marriage industry between Taiwan and Vietnam has become well-organised and standardised, and the markets in both countries are profitable and competitive. Hsia (2000, p. 46) labels such Taiwanese-Vietnamese transnational marriages as "commodified marriages" as they are "by-product of capitalist development". Indeed, this perspective has become influential in Taiwanese academia. Other researchers (e.g. Tien & Wang, 2006; Wang, 2001; Wang & Chang, 2003), however, examine both Taiwanese and Vietnamese societies to identify key factors resulting in such marriages and look into cross-border marriages from social and cultural perspectives.

While so many studies have tapped into crucial issues facilitating an understanding of this particular social group, none of them deals with naturally occurring face-to-face interaction between Vietnamese female spouses and their Taiwanese family members (such as their

* This paper is based on the writer's 2012 unpublished PhD thesis titled "The Interactional Achievement of Familyhood in Vietnamese-Taiwanese International Families".

¹ Dr., Department of Foreign Languages, National Chiayi University, Taiwan, lifen.wang@mail.ncyu.edu.tw

husbands, children, in-laws and other extended family members). There are therefore some unanswered questions pertaining to the Vietnamese-Taiwanese transnational familial interaction. For example, it is uncertain how a Vietnamese female spouse, who arrived in Taiwan with limited proficiency in Mandarin, makes her way in a transnational family. It is worth mentioning that, due to the commodified nature of the marriage, most Vietnamese females receive only months (if not weeks) of intensive Mandarin instruction in Vietnam and have no exposure to the other dominant language, Taiwanese, when they arrive in Taiwan. Since Taiwanese society is multi-lingual with both Taiwanese and Mandarin as dominant languages, the Vietnamese spouses may have to acquire both languages in order to communicate with people around them. Their deployment of the two linguistic codes as interactional resources in talk-in-interaction is therefore worth investigation.

In view of the research gap existing in the studies of Vietnamese female spouses in Taiwan and the indigenous attributes of Taiwanese-Vietnamese transnational marriages, this paper will focus on the face-to-face talk-in-interaction in Taiwanese families with a Vietnamese female spouse. Specifically, it is meant to uncover the relevance and consequentiality of the Vietnamese participants' orientation to both Taiwanese and Mandarin in a spate of conversation.

2. Theoretical Framework

In intercultural communication studies, identity has been a prevailing topic and has traditionally been regarded as given and fixed. However, the essentialist assumption that people from certain cultures have certain identities has been widely challenged. For example, Bhabha (1994) addresses the processes of 'cultural hybridisation' and Hall (1997) also elaborates on ethnic diaspora in a constantly changing era of globalisation. All these contentions in intercultural communication point out that no cultural grouping exists in isolation nowadays, "culture" is fluid and changes constantly, and so for identity and its purported accompanying notion of language use. Therefore, scholars (such as Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Koole & Thije, 2001; Mori, 2003; Zhu, 2010) of intercultural communication have now developed their approaches and arguments based on empirical evidence rather than treating identity or language use as a given which is reflected by group members' static and internally similar behaviours. In the empirical vein of intercultural communication studies, one of the prominent approaches is to use an ethnomethodological-conversational analytic (EM/CA) perspective to chart identity and language use.

The term CA in this paper refers to conversation analysis, which emerged in the late 1960s and was developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson in the 1970s. It is deeply influenced by phenomenological traditions as well as Goffman's and Garfinkel's arguments about social interaction. CA reflects Goffman's position that there exists an 'interaction order' consisting of the normative organisation of practices and processes in interaction. From Garfinkel, on the other hand, CA adopts his notion that participants' production of action and their recognition of the interlocutor's prior action are the resources they use to achieve mutual intelligibility. In this sense, participants' practices of action production and recognition can therefore be treated as their own methods to manage the interaction in which they are involved. Specifically, he proposes that social order is not performed through socially conditioned rules; rather, it resides in participants' endemic interactional practices (1967). From phenomenology, CA takes the concept that common sense knowledge and its usage is not a fixed or static entity, instead, they are dynamic and open to revision in that people's understandings, of the physical and social world, are continuously updated and renewed. Therefore, Schutz (cited in Goodwin & Heritage, 1990) argues that there is no guarantee that

social actors can always achieve mutual understandings which are in fact the outcome of participants' active engagement in interactive processes. The fundamental aim of CA is to explicate the participants' methodic processes in which their action production and recognition in talk-in-interaction are established.

2. 1. The EM/CA approach to bilingual conversations

While naturally occurring talk-in-interaction has always been the focus of CA analysts, their discussion started from and was confined to monolingual conversations initially. From an EM//CA perspective, bilingual conversations or the practice of using two linguistic codes in one spate of talk should be meaningful to the interlocutors in the course of achieving mutual understanding. In particular, linguists grounding on the EM/CA root treat code-switching, the prominent behaviour in bilingual conversations, as a contextualisation cue. According to Gumperz (1982), a conversation requires participants to provide one another not only with well-formed propositions for communication, but also with a context where the propositions can be embedded and interpreted. A context, therefore, is created and maintained by participants' utterances. Contextualisation (Gumperz cited in Li, 2002) can thus be seen as participants' joint efforts to create and maintain a relevant context, and a communicative strategy when speakers vary their communicative behaviour within a socially agreed matrix of conventions. Meanwhile, it prompts participants to attend to the social and situational context in the course of the ongoing interaction. Contextualization cues can be the linguistic resources (such as register, style, and prosodic, phonological, morphological and syntactic elements) and the non-linguistic resources (such as gestural, kinesic, and proxemic elements) that participants employ in interaction. They prompt participants by establishing a contrast to first indicate something new is going to come and then to suggest plausible inferences as to what this might be in the given context (*ibid.*).

The linguistic concept of 'contextualisation cue' proposed by Gumperz (1982) and the sociological concepts of 'frame'ⁱ and 'footing'ⁱⁱ proposed by Goffman (1974, 1981) have a significant convergence in that orientations to certain language choices for certain social activities can be regarded as participants' linguistic cues to negotiate frames and footings. This reifies a dynamic view of interactional context (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Extract 1 below is a simple illustration of frame shifting is done through bilingual children's use of code-switching. It shows in Line 6 that Noemí's commands issued in Spanish can be seen as a frame of house play that includes Vincent. Vincent, on the other hand, aligns with Noemí's house play frame by producing *okay* in Line 7. Additionally, by accommodating Noemí's language choice (Spanish) in line 10 and announcing that he is going to make food—an activity consistent with the house play frame, Vincent is seen to shift away from the frame he formerly had with Timothy (lines 1-2).

Extract 1

(linguistic codes—Plain: English, *Italics: Spanish*)

Children: Noemí, Timothy, Vincent, Rosario

Both Noemí and Rosario are leaving playhouse in yard while Timothy and Vincent arrive.

1 Vincent: Remember? See? See? ((Boys are walking into playhouse))

2 Timothy: Yeah the (prize).

3 Vincent: (You can't come in) ((waves flower in Timothy's face))

4 ((Timothy waves his flowers and also makes a crying sound))

5 ((Noemí comes by with her bike))

6 Noemí: *Vincent sí me cuidas la casa okay? Que nada me robé okay?*

Vincent yes you'll take care of my house okay? That nobody will steal anything okay?

7 Vincent: okay.

8 Noemí: *Porque estás la casita?*

Because this is the house okay?

9 Vincent: (Yeah)

10 *Te vamos hacer co:,mi:,da.* ((with loud volume and staccato))

We're going to make you food.

(Kyratzis *et al.*, 2009, p. 274-275)

The extract illustrates that the notion of contextualisation cues offers an analytic window allowing researchers to examine the relationship between participants' orientations to contexts and language use. In other words, the practice of code-switching, for example, does not necessarily reflect a pre-existing social structure or the value that a language variety carries in a community, neither are these factors ignored or discarded *a priori*, rather, they await participants to effect their potential relevance during the ongoing interaction. By conversationalists' orientation to the relevance of the factors, as Gafaranga (2005) argues, social structure (such as group membership and ethnic identities) is constituted, contested and rejected/accepted through conversational structure (such as language alternation and other language-related activities), and both structures coexist in a reciprocal way. Additionally, analysts (e.g. Auer, 1984; Gafaranga, 2005; Li, 1994) adopting a CA perspective treat language choice as an interactional issue in that participants' language choice in a sequential context may be influenced by a speaker's choice in the preceding turn(s) and exerts the same influence on a speaker's choice in the following turn(s). Therefore, language choice is not predictable but is a joint accomplishment of all the parties in the interaction.

2. 1. 1. Auer's model of language alternation

Borrowing Goffman's notion of frame, Auer (1984) argues that since participants continuously produce frames and create new frames for subsequent activities, the sequential contexts also change accordingly with the development of every turn and each utterance. He (*ibid.*) assumes that participants in a bilingual conversation tend to have a 'preference for same-language talk' used as the norm to interpret the negotiation of language choice between parties. With this preference, bilingual participants have to negotiate the language they use whenever a turn or turn constructional unit (TCU) has occurred. Whichever language they choose, the preferred choice should be that participants use the same one. Since the occurrence of language alternation counters the preference for same-language talk, it should be regarded as dispreferred or a deviance from this preference. If participants, however, require the introduction of a second language, then this practice must be essential for both participants to manage the ongoing interaction.

Moreover, Auer (1984, 1988, 1995) employs the term 'language alternation' or 'code alternation' to indicate the superordinate term for code-switching and transfer. He (1984) mentions that transfer does not lead participants to give up the current language-of-interaction, and it usually refers to the language alternation which speakers temporarily use a second language for lexical items. Code-switching differs from transfer in that the former introduces a new language which will be adopted by participants for the ensuing talk until another signal of language choice negotiation is oriented to. In addition to transfer and code-switching, he (*ibid.*) suggests that language alternation can be further divided into discourse-related and participant-related. Instances of language alternation categorised as discourse-related, deal with tasks such as participants' management of turn-taking, topical cohesion,

repair, etc., and contribute to the overall organization of the ongoing interaction. Participant-related language alternation, on the other hand, denote participants' language alternation practices after assessing the speakers' preference for and competence in one language or another, which involves the accommodation of one another's linguistic competence and language choice preference as well as the task of language-of-interaction negotiation. Auer's analysis apparatus is therefore based on the discourse-related/participant-related pair along with the transfer/code-switching pair to form a quadrant that covers all instances of language alternation.

Having discussed the theoretic framework, the following section starts with participants' demographic information and their language use patterns at home. It then explains how participants were recruited, how the researcher attended to ethical issues and the context of the recording data.

3. Participants and Data Collection

3. 1. Participants

The study has managed to include three Vietnamese-Taiwanese transnational families, with a total of seventeen participants involved—five Vietnamese and twelve Taiwanese. In general, Vietnamese female spouses in this paper are different in terms of their age, education and the age when they got married and started a new life in Taiwan. First, their ages range from twenty-four to thirty-four and their duration of residence in Taiwan also varies from twelve years (the longest) to five years (the shortest). When they were in Vietnam, one received formal education barely up to the second grade in elementary school whereas one of them went to senior high school.

In the following, background information about each family is presented in a table in which each member's age, educational level, profession and his/her relation to a Vietnamese female spouse are marked. In particular, for a Vietnamese female spouse (placed as the first member in each table), the duration of her residency in Taiwan is also specified. It is, however, worth mentioning that the tables merely serve the function of providing the reader as well as the researcher with a point of reference. Since CA does not treat demographic or social variables, such as age, education, profession or first language as predetermined factors influencing the data analysis, all categories in the tables are not assumed to be relevant unless the participants have themselves demonstrated the relevance in the data.

Table 3.1.
Profile of Family 1

Name	Relation to the Vietnamese Female Spouse	Age	Education	Profession	Duration of residence
S	X	34	Senior high school	Domestic keeper and part-time Chinese-Vietnamese interpreter	12 years
G	Mother-in-law	76	Elementary school	Domestic keeper	X
J	Son	10	Elementary school	Elementary school student	X
F	Daughter	7	Kindergarten	Kindergarten student	X

Table 3.2.
Profile of Family 2

Name	Relation to the Vietnamese Female Spouse	Age	Education	Profession	Duration of residence
JY	X	29	Elementary school (2nd grade)	Factory employee	10 years
Z	Sister	26	Elementary school (2nd grade)	Factory employee	2 years
JYH	Husband	49	Junior high school	Driver	X
ZH	Sister's Husband	36	Vocational school	Manufacturing worker	X
JS	Son	9	Elementary school	Elementary school student	X
JZ	Son	8	Elementary school	Elementary school student	X
YH	Niece	1	N/A	N/A	X
G	Mother		N/A	N/A	X

Table 3.3.
Profile of Family 3

Name	Relation to the Vietnamese Female Spouse	Age	Education	Profession	Duration of residence
H	X	24	Elementary school (5th grade)	Part-time employee in catering service	5 years
HH	Husband	41	Vocational school	Driver	X
YJ	Daughter	5	Kindergarten	Kindergarten student	X
YX	Son	2	N/A	N/A	X
G	Father-in-law	69	Elementary school	Retired driver	X

The participants' linguistic backgrounds have generational differences in terms of their use of Taiwanese and Mandarin. For the Vietnamese participants' parents-in-law, they understand Mandarin and use Taiwanese predominantly in daily life. For the Vietnamese participants' husbands, they have Taiwanese as their first language and display a stable preference for Taiwanese in different episodes. They are also capable of listening, speaking, reading and writing in Mandarin. For the Vietnamese participants' themselves, they have Vietnamese as their first language, and have Mandarin and Taiwanese as the second and the third languages. They are fluent speakers of both Taiwanese and Mandarin, and can switch between the two languages when talking to their spouses and children, but they seldom use Mandarin when conversing with their parents-in-law. For the youngest generation in these families, children

are early bilinguals yet have an increased exposure to Mandarin after having received formal education from being seven years old.

It is however worth mentioning that since this study investigates how Vietnamese female spouses use Taiwanese and Mandarin as interactional resources from an EM/CA perspective, their linguistic proficiency in either of the language is not the main analytic concern. The main focus will be placed on the interactional relevance and consequences of the Vietnamese participants' engagement in language-related activities. If linguistic proficiency becomes the interactional issue and has influences on the immediate talk-in-interaction, the researcher as well as the reader should be able to notice its 'demonstrable relevance' from participants' sequential organisation. In other words, the Vietnamese participants' proficiency in Taiwanese or Mandarin can be a potential factor in data interpretation, yet it is not considered as an *a priori* variable unless it is made relevant by the interactional parties.

3. 2. Data Collection

Before the researcher started looking for participants, she made a three-part document (see Appendix 1A, 1B and 1C) consisting of a letter of consent, a short introduction to the study, and a form listing fourteen questions about each participant's personal background. The document was deliberately created in two versions as the letter of consent for participants under age eighteen and over eighteen are different. For participants under eighteen, their custodians had to sign for them if the family agreed to participate in the research project. Other than this difference, the two versions have the same content in other areas. Moreover, the document was translated from Chinese into Vietnamese. The participants were recruited in three ways. First, the researcher tried to contact potential participants was through Department of Social Affairs in Tainan City. City government staff introduced the researcher to a group of Vietnamese volunteers working for various public and private groups dealing with immigrant and cross-border family issues. The researcher was further introduced to certain Vietnamese-Taiwanese transnational families by these public and private groups. The second way to reach potential participants was through the help of teachers at public kindergartens. The researcher visited three public kindergartens situated in Tainan City and introduced the study to the teachers. If a teacher agreed to help, the researcher then left the aforementioned document for the teacher to pass on to students whose mother was from Vietnam. Thus the researcher did not have direct contact with the Vietnamese mothers unless they were willing to participate and called the researcher for more details. The third way to contact potential participants was by using the researcher's social network. One Vietnamese participant was the neighbour of the researcher's acquaintance.

Most of the data collected were family talks at dinnertime when most of the family members were able to gather together after work or school and share with one another what had happened during the day. Before the recording started, all participants were informed of the recording process and the time that they were expected to contribute. They were also aware that they were to be video-taped whenever the researcher was present at dinner time. Moreover, all participants had completed the letter of consent and filled out the personal information form, so they were clear that personal names would be avoided and substituted with conventional initials or pseudonyms. Most importantly, they knew clearly that they were free to withdraw from the research during the course of the agreed recording time.

With regard to data transcription, all spoken in Mandarin was transcribed by *Hanyu Pinyin* which is the Romanisation system used widely in China. On the other hand, all Taiwanese speech was transcribed by another Romanisation system used specifically for the Taiwanese

language in Taiwan. Any spoken Vietnamese in the paper was noted down in Vietnamese written form as it consists of Romanised alphabet. Each language was marked by a distinctive style, i.e. Mandarin speech was put in plain type whereas Taiwanese speech was in italics and Vietnamese speech in boldface. All the spoken language was then translated into English by the researcher and marked in round brackets under original utterances. The transcription symbols in this paper are based on the conventional system developed by Gail Jefferson (cited in Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998) which is commonly used in conversation analytic research.

4. Data Analysis

After reviewing the corpus, it appears that the Vietnamese spouses use Taiwanese and Mandarin in a careful way which enables them to cooperate with their Taiwanese family members in parenting the youngest generation, particularly in admonishment sequences.

4. 1. Vietnamese spouses' language use patterns in self-initiated admonishment sequences

Extract 4.1 started when the Vietnamese spouse (S), her mother-in-law (G), her first child (J) and her second child (F) were in the first 3 minutes of their dinner. Before the extracted interaction, S was telling J to slow down his speed of eating in Mandarin while G was suggesting to F a way to prevent food from irritating her mouth ulcer in Taiwanese. During the course of the discussion, the Vietnamese spouse, S, had noticed that her son, J, was distracted by the cupboard behind him and thus brought the issue into focus in the form of an admonishment. The admonishment, however, was issued in Taiwanese rather than in Mandarin which is the language that she and J had been using.

Extract 4.1

No more playing

04112009 S' 02:29~02:45—M2U04393

Plain: Mandarin Chinese, *Italics: Taiwanese*, **Bold: Vietnamese**, Round Bracket: (English), Double Bracket: ((a non-verbal activity or the transcriber's comments))

G: the Vietnamese spouse's mother-in-law, S: the Vietnamese spouse, J: the Vietnamese spouse's first child, F: the Vietnamese spouse's second child

1	J	((turning to the cupboard and touching the window panel))
2	S	<i>hó lah</i> (.) [<i>mài koh</i> [<i>SNG</i> <i>a lah</i> <i>okay UFP</i> <i>NEG keep play CRS UFP</i> (Okay, no more playing.)
3	J	[((sliding close the glass panel))
4	G	[° <i>ko-ko</i> ° <i>elder brother</i>
5	J	(0.5) ((turning back and looking downward))
6	G	<i>khah-kín chiáh</i> <i>quickly eat</i> (Eat quickly.)

7	S	<i>lí</i> <i>bô</i> <i>sî-kan</i> [<i>thang</i> <i>síng</i> <i>a</i> <i>lah</i> you have no time enable play CRS UFP (You don't have time to play.)
8	J	[((looking at his mom for 0.6 sec.))
9	G	<i>lí</i> <i>lák-tiám-poàⁿ</i> <i>ài</i> [<i>pó-síp</i> <i>neh</i> you six-o'clock-half should go to cram school UFP (You have to go to cram school at 6:30 (pm).)
10	S	[((adjusting J's glasses frame for 1.7 sec.))
11		<i>dui</i> <i>ah</i> True UFP (Indeed.)
12	J	(1.7) ((looking downward while chewing food))
13	S	<i>qing</i> <i>ní</i> <i>zhuan xin</i> <i>chi</i> <i>ah</i> please you focus eat UFP (Please concentrate on your eating.)
14	J	((putting some medicine on the table for 0.6 sec.))
15		<i>hao:de</i> okay (Okay.)
16		((eating the food in his plate))

When S sees her son, J, turning to the cupboard and touching its window panel, she introduces a frame shift to admonishment in Line 2 which projects not only that J's behaviour of panel-touching as *SÍNG* (play), but it is something admonishable and should be terminated. It is shown that this particular admonishment is formulated in Taiwanese with S's production of *SÍNG* noticeably in an emphatic and louder manner. The accented word, which is also the admonishable behaviour, is preceded by a negation marker *mài* showing the admonishment initiator's intention is to have the admonished target stop the admonishable behaviour of playing. Right after S's first TCU in Line 2, J slide closes the window with which the admonishment initiator (i.e. his mother) identifies he is playing. S's admonishment, therefore, displays its influence on J to modify the projected admonishable behaviour. In Line 4, however, G makes a bid for the floor by summoning the admonished, J, (*ko-ko* / elder brother) before the admonishment initiator's turn even comes to an end.

4. 2. A Taiwanese-preferred family member's intervention and collaboration

It is argued that G's pre-empted summoning action in Line 4 is an immediate intervention in the admonishing action initiated by S. First, since '*mài koh* / stop' in Line 2 signals that S attempts to issue an admonishing directive toward one of the present family members, and since J is not engaging in what he is supposed to do, i.e. finishing his food—the normative behaviour at the dinner table, the admonished target can thus be easily inferred by G. Secondly, later in Line 6 after her summoning action, G is seen to formulate a follow-up

admonishment addressed to the same target, J, by warning him that he should not only resume the normative behaviour (eating) but also resume it at a certain pace by uttering *khah-kin chiah* (eat quickly). G's action in Line 4 thus, on the one hand, prepares her for producing a follow-up admonishment targeting J; on the other hand, it shows clearly that she treats him as the target of S's admonishing directive in Line 2 for his disengagement in the normative eating behaviour and the engagement in a deviant playing behaviour. Therefore, G's summoning in Line 4 is an immediate intervention in an admonishing context, and the two adults have so far demonstrated their cooperation in the admonishment sequence initiated by the Vietnamese spouse in that one warns the admonished to stop a deviant and admonishable behaviour at the dinner table, while the other warns the same target to engage in the normative behaviour in the expected way.

The admonishment initiator, S, then recycles the essential element *SNG* (play) in her previous turn, and expands the admonishment by providing an account specifying that the playing action has to be stopped, because the admonished, (J) has no time for this. This admonishment initiated by S in Line 7, like the one in Line 2, is again produced in Taiwanese. In Line 9, G self-selects herself as the next speaker and provides a more detailed account explaining that the very reason that J has no time to play is because of his tight schedule and that he has to arrive at the cram school by 6:30pm. Therefore, up to Line 9, G is seen to have offered her efforts in collaborating with S in this admonishment episode twice. G's account not only shares S's stance but also contributes to a crescendo of J's playing as problematic and admonishable, and further justifies S's initiation of this admonishment sequence. In particular, by contributing her backing with incremental details based on S's admonishment, G is participating in the production of the admonishment sequence that constitutes her a 'co-author' (cf. Levinson, 1996).

4. 3. The admonishment initiator's resumption of Mandarin and the frame shift away from admonishment

Further in Line 11, G's collaboration is ratified and confirmed by the admonishment initiator, S, with her production of an agreement token (*dui* / indeed). This particular ratification, however, is produced in Mandarin which is resumed by S and J for ensuing interaction. Moreover, the Vietnamese spouse, S, shifts the admonishment frame to that of a request in Line 13 asking J to 'please concentrate on eating' after he shows compliance by chewing food in Line 12. On the other hand, however, it is from Line 11 onwards since S resumes Mandarin that G makes no bid for speakership and her position thus returns to 'audience' (ibid.) for the Mandarin-dominated mother-child interaction.

It is therefore argued that the Vietnamese spouse's alternation to Taiwanese leads to intervention and collaboration from another adult member who prefers the switched-to linguistic code (as in Lines 6 and 9). Meanwhile, when the Vietnamese spouse resumes Mandarin, the action not only signals the end of the admonishment, but it also brings about the Taiwanese-preferred family member's withdrawal from the interactional floor. What can be drawn from this extract, therefore, is that the Vietnamese spouse uses the two languages available in the bilingual family as contextualisation cues to signal the shift of interactional frames, and thus allows a Taiwanese-preferring family member (the mother-in-law in this case) to navigate her various participant positions (i.e. from audience to a co-author and then to audience) in an admonishment episode.

Similar findings can be found in Extract 4.2 below. Before the segment, the dinner table was set and the whole family was about to have dinner. After setting the table, however, the

Vietnamese spouse (S) left the dinner table to finish her chores at the kitchen sink and was therefore off-camera while the others started to enjoy the food. Since the sink was only three steps away from the interactional arena, i.e. the dinner table, S was capable of hearing the verbal interaction among her mother-in-law (G), her son (J) and her daughter (F), yet she could only have limited view of the interaction because of the seating arrangement and the location where she was situated. Extract 4.2 starts when G offered J some vegetables which J refused by shaking his head, yet the grandmother somehow carried out the offering regardless of J's head-shaking. This sparked J's protest by both wielding his chopsticks in the air and grumbling loudly. This behaviour triggered G and S to respectively initiate repair operations and invites S to further initiate an admonishment in Taiwanese addressing J's behaviour.

Extract 4.2

Not happy with Grandma helping you?

12102009 S' 01:20~01:55—Video 1

Plain: Mandarin Chinese, *Italics: Taiwanese*, **Bold: Vietnamese**, Round Bracket: (English), Double Bracket: ((a non-verbal activity or the transcriber's comments))

G: the Vietnamese spouse's mother-in-law, S: the Vietnamese spouse, J: the Vietnamese spouse's first child, F: the Vietnamese spouse's second child

1		<i>a-má kā lí ngeh lâi a-má kā lí ngeh</i> <i>grandma to you pick come grandma to you pick</i>
		(Let grandma help you get the food. Here, let grandma help you get the food.)
2		(1.7)
3	G	yao bu yao want NEG want
		(Do you want it?)
4		((picking up some shredded carrots and moving toward J))
5	J	hm ((shaking his head horizontally))
6	G	((putting shredded carrots into J's bowl))
7	J	eiemum :: ((waving his right hand with chopsticks in the air))
8		(0.6)
9	G	<i>án-ná</i> [[°] lah [°]] <i>what</i> UFP
		(What?)
10	S	[liu jung-ji <i>teh</i> <i>hhòng-sáⁿ</i> NAME ASP-dur. do what
		(Liu Jung-Ji what are you doing?)
11		(1.2)

12	S	liu jung-ji NAME	ah UFP							
		(Liu Jung-Ji)								
13	G	a-má grandma	kā to	lí you	ngeh pick	lí you	m̄-hó NEG-okay	o' UFP		
		(Do you not want grandma to help you get the food?)								
14		(1.4)								
15	S	lí you	chhòng-sá ⁿ do what	a-má grandma	bang help	ni you	jia pick	eh UFP		
		(What were you doing? Grandma was helping you get the food.)								
16		ni you	zemo what	la UFP						
		(What's the matter with you?)								
17		(1.2)								
18	S	a-má grandma	shi COP	zai ASP-dur.	guanxin concern	ni you	nei UFP	(.)		
		(Grandma was showing her concern about you.)								
19		ni you	*zi sit	yuan (.) far	zuo sit	namo (.) so	zuo sit	yuanyuande far away	bang help	ni jia you pick
		(You sit so far away. She was helping you get the food.)								
20		((sitting between G and F while talking to J))								
					lí: you	a DM	lí you	a: DM		
		(You, you)								
21		ah DM	lí you	sī COP	teh ASP-dur.	toā-sia ⁿ loud voice	sá ⁿ what			
		(Why did you raise your voice?)								
22	J	((stirring his food with chopsticks till the end of this extract))								
23	S	((looking at F for 0.4 sec.))								
24		fu xuan NAME								
		(Fu-Xuan)								
25	F	((looking at S))								
26	S	chi eat	le ASP-pfv.	ma UFP						
		(Have you eaten?)								

27		[((putting shredded carrots into F's bowl))
28	F	[hm::

In Line 1 when G offers J help to get some food in Taiwanese, there is no response from J to acknowledge G's proposal. After the 1.7-sec silence, therefore, G self-selects herself as the next speaker and picks up some shredded carrots while at the same time alternates to Mandarin to produce the first pair part of a question-answer sequence *yao bu yao* (do you want it) to elicit J's willingness for the offer. In Line 5, J is seen to formulate the second pair part of this question-answer sequence with the production of a minimal response token *hm* as well as shaking his head. J's formulation, however, is treated by G as an acceptance of the proposition in the sense that she carries out the offering action and puts the shredded carrots into J's bowl in Line 6. J then reacts to G's action in verbal and nonverbal agitation which is substantiated by his production of a grumble in a gradually louder manner with ending sound stretches (*eieum::*) and by violently waving his right hand with chopsticks in the air. J's agitated behaviour subsequently invites G to produce an 'open-class repair initiator' (Drew, 1997) *án-ná* (what) in Line 9, and triggers S to produce in Line 10 utterances that are composed of an explicit summon of speaker of the trouble source (i.e. the boy's name) and a repair initiator specifically locating J's behaviour as the repairable (*teh hhòng-sáⁿ* / what are you doing). S's turn in Line 10 not only forestalls G's turn completion in Line 9, but also anticipates the nominated next-speaker's (i.e. J's) turn. Both G's and S's turns demonstrate that the two adults treat J's behaviour as a trouble source resulting from either a hearing, speaking or understanding problem (Schegloff *et al.*, 1977). Moreover, the two turns uniformly projects J as the next-speaker, yet he fails to claim the floor and leaves it unoccupied for 1.2 seconds in Line 11.

In Line 12, S then engages in a second try to summon J, which again projects the boy as the next speaker. Rather than waiting for the nominated next-speaker to produce his TCUs, G bids for the floor and formulates a repair initiator in a question form presuming the reason for J's troublesome behaviour (do you not want grandma to help you get the food), which not only relay-selects J as the next-speaker but also requests J's confirmation of the presumption. This segment has suggested that J's withholding explicit responses (either an affirmation or an explanation) to G's and S's repair initiation in Line 9 and Line 10 are treated by the two adults as noticeably absent and thus drive S to resume the summoning of J in Line 12 and cause G to refashion her interrogation and engage in overt pursuit of an explicit response in Line 13. Like S's summoning action in Line 12 and their previous turns respectively in Lines 9 and 10, however, G fails to draw J out after her utterance. In terms of organisation of repair operation, S's and G's turns (Lines 9, 10 and 13) serving as repair initiators all fail to yield a successful repair by J. It is argued, however, that they function as admonishment pre-sequences co-constructed by G and S to preface an admonishment targeting J.

4. 4. A Taiwanese-preferred adult member's intervention and collaboration in the admonishment pre-sequence

Since S was working at the kitchen sink during J's outburst of grumbling, she could not fully understand what caused her son's behaviour as her vision was partially blocked by G. Even if S lacks a full grasp of the talk-in-interaction between J and G, yet it shows in Line 10 that she treats J's loud grumble as a trouble source. Intriguingly, her utterance initiating repair is produced in Taiwanese. Moreover, after S alternates from Mandarin to Taiwanese in Line 10 followed by J's noticeable silence, G immediately takes the floor after S's resumptive summons in Line 12. Since S does not capture the overall interaction resulting from her

physical absence at the dinner table, G's presumption (Line 13) of J's repairable behaviour to be caused by her offering action helps to address S's lack of sufficient knowledge on the subject matter. G's repair initiation in Line 13 not only explicitly projects J as the next speaker, but also implicitly provides S with ground to evaluate J's agitated behaviour from her epistemic stance. Therefore, G is seen to delicately offer S two-fold help in Line 13 by first teaming up with S to produce relay elicitation of J's explanation for his behaviour, and then furnishing S with necessary knowledge to fashion J's behaviour as admonishable and thus justifies the initiation of an admonishment afterwards.

4. 5. The body of the admonishment (Lines 15-17 and Line 22)

After the 1.4-sec pause in Line 14, S then partly recycles her repair initiator in Line 10 (*teh hhòng-sáⁿ* / what are you doing) and G's utterances in Line 13 (*a-má kā lí ngeh lí m̄-hó o'* / do you not want grandma to help you get the food) to formulate what is argued as an admonishment in Line 15 (*lí chhòng-sáⁿ a-má bang ni jia eh* / What were you doing? Grandma was helping you get the food.) The reason for it being an admonishment is that the first TCU of this turn is a rhetorical question which is immediately followed by an absolute fact sufficient to attest to J's behaviour as admonishable. To begin with, since J's grumble has been targeted by S as a repairable behaviour in previous turns, S knows the answer to her question of what her son has done, i.e. a loud grumble at an elder family member, and thus certifies it as a rhetorical question requiring no response from J. Moreover, the second TCU of this turn not only delivers the fact that G has offered J some food, but it projects G's offering as an action of benevolence by S's formulation '*bang ni jia*' (help you get the food). Most importantly, S orients to the membership category 'grandmother', and invokes the predicates associating with it. The orientation to the category specifically and explicitly locates J's grumble as a wrongdoing and as an admonishable behaviour, because one should not make such a rowdy grumble in return for his grandmother's offering of food, especially when it is an act of good will. Therefore, it is argued that an admonishment sequence initiated in Line 15 and continues in Line 16 when S produces *ni zemo la* (what is the matter with you). Later in Lines 18 (Grandma was showing her concern about you) and 19 (You sit so far away. She was helping you get the food), S again projects G's offering as an action out of concern about the admonished, J. The successive utterances from Lines 15, and 16 to Lines 18 and 19, therefore, make a different formulation of admonishment sequence from that in Extract 5.5. That is, it consists of the integration of a rhetoric question (1st TCU in Line 15) and a series of fact statement (2nd TCU in Line 15 and Lines 16, 18 and 19) used to identify admonishable behaviour and justify her perception of J's loud grumble as admonishable and legitimise her initiation of an admonishment.

4. 6. The admonishment initiator's resumption of Mandarin and the frame shift away from admonishment

Another interesting aspect of this admonishment is that S formulates it by undertaking language alternation between TCUs in Line 15, and it is noticeable that since S's alternation to Mandarin, G withdraws from the ensuing mother-child interaction (though the admonished, J, makes no verbal contribution). As in Extract 4.5 the Vietnamese participant's resumption of Mandarin in an admonishment sequence leads to a Taiwanese-preferred family member's change of participant status, this extract, too, leads to G's change of participant status. Since in this case, G only engages in the admonishment pre-sequence (Lines 9-13) rather than the body of the admonishment (Lines 15-16 and 18-21), it is argued that her participant status changes from a 'sponsor' of the admonishment to 'audience' of the mother-child interaction (cf. Levinson, 1996). In other words, she takes part in the admonishment

sequence and has the motivation of treating J's behaviour as admonishable, yet is not the actual transmitter of the admonishment.

It is worth mentioning that throughout the extract, J has been projected as the SPP speaker several times (Lines 11, 14, 17, 22) in the admonishment pre-sequence and the admonishment body when G and S ask about the reason for his repairable/admonishable behaviour. Nevertheless, he does not fulfil the projected reciprocity and remains silent. Since silence, as Heritage (1988) argues, is itself a response which serves the major motivation for a non-responding party to produce either compliant actions or accounts for non-compliance, J's absence of response in Line 22 seems to be treated by S as a preferred and compliant action as the admonishment sequence is not further expanded. S is then seen to signal a frame shift from admonishment to food-offering by first gazing at her second child, F (who has been amongst the 'audience' during the admonishing interaction), and then by summoning F in Mandarin for subsequent carrot-offering action in Line 27.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This paper aims to identify how Taiwanese and Mandarin (the two dominant languages in Taiwan) are used as interactional resources by Vietnamese female spouses in bilingual Taiwanese families. By adopting an EM/CA approach, it was found that the Vietnamese participants orient to Taiwanese and Mandarin as salient resources in admonishment sequences. The two extracts presented have demonstrated that in self-initiated admonishment sequences, a Vietnamese spouse issues an admonishment by alternating from Mandarin to Taiwanese highlighting problem behaviour, signaling the initiation of an admonishment frame and projecting her intent to have the behaviour corrected. In other words, the admonisher not only projects her disalignment with the admonished when the behaviour takes place, but she also projects the disalignment at the language level.

In admonishment sequences, what can be drawn from a Taiwanese-preferred family member's floor bidding and retreat phenomena is that the Vietnamese spouses' ability to translate or alternate between the two languages seems to play an essential role in determining participants' turn-taking in an admonishment sequence. First, while conventionally the current speaker selects a next speaker in current turn or self-selects as the next speaker (which may or may not encounter other participants' competition for the floor), a Vietnamese spouse carves out a potential collaborative floor for another present family member with the language that he/she prefers in admonishment sequences. The present Taiwanese family member can choose to involve in the admonishing action initiated by a Vietnamese spouse. In other words, the Vietnamese participants can use Taiwanese to implicitly invite a Taiwanese-preferred adult family member to cooperate and lead to possible speaker change.

In line with Auer's (1984) arguments, it is identifiable that the Vietnamese participants' code alternation patterns are not only discourse-related code-switching but also participant-related code-switching. It is so because a Vietnamese participant is found to use both Taiwanese and Mandarin to manage turn allocation and thus contributes to the overall organisation of admonishment sequences making the code alternation discourse-related. On the other hand, it is found that their code alternation patterns involve the accommodation of another family member's linguistic competence or preference (i.e. implicitly inviting a Taiwanese-preferred family member by alternating to Taiwanese), they can thus be identified as participant-related. Most importantly, the Vietnamese participants' code alternation in both directions (from Mandarin to Taiwanese and from Taiwanese to Mandarin) is not used to mark lexical

items but is used for ensuing interaction. By studying the unfolding of admonishment sequences, the Vietnamese participants' code alternation patterns in admonishment sequences are mapped out. The study thus not only sheds light on the way that Taiwanese and Mandarin are deployed by Vietnamese female spouses in admonishing sequences, but it also reveals the way Vietnamese-Taiwanese transnational family members engage in familial talk-in-interaction in this specific context.

References

- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.
- Atkinson, M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching*, (pp. 187-214). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One Speaker Two Languages*, (pp. 115-135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Drew, P. (1997). "Open" class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 69-101.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologising language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 281-300.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 283-307.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (1997). Cultural identity and diaspora. In K. Woodward (Ed.), *Identity and difference*, (pp. 51-59). London: Sage.
- Heritage, J. (1988). Conversation accountability. In C. Antaki, (Ed.), *Analyzing Everyday Explanation*, (pp. 127-144). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hsia, H.C. (2000). Transnational marriage and internalization of capital the case of the foreign bride phenomenon in Taiwan. *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies Vol. 39*, 45-92.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Koole, T., & ten Thije, J.D. (2001). The reconstruction of intercultural discourse: methodological considerations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 571-587.
- Kyratzis, A., Tang, Y.T., & Koymen, S. B. (2009). Codes, code-switching, and context: style and footing in peer group bilingual play. *Multilingua*, 28, 265-290.
- Levinson, S. (1988/1996). Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew and A. Wooton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*, (pp. 161-227). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Li, W. (1994). *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li, C.N., & Thompson, S. (1981/1992). *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Li, I. (1999). *Utterance-Final Particles in Taiwanese: A Discourse-pragmatic Analysis*. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Li, W. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society*, 31, 159-180.
- Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: a study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36, 143-184.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self- correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.
- Tien, C.Y., & Wang, H.J. (2006). Masculinity and 'marriable' cross-border marriages: Why Taiwanese men marry Vietnamese women. *Taiwan Southeast Asian Studies*, 3, 3-36.
- Wang, H.J. (2001). Social stratum in issues of marriage migrants and national labour markets: The case of Vietnamese brides. *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies*, 41, 99-127.
- Wang, H.J., & Chang, S.M. (2003). A commodified Taiwanese-Vietnamese cross-border marriage market. *Taiwanese Sociology*, 6, 177-221.
- Zhu, H. (2010). Language socialization and interculturality: Address terms in intergenerational talk in Chinese diasporic families. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10, 189-205.

Appendix 1A Research Project

1. Topic:

The discursive construction of identity and language use patterns in Vietnamese-Taiwanese international families

2. Data Collection:

A. Video-/audio recording at dinner time (To minimise possible intervention, the recording will mainly be conducted by the participants. Alternatively, the researcher will visit and observe the familial interaction after getting permission.) It is estimated that the recording process will last for 1-2 months, yet it may also be ceased when the recording data collected in each family come to 3 hours.

B. 1-2 post-recording interviews (Each interview may take 1.5 hours and will also be video-/audio recorded.)

3. Each family will be given 3,000 NTD for participation in and contribution to the research project.

Appendix 1B Letter of Consent

Dear Sir/Madam:

My name is Wang Li-Fen, a PhD student based at Newcastle University, UK and major in educational and applied linguistics. I am currently writing my PhD thesis and will need your assistance for collecting data. The following are the introduction to my research topic and research process.

The overall aim of my thesis is to investigate the discursive construction of identity and language use patterns in Vietnamese-Taiwanese international families. In order to gain the appropriate data for analysis, I will be recording your conversation with your friends, family members or relatives at dinner time. The entire recording work will last 1-2 months in total. Your recorded speech will be transcribed into written document and digitalized as well as archived in electronic forms for possible later use on further language research.

If you agree to participate, please sign this letter and fill in the questionnaire attached to this letter. Agreeing to participate in this research does not commit you to anything, and you may change your mind and withdraw at any time. Note that any reporting will be completely anonymous, and neither your names nor your personal details will feature in any reporting of this research.

I will be happy to discuss any aspect of the research with you, so if you have any questions or comments, please don't hesitate to inform me.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Wang Li-fen

I understand that my speech will be recorded, and my name will not be revealed in any reports. I also agree that my recorded speech may be used later for archiving and for further language studies.

Signed:

Date:

Appendix 1C

Personal Information

Name:

Sex:

Mother tongue:

Nation/City acquiring mother tongue:

Language(s) using in the recording:

Nation/City acquiring the language(s) using in the recording:

Age of acquiring/learning the language(s) using in the recording:

Level of formal education:

Occupation:

Date of birth:

Birth place:

Address:

Telephone number:

E-mail:

Thank you for your help!!!

Appendix 2

CA Transcription Conventions

(Adapted from Atkinson and Heritage 1984)

- [] Overlapping utterances – (beginning [] and (end])
- = Contiguous utterances (Latching intra/inter turn)
- (0.4) Represent the tenths of a second between utterances
- (.) Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)
- : Sound extension of a word (more colons demonstrate longer stretches)
- . Fall in tone
- , Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)
- An abrupt stop in articulation
- ? Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
- LOUD Capitals indicate increased volume
- loud Different front sizes indicate gradually increased volume
- Underline words indicate emphasis
- ↑ ↓ Rising or falling intonation (before part of word)
- ◦ Surrounds talk that is quieter
- > < Surrounds talk that is faster
- < > Surrounds talk that is slower
- (?) Inaudible utterances
- (()) Analyst's notes

Appendix 3

Glossing

(Adapted from Li 1999; Li and Thompson 1992)

3sg = third person singular pronoun

ASP = aspect marker (including perfective, durative, experiential, delimitative)

ASSOC = associative
 CL = classifier
 COP = copula
 CRS = currently relevant state
 CSC = complex stative construction
 delim. = delimitative aspect marker
 DISP = disposal marker
 DM = discourse marker
 dur. = durative aspect marker (e.g. 在 zai, 著 zhe)
 GEN = genitive
 NAME = proper noun
 NEG = negation marker
 NOM = nominalizer
 PASS = passive voice marker
 pfv = perfective aspect (e.g. 了 le)
 Q = question marker
 RT = reactive token
 UFP = utterance final particle

ⁱ Goffman (1981) proposes the concept of 'frame' which refers to basic elements defining a situation (e.g. what is going on, what activity is being engaged in, how speakers mean what they say, etc.)

ⁱⁱ According to Goffman (ibid.), 'footing' refers to the various ways participants display their epistemic accountability and ensuing authorities (e.g. participants' alignment and assessment made in a particular frame, and the realignment and reassessment made from one frame to another.)